

2022 Visiting Team Report

Fairmont State University
School of Architecture

M.Arch.

Initial Accreditation Visit
October 31-November 2, 2022

The logo for the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) is displayed in large, bold, white, sans-serif capital letters. The letters are closely spaced, with the 'A's and 'B's having a slightly irregular, blocky appearance.

National
Architectural
Accrediting
Board, Inc.

Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Visit	3
II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	4
III. Program Changes	5
IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation	5
1. Context and Mission	
2. Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession	
3. Program and Student Criteria	
4. Curricular Framework	
5. Resources	
6. Public Information	
V. Appendices	26
1. Conditions Met with Distinction	
2. Team SPC Matrix	
3. The Visiting Team	
VI. Report Signatures	30

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The visiting team wishes to thank the program, college, and university for hosting this virtual accreditation visit. An extended thank you goes out to Kirk Morphew, program coordinator for architecture, and Robert Kelly, graduate program director. Both individuals worked tirelessly to provide information and organize this virtual visit.

The team found a program that is incredibly eager to advance and build on the many years of planning and preparation for an accredited graduate-level program. The visiting team is grateful for the program's hospitality and to all individuals who participated in the preparation of and during the visit. The program uniquely serves the state of West Virginia and strives to become the state's first accredited school of architecture.

Due to the small scale of the program, graduate faculty continue to take on administrative burden of record-keeping, organizing, gallery management, and scheduling that is not sustainable for a growing program. All fabrication shops and labs used by graduate students need dedicated staff to function properly and safely. The program acknowledged these challenges as a human resources-focused "pinch point" during the visit. In addition, a long-range strategic plan that nests within the institution's aspirations and that goes beyond the horizon of an initial accreditation is paramount for the program. The program is challenged with proactively managing change in curricula, human resources, physical resources, and financial resources as it grows and pivots with an ever-changing academic environment of learning and engagement with society. This must be balanced while defining a program that contributes to responsive, impactful architecture for West Virginia and the region.

Faculty, staff, students, and the professional community share excitement and curiosity for student success within the program that has made its way into their local communities for over a generation. The graduate program is well-understood and lauded throughout all functional levels of the institution and has the highest levels of support to further develop its positioning and impact as a stand-out graduate program for the university, as well as for the Northern West Virginia/Appalachian region.

The team heard from the professional community how instrumental this program has already been to create a visible impact on West Virginia's built environment through knowledge sharing and creative and sustainable design solutions. Over the years, students-turned-graduate professionals are revitalizing landscapes and towns and mending communities suffering from neglect and population decline. The program's reputation to feed and grow the pipeline of architects and offer lasting contributions to the built environment in the state of West Virginia is highly commendable and critical to the future redevelopment, economic growth, and livability of the state according to all constituents that the team interacted with during the visit.

b. The team found insufficient evidence for the following Conditions:

- 2 – Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession
- 4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education
- 5.2 Planning and Assessment
- 5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2014 Conditions Not Met

C.3 Integrative Design: Ability to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

Previous Team Report (2020): Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not sufficient in student work prepared for ARCH 5550 Comprehensive Design Studio and ARCH 6650 Advanced Architectural Design. Additional documentation was needed in order to better understand the students' overall ability to illustrate their decision process when dealing with materials, technology systems, building systems, and others within the development of a comprehensive design.

2022 Team Analysis: SPC C.3 Integrative Design has been replaced by SC.5 Design Synthesis and SC.6 Building Integration in the current 2020 Conditions.

I.4.1 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, Appendix 1, in catalogs and promotional media.

Previous Team Report (2020): The following information was provided in the APR, page 32, and verified through the program website. The team observed inconsistency in including the exact language of the sample text for accredited programs found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

The correct statement was provided in these locations:

<https://www.fairmontstate.edu/collegeofscitech/academics/accreditation>

<https://www.fairmontstate.edu/collegeofscitech/academics/architecture-program>

A version of the required statement found here omitted the projected year of initial accreditation:

<https://catalog.fairmontstate.edu/content.php?catoid=4&navoid=485>

2022 Team Analysis: The team found that the correct statement is included in the 2022-2023 Graduate Catalog and the program's website.

2014 Conditions Not Applicable

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates: NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/postsecondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their websites to the results.

Previous Team Report (2020): The Fairmont State University Architecture program has not graduated a single cohort that would allow them to provide this statistic.

2022 Team Analysis: NCARB does not currently track ARE pass rates for Fairmont State University. Once the pass rates are tracked this information will need to be made available via the program's website.

III.2 Interim Progress Reports: The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (see Section 11, NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition, Amended).

Previous Team Report (2020): As the program moves through its Candidacy phase, there are no interim progress reports on record.

2022 Team Analysis: This requirement is not applicable to a program seeking initial accreditation.

III. Program Changes

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

2022 Team Analysis: Previous evaluations were conducted under the 2014 Conditions and the 2015 Procedures. The program responded to changes in these Conditions and Procedures by identifying four program outcomes that incorporate the Program and Student Criteria outlined in the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation. These program outcomes center on design decision making, the development of sustainable design, the role of the practitioner, and the application of precedents and technologies. This organization addressed all of the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation Program and Student Criteria through different frameworks, with some of these criteria incorporated in more than one of the program learning outcomes.

Taskstream by Watermark allows for integration of assessment across the institution. This platform is somewhat new to the program. This assessment tool provides an objective review structure for verifying that course learning outcomes are achieved, which support the program outcomes. Course data is entered into Taskstream by faculty each semester. Student achievements are tracked as assignments are assessed at different levels, which then can be compiled to review the achievements of all students in the course. The descriptions of the achievements have accuracy and detail, which serves as informative feedback for the student. In addition, the entire faculty reviews coursework annually through marks and comments on rubrics and a review that includes faculty, students, professionals, and administration is completed every five years.

In response to the new conditions, the program has introduced a broad discussion of the profession in introductory courses and included collaboration and inclusion in the studio sequence. These changes have brought attention to the larger understanding of the design profession and collaborative activities.

IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

1—Context and Mission (*Guidelines, p. 5*)

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 those 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).

Described

2022 Team Analysis: The program described their mission and overall philosophy on architectural education in the APR, which provides an emphasis on opportunities outside of the traditional school setting. Of particular note is a strong relationship with the AIAWV chapter through programs such as the Professional Advisory Committee and the Community Design Assistance Center (CDAC). The CDAC provides a great opportunity for students to participate in meaningful ways in the community. This practice serves as a model to demonstrate ways to achieve professional goals. Emphasis on engagement of this nature is also shown with the encouragement of minors and other interdisciplinary programs and the Celebration of Student Scholarship (CSS) described on page 8 of the APR. The program also actively supports the AIAS chapter and allows them to enhance the school rather than compensate for where it may be lacking. Of particular note is acknowledgment of the importance to the program regarding accessibility and availability to many different students as there is a lack of other programs in the area and the reasonable tuition at Fairmont State University makes the education affordable to many. The program mentions their efforts at meeting institutional goals informally, as noted on page 32 of the APR. Evidence was not found where the program's strategic planning beyond initial accreditation is clearly nested within the institution's strategic plans.

2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession *(Guidelines, p. 6)*

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. *(p.7)*

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. *(p.7)*

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. *(p.7)*

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. *(p.8)*

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. *(p.8)*

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. *(p.8)*

Not Described

2022 Team Analysis: Long-range planning efforts and goals are not addressed in the Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession, as described on pages 10-12 of the APR. This narrative does not indicate where students learn about the majority of the shared values, such as identifying specific courses required in the Master of Architecture program. On pages 1-4 of the Fairmont State University RFI response (per the Fairmont State University_RFI.pdf shared by the program in response to the visiting team chair's initial review and request for more information), additional information maps out the needs for faculty and physical resources as the program grows; however, these were not framed within the context of aspirational goals to outline a path for the program's future and no further information regarding long-range planning beyond initial accreditation was shared at the time of the visit. While each of the shared values are understood presently, these are not advanced beyond initial accreditation nor located within the professional curriculum in required curricular activities. The program did not present a strategic plan linking goals and values to define specific objectives and actions.

Design: The narrative does not describe ideas for developing a particular approach to or view of design at Fairmont State University. Meetings with faculty and students provide an understanding that the studio environment creates rich and intriguing design inquiries. Non-curricular activities such as the Mayfield Lecture, also highlight design, as this event brings in a professional on an annual basis to introduce diverse ways of thinking about architecture. The narrative does explain how students are introduced to diverse points of view about design from studio critics, lectures, and outside reviewers who present different perspectives of architecture. The narrative in the RFI states that the design value is the "backbone" of the degree program that informs the need for faculty, physical, and financial resources. However, there was not sufficient evidence of linking this value to long-range goals to provide a framework of goals, objectives, and actions.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: The narrative in the APR did not describe how this value influences long range planning. On page 10 of the APR, the value of environmental stewardship is linked to ARCH 5560, Architecture Design Seminar-Sustainable, which is a required course in the professional program. The course presents environmental stewardship and professional responsibility as a central role of the profession, including food production, energy resources, and waste management. The course also prepares students for the LEED Green Associate examination. Conversations with students and faculty confirmed environmental sustainability is an important value for the program. In the RFI on page 1, Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility are stated to be a "program wide imperative" that informs the need for faculty, physical, and financial resources. However, there was not sufficient evidence linking this value to long-range goals, objectives, and actions.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: Opportunities relating to equity, diversity, and inclusion available for students in the professional program are not described, nor are these opportunities part of long-range goals. How students learn to engage equity, diversity, and inclusion into their professional degree coursework is not clear. On page 11 of the APR, it is noted that the program strives to "create a climate of opportunity and fairness" to allow for and help develop individual expression. At a program level, equity is pursued through providing functional and safe spaces. Inclusivity is also part of the program as Fairmont State University is affordable in comparison to other institutions, providing access to education for a broad range of students. The program's' goal to improve the understanding of an inclusive global culture is stated in the Fairmont State University RFI on page 2. A significant initiative presented in the RFI is the commitment of the architecture program to establish a scholarship program for minority students in the graduate architecture program. The Interim President Dianna Phillips and Interim Provost Tim Oxley addressed diversity, equity, and inclusion within the context of the institution. The concerns of equity, diversity, and inclusion need to be translated into the long-range goals for the program beyond initial accreditation.

Knowledge and Innovation: How knowledge and innovation are incorporated and developed in the long-range planning of program is not yet clearly defined. There is recognition that this value applies to various scales and the program narratives outline the ways in which students explore and advance the profession. Evidence was found in the APR and RFI, and includes the documentation for PC.5 Research and Innovation. Specifically, ARCH 6610 seminar course and ARCH 6550 studio course teach and engage students in research, which ultimately produces architectural knowledge. This work and other similar engagements need to be addressed and developed as part of the long-range planning goals beyond initial accreditation for the program.

Leadership and Collaboration: The program did not clearly explain how this value connects to long range planning goals. The size of the program supports the development of leadership and collaboration among the students. This is extended with interdisciplinary student projects. Additional evidence was found in PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration in ARCH 5500 Community Design Studio and the student leadership development that occurs through opportunities in the small class sizes or through activities such as AIAS. The Fairmont State University RFI note intercollegiate and community partnerships and collaborations in ARCH 5500 with the City of Fairmont and the Fairmont Development Corporation. Strong possibilities for leadership and collaboration are present, but how these evolve and grow needs to be clarified through long-range planning goals.

Lifelong Learning: It was not clear how life learning informs long term planning goals. The program demonstrates lifelong learning with its engagement in AIAWV and its role in continuing education efforts. How students learn of lifelong development was found in the documentation for PC.1 Career Paths, as ARCH 5540 Professional Practice, ARCH 5580 Internship, and the activities of the Architect Licensing Advisor for the program provide a solid basis for establishing professional learning throughout one's career. The Fairmont State University RFI states a goal of developing the students' awareness of their role as "global citizens." The RFI further highlights efforts for financial resources to facilitate students and faculty attending conferences and workshops that contribute to their individual and collective learning. All these courses, activities, and efforts provide promise for lifelong learning, yet it is not clear as to how this is part of the long-range planning goals.

3—Program and Student Criteria (*Guidelines, p. 9*)

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) (*Guidelines, p. 9*)

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. (p.9)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: Adjunct Professor and Architect License Advisor Joshua Lyons provides annual workshops to inform students of the professional requirements for licensure including the AXP and ARE components. In meetings with Mr. Lyons and the students, it was confirmed that students attend annual online meetings, one of which is an introduction to the path of licensure and the other that addresses the transition to practice. Lyons confirmed that approximately 80% of the students attend both lectures.

Further, the APR and supporting documentation for ARCH 5540 Professional Practice (specifically, the course schedule) provide examples of how the program ensures students understand the process of becoming licensed. The APR narrative and a review of the program offers ARCH 5580 as an elective internship course for graduate students.

The assessment of Career Paths occurs through the University's formalized assessment using Taskstream by Watermark. The ARCH 5540 Professional Practice Narrative states that in the fall 2002 semester, that the students exceeded the benchmark of 80%. Evidence of achieving this benchmark was not provided, nor was an improvement plan offered. However, the team did confirm that students were aware of the path to licensure and many had started AXP records. In addition, the number of professionals associated with the program who have chosen related fields for their careers demonstrates that students are aware of the potential for work in historic preservation, planning, and other similar areas.

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. (p.9)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: The program views design thinking as pivotal in architectural education. The first graduate studio teaches and assesses the student's capability to consider multiple design factors at once. While the ARCH 5500 studio addresses issues at a larger scale and looks at a wide variety of programming from year to year, the program enables students to explore more minute details of design within the next set of studios, ARCH 5550 and ARCH 6550. The program has also shown a level of response from student and faculty feedback to the design ideas and scale of the projects, ensuring that the learning outcomes and quality of work is kept as a priority. Furthermore, opportunity for students to select and execute their own design thesis in the ARCH 6550 studio allows for students to explore their own design interests and refine their design thinking and processes further. This individualized investigation is accomplished simultaneously to meeting the final requirements of the architectural education. This studio not only demonstrates a capacity for design but exemplifies the unique ways in which individuals choose to tie their design work to their passions.

As mentioned on page 7 of the APR, the program also offers a Mayfield lecture in which design ideas and inspiration are introduced to the students. The invited speakers are selected to bring awareness to an array of perspectives within the design profession.

The program assesses learning about design through Taskstream by Watermark at the end of the semester. Studio professors review the student work in comparison to the learning outcomes and enter the results in the assessment tool. Evaluation remarks are shared with the student and retained for program review. Full faculty evaluations occur yearly, with faculty comparing studio work to identified learning outcomes. A larger group consisting of faculty, administration, professionals, and community members evaluates the work every five years. Taskstream and yearly evaluation documentation was shared, but not five-year review work. No improvement plan was shared.

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. (p.9)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: The program addresses sustainability as a fundamental responsibility of the profession by introducing environmental ideas and architectural responses early in the curriculum and

including this subject as part of the required courses throughout a student's course of study. In ARCH 5560, sustainability is the primary topic explored. Social, political, and economic understandings are examined, and environmental issues are studied through a broad range of activities such as food production, energy resources, and waste management. The course aims to equip students to employ sustainable principles in their work, creating healthy environments and protecting natural resources and sites. ARCH 5550 also addresses sustainability in the studio through assignments that explore how a student successfully incorporates daylighting, passive ventilation, views, and recycled materials in a project.

The Mayfield lecture has invited speakers who share their engagement in sustainable practices and resilience, which not only enlightens students but also provides continuing education lessons for area practitioners. In addition, the school participates in a campus recycling program.

At the conclusion of ARCH 5560, students are prepared to take the LEED Green Associate exam. The program has a 100% pass rate for the LEED Green Associate and LEED AP exams, as cited on page 7 of the APR. This achievement serves as an assessment tool with comparisons beyond the university. For ARCH 5550, Taskstream provides a way to evaluate sustainable responses that are then able to be relayed to the student and reviewed for achieving learning outcomes. This evaluative documentation was shared. A plan for improvement was not offered.

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. (p.9)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: The program's primary evidence of this criteria was found in ARCH 5510, Architecture Design Seminar 1. The program demonstrates its curriculum, structure, and assessment around history and theory of architecture and urbanism through evidence consisting of a syllabus, schedule, narrative, and self-assessment. This seminar course is taken in the first semester of the graduate program and is coupled with ARCH 5500, the Community Design Studio, which provides opportunities of understanding diverse social, cultural, economic, and political forces, regionally, nationally, and globally. Student assessment is through evaluation of course discussions, annotations of assigned course reading, and course presentations. Per the program's annual self-assessment, student outcomes exceeded their 80% benchmark in fall 2021. The program reviews courses annually for adjustments and additions, based on benchmarking and student surveys. A new spin-off course that focuses on historic preservation and adaptive reuse is a result of self-assessment of ARCH 5510.

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. (p.9)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: Research and Innovation: The program's primary source of research is through their large-scale final studio project that spans the ARCH 6610 seminar course and the ARCH 6650 studio course. Throughout the experience of the courses the students are provided an opportunity to understand a more general stance on architectural research through a series of required readings. After this investigation, they explore their own strategies and initiatives for their own chosen research topic. This endeavor culminates in a complex design studio in which the students are asked to not only explore the topic they chose but to do additional design investigations. In its entirety, this process satisfies the need to learn about and engage in design research, offering the student an opportunity to push the profession towards innovation and new ideas. During the discussion with the students, they mentioned how they feel the program has excelled in educating them on how to think and research architectural ideas. The students also expressed a strong appreciation and readiness for the profession due to the

research they had done in their ARCH 6610 and ARCH 6650 courses. Assessment evidence was shared for ARCH 6650. Through conversations with the students and the faculty, it is clear that these assessments are reviewed and plans to improve the work are entertained.

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. (p.9)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: The program's curriculum integrates collaborative leadership as stated in the APR and supported in virtual documentation for ARCH 5500 Community Design Studio. Projects in this studio are community based and include explorations of neighborhood developments, landscape, urban design, and historic preservation or renovation. Two of the course goals stated in the syllabus are developing approaches that engage the community and work collaboratively. The course schedule includes meetings with the project stakeholders. Design work holds the possibility of becoming realized, although this design studio does not operate in competition with area professionals.

The ARCH 5500 Community Design Studio Narrative states that the students exceed the benchmark of 80% for the course objectives. This assessment is accomplished through Taskstream, which studio instructors use to compile data and identify benchmarks. Students were assessed by faculty and practitioners using a rubric that is included in the course syllabus and transferred to Taskstream. Faculty also review all courses on an annual basis, evaluating the projects in relation to the course learning outcomes. Descriptions of these assessments were provided in the narrative but no evidence was submitted.

Leadership development is enhanced through AIAS, which includes graduate students. This group operates a store, coordinates visits to area firms, and has various campus events such as a taco night to recruit new members. Young alumni in the community member meeting also noted that leadership is learned because of the small size of the program—the setting encourages conversation between students and faculty, which operates as a model of professional communication.

The program does not have a Tau Sigma Delta chapter; nor does it have an Alpha Rho Chi fraternity, a NOMAS chapter, or a Young Women in Architecture chapter. As the program grows, these student organizations are options to be considered.

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. (p.9)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: The transparency of the assessment process adopted by the architecture faculty contributes to the positive learning and teaching culture in the program. Taskstream by Watermark is used at the end of every semester for assessing student learning, introducing an objective standard set for all coursework that is reviewed at established intervals. The Taskstream rubrics from ARCH 5550 demonstrate how this evaluation is documented and is able to be shared with the student as feedback and compiled to gain an understanding of possible improvements in the course, which in turn improve the program. This process is in place for all courses and allows faculty and students to follow a standardized system to identify how learning outcomes are met and recognize ways that learning can be improved and extended. In addition, faculty review the studios yearly. Rubrics from ARCH 6650 provided such evidence, as a clear set of achievements is listed in a rubric that faculty complete with marks and comments. These rubrics reflect the learning outcomes of the studios. The Institutional Effectiveness and

Strategic Operations staff assist with a yearly assessment review. The university also implements a five-year review that involves upper administration, including the dean, provost, as well as professionals, and community members. Students evaluate all faculty every semester. All these reviews provide feedback on which the program can identify needs and introduce changes. The assessment processes are documented well, operate on regular intervals, and involve an array of parties at different times. Creating the teaching and learning culture aids the development of the curriculum.

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. (p.9)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: In multiple courses, the program exhibited a priority on educating their students on the diverse way buildings can impact cities and their communities. Both the ARCH 5510 class and the ARCH 5500 studio focus on the urban and larger scale impact of architecture. The work demonstrates exploration of these issues as students address site, context, and urban conditions within the setting of West Virginia. However, the highlight of their equity and inclusion of their program is their ARCH 6650 studio, which allows students to fully express their own experiences and individuality through their project. Projects engaged in studies of housing, revitalization, and other conditions that are critical issues in this region. In addition to introducing classmates to a wide range of problems and moments of inspiration, the breadth of knowledge identified in these investigations should not be understated. The use of studio projects in this way allows students to explore, challenge, and create equity and inclusion in the built environment.

3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes (Guidelines, p. 10)

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. (p.10)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: The program provided evidence in the APR and supplemental material that student learning outcomes associated with this criterion are articulated and assessed on an annual basis. The assessment cycle is delivered through Taskstream assessment software university-wide per the APR, and was active at the time of the visit. Changes to coursework were acknowledged by faculty at the visit based on student feedback and faculty internal review. Evidence regarding this criterion was found in the narrative, self-assessment, and supporting materials related to graduate-level coursework found in ARCH 5540 and 5560. The team confirmed evidence during the site visit in conversation with the faculty, who affirmed annual course reviews occur and are based on student course surveys and faculty review.

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. (p.10)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: The program addresses professional ethics, regulatory environments, and business processes influencing professional practice in ARCH 5540 Professional Practice. Evidence was found in the documentation through four exams that students complete. Additional documentation was described in the narrative and statistics for the course, both of which provide an overview of the assessment of student work. The sampling includes five students whose grades ranged from 86-91%.

The narrative indicates that the students exceeded the benchmark of 80%. The assessment process is documented in Taskstream by Watermark. No plans for improvement were offered.

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. (p.10)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: Evidence of students applying an evaluative process relating to the compliance of laws and regulations was provided for ARCH 5550, the Comprehensive Design Studio, and ARCH 6650, the Advanced Architecture Design Studio. The APR notes on pages 19-20 that the program addresses principles for life safety, land use, laws, and regulations that apply to building. In ARCH 5550, the course syllabus, schedules, and student work outline the material. The schedule for this course includes the application of building and life safety codes, and an assignment includes the predesign requirements of an analysis of zoning requirements and a code review. Student work in ARCH 5550 and ARCH 6650 indicate that students have knowledge of evaluating and applying life safety, laws, and regulations to building projects. Students are assessed by faculty and practitioners through Taskstream by Watermark. The Fairmont State University RFI page 4 indicates that typically the outcomes are above the 80% target proficiency level. No plan for improvement was included.

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. (p.10)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: Evidence that students have an understanding of systems, technology, and assemblies in building construction was found in ARCH 5550 Comprehensive Design studio through the design of a mid-size commercial building that integrates systems, assemblies, and building technologies. Evidence was identified in the course schedule, course syllabus, assessment rubrics 3-6, and in student work in the form of Course Notebooks and project presentations. The work included methods and criteria for assessing design economics and performance. As described in the Fairmont State University RFI on page 4, the assessment process is documented in Taskstream by Watermark. The assessment outcomes typical exceed the target of 80% efficiency. Based on these assessments, the program continually makes adjustments to improve student learning and outcomes.

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. (p. 12)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: In ARCH 5550, learning outcomes include that each student be able to execute pre-design site analysis, programming, and code reviews, develop a response in the project to daylighting, passive environmental systems, views, thermal mass, solar gain, structural system selections and development, environmental systems, water systems, material selections, life-cycle costs, and other considerations that inform a design. These issues are addressed through a set of assignments that ask students to prepare research and design work.

Through Taskstream by Watermark, the program assesses the student work. Studio learning is guided through one-on-one conversations between student and professor. Through pin-ups and assignments, documentation is collected and evaluated. Assessment for the course happens by the faculty member who teaches the course and by the entire faculty yearly. An examination of how the learning outcomes have been met are recorded and evaluated through the Taskstream documentation and through faculty notes. This information provides a benchmark for the work of the program.

In ARCH 6650, learning outcomes were identified in the course syllabus. While Taskstream is used for all courses, the evidence demonstrated for this course consisted of rubrics completed by faculty. The learning outcomes were listed on the rubric and review of the student projects resulted in noting how well these outcomes were met. While the individual aspects of what is to be synthesized was not listed in the rubric, SC.5 was listed and evaluated as a whole. The rubric also included a more general set of criteria such as clarity of ideas, spatial understanding, quality of drawings, verbal and written communication skills, and professionalism. These criteria were marked and included comments. Additional comments completed the evaluation. No indication of next steps was offered.

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. (p. 12)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: In ARCH 5550, learning outcomes focus on the ability of each student to integrate building systems, technology, user needs, codes, site concerns, materials, and building assemblies. Assignments that address these topics are given throughout the semester. Responses are collected and also included as part of the final project. There are both general rules-of-thumb form responses for sustainability and measurable evaluations of environmental systems. The studio is assessed through assignments addressing these topics. Assessment occurs at the end of the semester by the faculty member who teaches the course and by the faculty yearly. The end of the semester evaluation is organized through Taskstream, which enables each topic to be reviewed and evaluated. The process enables a breadth and consistency in the evaluation. The yearly evaluation is completed by the entire full-time faculty.

Evidence for evaluation and assessment of student work in ARCH 6650 was provided through rubrics completed by the faculty. These documents showed the review of design development work that checked for decisions regarding structural system selections and design, the incorporation of active and passive environmental control systems, decisions regarding massing and sustainability, and materials and assemblies. The evaluations by the faculty provide a comprehensive assessment of the work. No indication of next steps was offered.

4—Curricular Framework (Guidelines, p. 13)

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 (Guidelines, p. 13)

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)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: As noted on page 22 of the APR, Fairmont State University is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission. The accreditation efforts are supported at Fairmont State University by the Accreditation Liaison Officer and administrators tasked with academics, the institution, finances, and data. The university issues associate's, bachelor's, and master's degrees. The institution was last accredited in 2012-13, and will have another accreditation review in 2022-23.

4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum *(Guidelines, p. 13)*

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. *(p.13)*
- 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. *(p.14)*
- 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. *(p.14)*

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.

Met

2022 Team Analysis:

4.2.1 Professional Studies: Links to the catalog that lists courses required for the B.S. Arch and the M.Arch are on page 23 of the APR. These links are available to students. Required and elective courses are noted as well as a suggested sequence of study.

4.2.2 General Studies: As noted on page 23 of the APR, Fairmont State University requires all students to complete a core general studies curriculum of 30-34 credit hours to ensure a wide range of knowledge is acquired. The core curriculum at Fairmont State University includes courses in written and oral communication, mathematics, humanities, fine arts, natural science, social science, citizenship, a first-year seminar, and personal development through courses in global awareness, fitness and well-being, or technology. This core curriculum accounts for 30-34 credit hours. The Fairmont State University RFI on page 5 provides links to the website for transferable credit from regionally accredited institutions. The University reviews applicants to ensure general education core requirements are met.

4.2.3 Optional Studies: The APR on page 24 provides links to the catalog the state that the Master of Architecture includes 12 credit hours of elective courses.

4.2.4 Bachelor of Architecture: not applicable.

4.2.5 Master of Architecture: As stated on page 25 the Master of Architecture programs consists of the minimum credit hours, Master of Architecture 42 credits, and B.S. Architecture 126 for a total of 168 credit hours.

4.2.6 Doctor of Architecture: not applicable.

4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education *(Guidelines, p. 16)*

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.

Not Met

2022 Team Analysis:

4.3.1 While the documentation for evaluating a student's prior academic work is clear, the process itself is not transparent or straightforward. The program states the process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework on their admission requirements website for the Master of Architecture program. This website instructs those interested in applying to the program at Fairmont State University to first submit paperwork for acceptance to the graduate school through the provided link to the general graduate school admission. After the application to the graduate school is submitted, an application to the Master of Architecture program is to be completed. The link to the application document to the Master of Architecture program is provided online. The application directs students who have earned B.S. or B.A. in Architecture degrees from other institutions to submit evidence of completed coursework that fulfills the Program and Student Criteria. It is this step of the admissions process that is unclear as a provided application showed that the Program and Student Criteria noted numerous FSU courses that were fulfilled by numerous courses from the previous institution, preventing a concise and accurate evaluation of the knowledge material already mastered by the applicant and how this translates to the courses at FSU. While there have only been two students in the last six years who completed undergraduate degrees in architecture at another institution and matriculated into the M.Arch. program at FSU, this process needs to be revisited and strengthened for future students.

4.3.2 While the program has identified established standards for meeting accreditation criteria, the program has yet to define how these standards are interpreted clearly. The program lists established standards for applicants to the program in an online form. This form describes that students who have earned a B.S. in Architecture from Fairmont State University have fulfilled designated Program and Student Criteria. Students who earn a B.S. or B.A. in Architecture at an institution other than Fairmont State University have to submit a NAAB PC/SC Matrix or course descriptions and syllabi from their former institutions. The program notes that applicants found to be deficient in studies will have additional coursework. However, because the assessment of the Program and Student Criteria is translated into numerous FSU courses, the ways in which the student's prior outside experience has satisfied the same Program and Student Criteria as students in the BS Arch degree at FSU is not clearly identified, as each of the learning achievements included in each criterion are not individually documented and assessed. A provided application showed FSU courses that addressed the Program and Student Criteria through notation, but this step is accomplished administratively. In this way, applicants do not have access to a clear understanding of how deficiencies have been identified.

4.3.3 The evaluation process is described in the admission requirements, but as previously described, the exact translation of an applicant's previous work in relation to the NAAB Program and Student Criteria is unclear. A sequence of courses is provided online. This sequence informs students who have been continuously enrolled in the program at Fairmont State University of their time to degree. However, for students who have earned undergraduate degrees at other institutions, the time to degree may differ depending on the evaluation of the previously completed coursework. This evaluation is not

straightforward as an applicant would not know how their previous coursework would be assessed by the program to meet NAAB Program and Student Criteria, and therefore applicants may be unaware of the time necessary to complete a degree.

5—Resources

5.1 Structure and Governance *(Guidelines, p. 18)*

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.

Described

2022 Team Analysis:

5.1.1 The structure of the program is described within the overall structure of the university on pages 28-29 of the APR. The Architecture Program Coordinator, Kirk Morphew, is aided by the Undergraduate Program Director, Philip Freeman, and Graduate Program Director, Robert Kelly. The architecture program is one of three in the Department of Architecture Art + Design, which is chaired by Joel Dugan. This department is part of the College of Science & Technology. The colleges report to a provost and are complimented with a faculty senate and graduate school. The provost reports to the president, who serves at the pleasure of the Board of Governors. Currently, both of these positions are filled with interim appointments.

5.1.2 The governance of the program is described on pages 29-30 of the APR. The Graduate Program responds to the Graduate Studies Council. A Faculty Senate, university and college committees, and student organizations work in complimentary relationships to provide voice for all institutional members and support coordinated program, college, and institutional efforts.

5.2 Planning and Assessment *(Guidelines, p. 18)*

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.

Not Demonstrated

2022 Team Analysis: The program provided material pertaining to planning and assessment in the APR, as well as in the RFI.

5.2.1 Evidence was not found in the APR nor the RFI response to satisfy this sub-condition. It is apparent that the focus of the program has been to achieve initial accreditation; however, a strategic plan that recognizes and pursues particular opportunities to frame the program's future was not offered. The

description of the Shared Values in the APR hints at inevitable and safe goals such as exploring ways to expand interest in research, even though student research is evident in ARCH 6650 through the selection of individual projects addressing critical issues, and program research is seen in ARCH 5500 through community projects. The Plan Matrix, which was offered in multiple requests for a strategic plan (in chair's review of APR and again during the visit), provides a calendar for accreditation; reviews the needs for faculty, staff, and facilities; notes assessment periods; and schedules events. Strategic objectives for the program need to work in coordination with the institution to work toward meaningful goals.

5.2.2 Connections between program and institutional goals are not clear. KPIs for the institution, which focus on enrollment and financial growth, are online. The Plan Matrix in the APR, and extended on a departmental website and in the RFI, notes points through Spring 2025 for the areas of accreditation, faculty resources, physical resources, financial resources, professional resources, assessment plans, and special event plans.

5.2.3 Evidence was not found in the APR nor the RFI to satisfy this condition. While the program is reaching all targets it has established in the Plan Matrix, the goals seem timid and certain. Achievements address accreditation; enrollment growth; and reviewing faculty, staff, and facility resources. Multi-year objectives that move the program forward as an accredited architecture program specific to West Virginia and Fairmont State University (or beyond) were not identified.

5.2.4 Evidence of strengths, challenges, and opportunities were not identified in the APR nor in the RFI to satisfy this condition. Strengths of the program that the team identified include a dedicated faculty and adjunct faculty, support from the university and area professionals, and students who are engaged in the courses and program activities, producing competent work that addresses current and critical issues. The place of the program in West Virginia has created a situation in which the faculty have been able to communicate to the students about a pathway to the profession, building a place that connects students to careers. The environment is also one that is rich in research possibilities, and the program has built on that in the development of their courses, such as ARCH 5550 and ARCH 6650. Challenges of program growth need to be addressed, as administrative support and lab supervision are not present. In addition, the program does not seem to be prepared with an objective, transparent, and efficient admissions process if initial accreditation is achieved. Opportunities need to be recognized in a strategic plan for the program, and include acknowledging what architecture students, faculty, and professionals can bring to West Virginia and the region. Possibilities include both studies and professional work addressing Appalachian towns in regard to economics, diminishing populations, employment opportunities, historic structures, and developing an awareness of the profession.

5.2.5 The program demonstrated this sub-criterion. Ongoing input from area professionals was apparent in the visit meeting with the Profession and M.Arch. Alumni. The professionals spoke about the potential for the program and the ways in which it has already been effective in the region. The professionals identified stronger understandings and applications of architecture in the area, which introduces positive changes. The alumni of the program noted that the combination of their education and the nature of its place resulted in a strong basis for their professional work.

5.3 Curricular Development *(Guidelines, p. 19)*

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.

Demonstrated

2022 Team Analysis:

5.3.1 On pages 38-43 of the APR, the relationship between course assessment and curricular development is explained as guided by the institutional assessment tool Taskstream by Watermark. A chart lists key courses that address program outcomes. General assessment takes place when evidence is reviewed, such as tests are graded and then results compiled, or projects evaluated through verifying task completions or commenting on work. All evidence is entered into Taskstream. This review is accomplished each semester by the faculty, per the APR. The faculty also reviews the work through faculty discussions and the completion of rubrics that consist of learning objectives and the Program and Student Criteria associated with the course. The Professional Advisory Committee, other university colleagues and administrators, community members, and student representatives participate in program reviews every five years. This assessment aims to identify needs for changing, adding to, or discontinuing courses. The program's mission and effectiveness are part of this metric and learning outcomes are evaluated in relation to NAAB conditions and NCARB recommendations.

5.3.2 The core faculty are responsible for establishing curricular agendas and initiatives, as noted on page 41 of the APR. There are only four full-time faculty, with two serving as administrators for the program. These four all participate in developing and reviewing the curriculum. However, a larger number of voices are part of the assessment, supporting a more inclusive perspective that balances the small faculty numbers.

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development (*Guidelines, p. 19*)

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.

Not Demonstrated

2022 Team Analysis:

5.4.1: The team found that faculty workloads are not balanced to optimize student and faculty achievement: currently nor long-term. Therefore, this sub-criterion is not demonstrated. Due to the small scale of the program, graduate faculty continue to take on administrative burden of record-keeping, organizing, gallery management, and scheduling that is not sustainable for a growing program. These are in addition to the faculty duties that include teaching, advising, and administrative tasks. Through conversations with Kirk Morphew, the team confirmed that the architecture program does not have dedicated administrative or technical support staff. The program does share a staff position with the college to procure equipment, educational materials and supplies, as well as IT staff. There are no technical positions assigned to the program to manage the digital fabrication labs. These labs are currently managed by students, which may present a safety concern. The program acknowledged these challenges as a human resources-focused "pinch point" during the visit.

Meetings with the faculty and Director, Bob Kelly, and the Program Coordinator, Kirk Morphew, confirmed that teaching is the mission of Fairmont State University. As a result, all full-time faculty are supported to remain current in their expertise, and faculty of professorial rank stated there is a review every five years for graduate faculty status to ensure currency.

Conversations with the full-time and adjunct confirm that the faculty feel they have a balanced workload that facilitates student and faculty achievement in spite of additional administrative duties. All full-time faculty are registered architects. The program strives to promote student and faculty achievement as described in the APR on page 41. Several adjunct faculty members committed that the program works to accommodate their work schedule. The team commends the dedication of the full-time and adjunct faculty.

5.4.2: The program demonstrated this sub-criterion. Joshua Lyons, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP O+M serves as the Architect Licensing Advisor as described on page 44 of the APR. The Fairmont State University RFI on page 6 confirms that he has attended all of the NCARB Licensing Summits held since his appointment as ALA. Both the APR and RFI describe how he performs the duties to ensure students have the resources to guide their path to licensure. In a conversation with Joshua Lyon, he stated that over 80% of the students attend his annual online workshops, the first on the path to licensure, and the second on the transition to practice.

5.4.3: The program demonstrated this sub-criterion for faculty. The report describes the opportunities that faculty have for development and improvement on page 44 of the APR. These include opportunities to maintain professional currency such as applying professional expertise and engaging in professional activities that support the mission of the program. The faculty confirmed that the program does provide development opportunities. Faculty receive support to attend conferences to earn continuing architectural education. Several faculty members cited examples of travel that was funded by the program. The APR provides links to the Fairmont State University Faculty Handbooks for policies on sabbaticals, as well as appointment, promotion, and tenure.

As the program has no dedicated support staff, the team was unable to assess staff development opportunities.

5.4.4: The program demonstrated this sub-criterion. The Fairmont State University Turley Student Services Center provides services to students, including financial aid, advising, and career development, as described on page 45 of the APR and through a link to the Student Services Center website. Conversations with students, faculty, and program administrators confirm that faculty academically advise and mentor students.

In addition, the APR describes counseling services available to students at the Falcon Center. The narrative in the APR for PC.1 Career Paths on page 13 describes internship opportunities available to students. In a meeting with the graduate students, all of the students volunteered that they were pursuing internships, and 75% of them confirmed that they have established their NCARB record and are participating in the Architectural Experience Program.

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (*Guidelines, p. 20*)

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.

Demonstrated

2022 Team Analysis:

5.5.1 The student-to-faculty ratio is low and the physical resources are accessible most hours of the day as demonstrated by discussions with the faculty and students. As mentioned above, faculty are performing nearly all administrative support duties in addition to their teaching load. The faculty mentioned during the visit that 63% of their students are first-generation students and 80% of the students receive federal aid. These characteristics describe a student body that has critical challenges and illustrates that the program is providing an important opportunity and an equitable option for students who are from a background that is not familiar with professional degrees or may encounter significant financial burden for this education.

5.5.2 The program has outlined its desire for a more diverse population on campus. However, they mention that their current faculty gender and ethnicity ratio correspond with their current student body and regional demographics. In a follow up question, administrators explain that they have a 12.4% faculty population that identifies their ethnicity other than white. While not outstanding, they point out that this is still almost double the state average, and that they intend to further develop a more diverse population.

5.5.3 The program has outlined an extensive desire for a more diverse population on campus. While the program lacks racial diversity (most prominently due to the regional population they serve), the program provides a unique experience to students in that region. With no accredited option in the state to-date, the school serves students who likely would otherwise not be aware of or have access to the profession. The measured diversity marks, which mostly include that of race, are at the level of the university; however, the alumni mentioned they are seeing an increase in female students in the program since the last candidacy visit in 2020.

5.5.4 The program has adequately provided documents on their initiatives in each of the categories listed.

5.5.5 Resources and facilities are prepared to aid the physical and mental health needs of the faculty, staff, and students. Functional spaces in the program are described in the APR as physically accessible. Information about mental health support is provided in multiple formats. With the small size of the program, discovery and response to concerns are able to happen much more easily. Additionally, discussions with students conveyed that they feel their program is approachable if concerns arise.

5.6 Physical Resources *(Guidelines, p. 21)*

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.

Demonstrated

2022 Team Analysis:

5.6.1: Sufficient space to facilitate peer-to-peer learning is the result of a recent 5,000 square foot addition to the Engineering and Technology Building, as noted on page 49 of the APR. Additional information is provided in the virtual facility video, showing the studios, classrooms, and other areas. Meetings with Director Bob Kelly, Program Coordinator Kirk Morphew, Department Chair Joel Dugan, Dean Steven Roof, Interim Provost Tim Oxley, and Interim President Dianna Phillips all highlighted the recent reorganization and acquisition of additional space for the architecture program to accommodate current needs and future growth.

5.6.2: There are no technical positions assigned to program to manage the digital fabrication labs. Kirk Morphew confirmed that currently these facilities are managed by students, which presents safety concerns. All fabrication shops and labs used by graduate students need dedicated staff to function properly and safely. Kirk Morphew explained that the program is coordinating with the art program to pilot a program for a faculty to provide training to the students on the safe use of tools in the shops and labs. The virtual tour showed classrooms, multimedia classrooms, computer labs, digital fabrication equipment, woodshop, metal shop, and exhibition spaces that support student learning. In addition, the APR on page 49 provides an overview of learning spaces that includes the Musick Library. Meetings with the students confirmed that they feel they have the resources to perform their work. Students noted the 3-D printers, CNC, and laser cutters as tools they are able to use for their work.

5.6.3: Faculty offices are shown in the video and described on page 49 of the APR. The offices appear sufficient to fulfill the range of roles and responsibilities of the current faculty. Meetings with the full-time faculty confirmed that they had sufficient physical resources to perform their duties, including teaching and advising students.

5.6.4: As indicated by the student work shown in the background of the video, including the work of the CDAC, the program appears to have sufficient resources to support the programs pedagogies. The students noted that the program is responsive to their requests for equipment. The department chair Joel Dugan cited recent efforts to integrate the resources of the Department of Architecture, Art, and Design to share resources and distribute costs to meet the needs of the programs.

5.7 Financial Resources (*Guidelines, p. 21*)

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.

Demonstrated

2022 Team Analysis: In conversation with Dean Steven Roof and Department Chair Joel Dugan, both administrators relayed that the university has adequate financial resources to provide the necessary support for the program. This includes salaries and budget for operations and basic activities. Graduate Program Director Bob Kelly and Program Coordinator Kirk Morphew stated that the university would respond with financial support if needs, such as more adjuncts, occurred. Beyond this university funding, monies to support the program are garnered through student fees. A budget for the program's activities is

described on page 50 of the APR. This includes monies for events such as field trips, lectures, and equipment, supported through a \$400 fee per semester. Funds were available in 2021-2022 to provide three graduate assistantships and all graduate students receive some funding. The APR projects enrollment growth to provide more financial support for the program, and donations are increasing.

5.8 Information Resources *(Guidelines, p. 22)*

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.

Demonstrated

2022 Team Analysis: 5.8 Library resources are accessible and current with modern standards. As stated in the APR, updated architectural publications are kept both in hard and digital copies. The use of a digital catalog for the documents makes them easily accessible for students outside of standard library hours. During the virtual visit with the librarian, it was apparent that the library is supportive of the program. The staff mentioned that individuals are welcome and encouraged to ask questions any time of day and library staff are able to respond at the earliest time possible. The library also expressed its support of student research, allowing for student consultation hours and providing feedback on best practices regarding research. A librarian who has worked with the school for over seven years also expressed their long-term commitment to the program and to the students, ready to assist them in their educational needs. The inclusion of a writing lab and extensive resources on citation creation are important notable resources that are provided.

Digital resources are also provided by the program. Computers are accessible at any hour of the day and have necessary programs, such as Adobe Suite, Revit, AutoCAD, SketchUp, Lumion, and Microsoft Office. The individual overseeing program technology informed the team that the software is housed on up-to-date Alienware desktops that are highly capable of running the necessary software. The students then confirmed this in discussions with them and have no issues or complaints with the resources currently provided to them.

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 *(Guidelines, p. 23)*

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.

Met

2022 Team Analysis: The program provided evidence in the APR by including the weblink on the program's website where the Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees is published and the links were verified by the visiting team.

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures *(Guidelines, p. 23)*

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)

Met

2022 Team Analysis: The program provided evidence in the APR by including weblinks to the locations on the program's website where these documents are posted and the links were verified by the visiting team.

6.3 Access to Career Development Information *(Guidelines, p. 23)*

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.

Met

2022 Team Analysis: The program provided evidence in the APR by including weblinks to the Fairmont State University Enova Career Development Center and the link was verified by the visiting team. The program also provided direct links from the program website several popular architecture career development sites (Archinet; AIA Career Center; AIAWV; and NCARB).

Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents *(Guidelines, p. 23)*

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

Met

2022 Team Analysis: The program provided evidence in the APR by including weblinks to the locations on the program's website where these documents are posted and the links were verified by the visiting team. NCARB does not currently track ARE pass rates for Fairmont State University. Once the pass rates are tracked these will need to be made available via the program's website.

6.4 Admissions and Advising *(Guidelines, p. 24)*

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

Met

2022 Team Analysis:

6.4 Weblinks to information pertaining to admissions and advising was provided and is accessible through the websites provided in the APR.

6.5 Student Financial Information *(Guidelines, p. 24)*

- 6.5.1 The program must demonstrate that students have access to current resources and advice for making decisions about financial aid.
- 6.5.2 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.

Met

2022 Team Analysis:

6.5.1 The program notes on page 54 of the APR that the university has resources for students regarding financial information on the university's student affairs website. This website includes information on tuition and fees, consumer information, and information about payment plans. Financial Aid Services has office hours for students and a net price calculator is on the website. Other financial guidance tools and resources are also listed.

6.5.2 Page 54 of the APR notes the website that describes the cost of tuition, fees, books, and other materials needed for study in the architecture program. This website provides financial estimates for in-state, out-of-state, and metro students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Program fees are listed for architecture courses. The APR also explains that some courses provide materials and textbooks are available on reserve in the library.

V. Appendices

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

PC.1 Career Paths

Students were very communicative during the visit about their knowledge of career pathing: the three "E"s (education, experience, and examination), and said they are well supported by the program's AXP Architect Licensing Advisor. The professional community very much depends on/employees these students and graduates in their local communities. Although not required, students are very active in internships as a means to learn about the profession during their graduate education experience.

PC.5 Research and Innovation

The program demonstrated in their final courses a strong proficiency in research exploration. As evidenced in the APR and during the visit, both students and faculty have expressed the program's capabilities in developing individual research ideas that celebrate student individuality.

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

The program is required to provide the team with a blank matrix that identifies courses by number and title on the y axis and the NAAB SPC on the x axis. This matrix is to be completed in Excel and converted to Adobe PDF and then added to the final VTR.

		PROFESSIONAL COURSES												
		MASTER YEAR 1					MASTER YEAR 2							
		ARCH 5500	ARCH 5510	ARCH 5540	ARCH 5550	ARCH 5560	ARCH 6610	ARCH 6650						
		ARCHITECTURE DESIGN STUDIO - COMMUNITY	ARCHITECTURE DESIGN SEMINAR 1 - SM URBAN CONTEXT	PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE	COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN STUDIO	ARCHITECTURE DESIGN SEMINAR 2 - SUSTAINABLE	ADVANCED STUDY PROPOSAL	ADVANCED ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STUDIO						
PROGRAM CRITERIA														
PC.1	CAREER PATHS			X										
PC.2	DESIGN	X			X				X					
PC.3	ECOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE AND RESPONSIBILITY				X	X								
PC.4	HISTORY AND THEORY	X	X											
PC.5	RESEARCH AND INNOVATION							X	X					
PC.6	LEADERSHIP AND COLLABORATION	X												
PC.7	LEARNING AND TEACHING CULTURE				X				X					
PC.8	SOCIAL EQUITY AND INCLUSION	X	X						X					
STUDENT CRITERIA														
SC.1	HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE IN THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT			X		X								
SC.2	PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE			X										
SC.3	REGULATORY CONTEXT				X				X					
SC.4	TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE				X									
SC.5	DESIGN SYNTHESIS				X				X					
SC.6	BUILDING INTEGRATION				X				X					

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Practitioner Representative

Krista Phillips, FAIA
Director of Facility Planning
Southcentral Foundation
Anchorage, Alaska 99508
907.360.1236
kristarphillips@hotmail.com

Regulator Representative

Robert McKinney, Ed.D., M.ARCH.
Professor of Architecture, Architect, NCARB
School of Architecture and Design
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
Fletcher Hall, Room 227
P.O. Box 43628
Lafayette, LA 70504-3628
337.482.5319
robert.mckinney@louisiana.edu

Educator Representative

Karen Cordes Spence, Ph.D., AIA, LEED AP
Director and F.L. Crane Professor
School of Architecture
College of Architecture, Art and Design
Mississippi State University
Mississippi State, MS 39762
417.619.0021
kspence@caad.msstate.edu

Student Representative

Ethan Sandburg
AIAS | Chapter President 2020 - 2021
AIAS | National Membership Committee Member
University of Kansas
Master of Architecture, Class 2023
913.948.1473
ethansandburg@ku.edu

VI. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted.



Krista Phillips, FAIA
Team Chair



Dr. Robert McKinney, Architect, NCARB
Team Member



Karen Cordes Spence, Ph.D., AIA
Team Member



Ethan Sandburg
Team Member