March 20, 2013

Tom Apple, Ph.D.
Chancellor’s Office
University of Hawai‘i at Manoa
2500 Campus Road
Hawaii Hall 202
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dear Chancellor Apple:

At the March 2013 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the board reviewed the Visiting Team Report (VTR) for the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa School of Architecture.

As a result, the professional architecture program:

**Doctor of Architecture**

was formally granted a six-year term of accreditation. The accreditation term is effective January 1, 2012. The program is scheduled for its next accreditation visit in 2018.

Continuing accreditation is subject to the submission of *Annual Statistical Reports*, which are submitted online through the NAAB’s Annual Report Submission system and are due by November 30 of each year. This report captures statistical information on the institution in which a program is located and the degree program.

A complete description of the *Annual Statistical Report* process can be found in Section 10 of the *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition, Amended*. The program is no longer required to submit an annual narrative (Part II) report along with the statistical information, however it is required to submit an Interim Progress Report in 2014.

A complete description of the *Annual Statistical Report* process and the Interim Report process can be found in Sections 10 and 11 of the *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition, Amended*.

Finally, under the terms of the *Procedures for Accreditation*, programs are required to make the *Architecture Program Report*, the VTR, and related documents available to the public. Please see Section 3, Paragraph 8, for additional information.

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

Very truly yours,

Theodore C. Landsmark, M. Env.D., J.D., DFA (Hon)., Ph.D.
President

cc:  
Clark Llewellyn, Dean
Carleton Godsey, FAIA, Visiting Team Chair
Visiting Team Members

Enc.
University of Hawai‘i at Manoa
School of Architecture

Visiting Team Report

Doctor of Architecture
Track I (preprofessional degree in architecture [126/120 credits] + 90 graduate credits)
Track II (non-preprofessional degree [120 credits min.] + 108 graduate credits)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
3 October 2012

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

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The team extends sincere thanks to Dean Llewellyn and program directors Leineweber and Sarvimaki, their staff, and particularly the faculty and students at the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa School of Architecture for the thorough preparation, meticulous organization and display of program materials, the warm reception, tireless assistance, and the gracious hospitality that have made our work here over the past several days so rewarding.

The overall tone of the visit was excellent and allowed faculty, staff, and students to showcase their dedication to their architecture education. The overall presentation of the students' work and faculty accomplishments, coupled with candid discussions regarding concerns, was refreshing and aided the team greatly. The team room was clear, well organized, and a wonderful example of the high level of work and commitment. The staff and leadership are genuine assets to the program.

We would also like to express our deepest appreciation to the students who shared their thoughts and concerns with the entire team, and for their commitment to the quality of their education and their desire to become good citizens of the architectural community. We found them to be diverse, enthusiastic, articulate, motivated, talented, and engaged. The students maintain a strong respect not only for their work and one another but also for the culture and heritage of Hawai‘i.

The team is impressed with the faculty, especially considering the extensive growth over the last two years including three new hires within the last several months. The faculty shows a genuine commitment to the student body as well as to the university, with its focus on collaboration and sustainability and the Hawaiian culture.

The School of Architecture has an impressive history steeped in Hawaiian culture and rich in student design exploration and expression. Within this strong history, and its professed focus on Asian-Pacific topics, the School of Architecture has positioned itself to explore the future of urban planning and architecture through its unique Dual Degree Global Track with Tongji University in Shanghai. In addition, the School of Architecture has successfully engaged in highly creative study of architecture and fabrication through new technological tools. The use of new technologies, including CNC machines, 3D printers, and laser cutters, is propelling the University of Hawai‘i and its students into the next age of architecture and design.

Hawai‘i and Oahu struggle with energy resources. This struggle has been addressed by the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa as it focuses on natural, sustainable energy solutions. The exploration of these solutions encompasses many schools within the university fabric and puts a strong focus on collaboration. The School of Architecture has a pivotal role in the study of sustainable energy solutions for the university and its buildings. The Environment Design Research Laboratory and Heritage Center are dynamic and enriching atmospheres that include a large variety of students, professionals, and faculty with the enhancement of the university setting at their cores.

The Strategic Hiring Initiative, commonly called the Cluster Hire, focused on sustainability issues and included the School of Architecture, which added an architecture faculty member. This initiative enhances the school's role in sustainable design.

The Practicum Program and Professional Studios are unique opportunities that not only position students within professional realms but also provide rigorous exercises to maximize the educational experience. Students are provided with an opportunity to grow personally and professionally.
A great example of the school’s involvement in the community is a commitment to design ten houses in ten years for DHHL Kanehili subdivision in Kapolei. Architecture students will be involved in all aspects of designing affordable, custom-built, green homes for qualified Native Hawaiian beneficiaries of the Hawaiian Home Lands Trust.

Amidst these strong attributes, the School of Architecture continues to struggle with an all-encompassing budget including a complete accounting of student/professional fees and understanding income from outreach programs. In addition, there exist several disconnects within human resource issues. Students believe that their evaluation of faculty and courses are being disregarded and there exists no formal faculty evaluation process to assist in professional and teaching growth.

The Liljestrand Residence, an extraordinary icon of Hawaiian Modernism by architect Vladimir Ossipoff. The house is a special attraction for visiting architecture scholars and students alike. It has been used for numerous special events and meetings. The house been used for the past five years by the School of Architecture, and Bob Liljestrand has been on the school’s Advisory Council since its creation. In addition, the house is an important part of the architectural heritage of the island and must be preserved.

The team reviewed all the conditions and SPCs and determined that all were met. However, some were not strong and would have previously been described as minimally met. These were delineated in all the exit interviews. They included long-range planning (strategic plan), self assessment procedures, and SPCs for accessibility and building envelope systems.

It was noted that the seven-year D Arch. program is changing to a four-plus-three program effective fall 2012. For the last several years, the program has effectively been operating as four plus three.

2. Conditions Not Met

None

3. Causes of Concern

A. Financial Resources

The visiting team reviewed the provided financial information from the School of Architecture and found it lacking in transparency. Although financial resources appear to be sufficient to administer the program, there are several issues that had not been clearly resolved at the time of the visit.

I. Although there appears to have been a great deal of effort by the dean and the School of Architecture finance officer to request additional information from the university regarding the use of student/professional fees, this information has not been forthcoming from the university.

II. The School of Architecture charges a professional/student fee of $500 per semester x 367 (374 less outreach students) or approximately 367 students X 2 semesters = $367,000 collected per year. Of this amount, the university returns $95,000 to the School of Architecture. The remaining $272,000 has not been accounted for by the university in spite of attempts by the visiting team.

III. The position of associate dean was eliminated in 2009 because of budget constraints. This position would be extremely beneficial to the financial stability of the School of Architecture and would assist the dean in determining course assignments, budgeting, and resources issues. This assistance will be necessary as the School of
Architecture moves forward with growth and with the Tongji dual degree program. The university administration voiced support for the reinstatement of this position if funding can be identified by the dean.

B. Self Evaluation
At the conclusion of each semester, students complete course evaluations, and the results are made available to the instructor who can choose to share them with the dean, the directors, and the students in an online forum. Because faculty members are part of the university union, they are not required to engage in formal reviews and evaluations. This lack of formal course and teaching evaluation has left the students feeling unheard and with incomplete content and teaching issues unresolved.

C. Communication
The existence of the university’s faculty union seems to impose some barriers to communication and management. As the team understands it, the dean has no ability to evaluate, direct, or terminate faculty. This lengthens communication efforts and requires additional efforts to accomplish some of the goals and initiatives of the school.

D. Studio Culture
Although there is a written Studio Culture Policy on the School of Architecture website, the team feels that it is not known by the students. Students were also not familiar with the Studio Culture Policy report adopted by the AIAS. This is an example of an apparent lack of communication between the School of Architecture administration, teachers, and the student body.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2007)

2004 Condition 3, Public Information: To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

Previous Team Report (2007): During review the team found evidence the School of Architecture had complied with the requirements from the previous Visiting Team Report; however, those requirements identified the doctorate degree was not accredited by the NAAB at that time and should not be identified as a NAAB accredited degree offered by the School of Architecture. Since the previous visit, the program has been accredited by the NAAB and the issue of the correct degree title has surfaced.

At the time of the 2007 visit the descriptive language contained in all School of Architecture promotional literature complies with the requirements of the NAAB under this condition; however, the language appears under the title heading of “Arch. D.” and not “Doctor of Architecture.” The Arch. D. degree title is not in compliance with the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and has been the subject of several communications between the NAAB and the School of Architecture since the program’s initial accreditation decision.

Per a letter, dated 29 June 2006, then-dean Raymond Yeh agreed to change the degree title to conform to the NAAB title “Doctor of Architecture” effective 2008, but with no specific month prescribed. During this visit the team reviewed a memorandum, dated October 12, 2007, from now-dean Clark Llewellyn to university president David McClain (copies to chancellor Virginia Hinshaw and interim vice chancellor for academic affairs Linda Johsnu) requesting the university officially acknowledge a degree title change from the “Arch. D” to the “Doctor of Architecture.” Additionally, during the entrance meeting discussions with Chancellor Hinshaw she
indicated she understood the issue and had officially approved degree title change to "Doctor of Architecture" in line with the NAAB requirement. Although the team received assurances that the correct degree title has been agreed to by everyone at the university, that title is not contained in any of the school’s public information available to students, prospective students nor their families. It is this lack of currently available information that has led the Team to consider this condition "Unmet."

Based upon the above, the NAAB should expect the School of Architecture to be in full compliance very soon with both its web site information and the 2007-2008 Catalog.

**FE Team Report (2009):** In reviewing the Public information on the University of Hawai‘i website it was noted that the NAAB statement differed in the two locations where it is presented. This was pointed out to Dean Llewellyn and since our discussions the differing statements have been corrected. The statements conform to the 2004 NAAB requirements, but have had the words "...and Doctor of Architecture" inserted in the sentence that clarifies that Master and Doctorate degree programs may consist of a pre-professional undergraduate degree and a professional graduate degree. This is consistent with the 2009 Conditions, except that it does not then list the accredited degree offered by Hawai‘i, nor does it list the next date for an accreditation review, required by the 2009 Conditions. We deemed the addition of the Doctor of Architecture wording to the 2004 Condition for Public Information appropriate given the nature of Hawai‘i’s program.

In the 2007 VTR the larger concern of the Team regarding Public Information, was the fact the School utilized the degree "Architecture Doctorate" and not the NAAB approved "Doctor of Architecture". This situation has been corrected. The degree awarded is the "Doctor of Architecture" and all literature uses that degree nomenclature.

**2012 Visiting Team Assessment:** The School of Architecture’s web site contains the statement, basically verbatim, from the NAAB statement. The same information and statement is contained in the University of Hawai‘i 2012-2013 catalog. This condition is now met.

**2004 Condition 10, Financial Resources:** *An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.*

**Previous Team Report (2007):** It appears that the budget allocation is adequate to support the current D. Arch. program. However, per dollar expenditure per student is considerably lower than three of five comparison programs listed in the chart. This is especially worrisome since this is a professional doctorate program. In addition, due to the transitions of the previous dean and associate dean to faculty and the search for the new dean, the school has had to bear a one-time cost exceeding $300,000. While these costs have currently placed the program in a significant budget deficit for 2007, the team was informed by the chancellor during the exit interview that the costs associated with the search would be reimbursed to the school. However, she did not indicate a time line for the reimbursement.

The university currently appoints the financial staff team members to the School of Architecture with the School of Architecture having little to no input. Unfortunately the current financial staff does not support the School of Architecture administration with timely or complete information in support of its efforts for financial planning and management, forecasting and tracking ongoing expenses. Financial management processes are further exacerbated by the slow process for expense reimbursement both within the school and the university. The team was not made aware of written procedures regarding travel authorization and approvals for faculty travel, or out of pocket expenses. An effective financial system with appropriately documented policies and procedures will be necessary for the anticipated development of additional degree types, expansion of services and projected growth in the student population.
Given the anticipated faculty retirements, the School of Architecture will need adequate time to plan personnel changes and to budget for the funding of the new vacant faculty lines. This would be difficult with the current financial management system and the unfunded faculty lines.

The team noted lack of dedicated personnel for development, also noted as a concern in the previous Team's report (2001). However the team was encouraged by support of the university in this regard as indicated by the recent appointment of a full time development officer.

**FE Team Report (2009):** The 2007 VTR raised four issues with respect to financial resources:
1. the annual budget allocation for a professional doctorate program;
2. non-recurring expenses associated with the administrative transition to a new dean;
3. adequate financial support staff and policies to operate their finances effectively; and
4. lack of dedicated development personnel.

Before the team completed its report, the university had responded to points 2 and 4 by providing non-recurring funds to cover the transition and by the appointment of a part-time development officer, this was noted in the VTR.

The Focused Evaluation has looked carefully at the remaining two issues. Addressing point 3 first, we note our concern that financial information was not easily accessible at the present time to the program's administration. We believe that adequate financial staff and policies are not yet in place to support the professional program.

Finally, to point 1, we note the 2007 VTR's conclusion that: "It appears that the budget allocation is adequate to support the current D. Arch. Program. However, per dollar expenditure per student is considerably lower than three of the five comparison programs listed in the chart. This is especially worrisome since this is a professional doctorate program."

Assessing this in 2009, after we were finally able to access financial data for the past three years, we note a great deal of variation in funding levels and in the sources of those funds. While the annual budgets demonstrate some progress in assessing the financial viability of the program, we note that these fluctuations make both fiscal and programmatic planning difficult.

This indicates that the data is not part of the strategic operations of the School nor have the policies and procedures discussed by the 2007 Visiting Team been implemented. These budgets appear to serve only as point in time markers for the University administration. (A detailed annual accounting is presented in footnote 1.)

---

1 The School has made some progress in regard to these issues. However, the economic downturn has had an effect on the 2009-2010 fiscal year budget. 10% cuts from the university have been put in place for this school year at the same time that transition and expansion of School programs are underway. Bottom line progress is noted by this comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>$269,515.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>$22,960.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>$536,925.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$210,000.00 from the university as a one-time allocation for the dean and associate dean search helped the School recover in 07/08.

Despite these positive results it is noted that the total revenue for the School has increased for several years but has been significantly reduced (more than 25%) in 09/10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>$1,703,288.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>$2,707,812.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>$3,125,319.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>$2,285,074.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The School has taken steps to counter several of the issues outlined by the last visiting team. These are expressed by the Interim Associate Dean in his current annual report, namely:

1. More classes are offered through the Outreach College, with corresponding higher tuition.
2. By moving to a 4+3 program, the tuition rates for the 3-year program will be increased.
3. A practicum studio scholarship fund has been created.
4. Sponsored studios by local firms are now being offered.
5. An advisory council charged with fundraising has been established.
6. A half-time development officer is on board. (So noted in the 2007 VTR.)
7. The practicum studios will be reduced from two to one in the new D Arch program.

This last change (#7) is occurring despite the 2007 Visiting Team's expressed concern that, "All students must have access to this innovative model of practice-education, and it is not clear that the current resources will sufficiently cover these costs." The FE team believes this change reflects the school's continuing concern over the future of its financial resources and the stability of the program.

In conclusion, we deem that the financial resources are still a concern, and although the school has made significant changes to address the issue, its plans to expand programs while transitioning the Doctor of Architecture degree, combined with the current economic situation, present a great challenge. We are not convinced that Condition 10, Financial Resources, has a sound footing through 2013.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: The School of Architecture has continued to make progress on the financial issues previously identified in the 2007 VTR and the F.E. Team Report (2009). The budgets for 2011/2012, 2012/2013, and 2013/2014 all project excess revenue. However, there are still concerns with these projections. The dual degree program with Tongji University was initialized this semester with six students in Tongji and four students at the University of Hawai‘i. The projected income and expenses are offsetting in the budget, but there could be a concern that the cost of operating a new program could increase.

Another concern is that in 2010, the university “swept away” 15% of the school's excess carry-forward funds. This was done university-wide to all academic units. The school was in effect penalized for having positive financial results. The concern is that this could happen again.

The general funds appropriation designated by the legislature shows only a modest increase in each budget year and both the chancellor and vice chancellor feel that it may in fact be reduced.

One other concern is that the school assesses a $500 professional/student fee per student per semester. There is no transparent accounting for these funds, and it is unclear whether they are being returned to the school. The visiting team's assessment is that with 367 students, $367,000.00 is generated annually, but the budget only shows $95,000.00 income from this source. The difference could make a substantial impact on the program. On the positive side, the school has implemented some creative funding sources for additional income. The sustainability program through the Environment Research Design Laboratory generated several grants that provide financial assistance and part-time employment for as many as 20 students.
The outreach program has become another source of funding for the school, generating as much as $250,000.00 annually. The vice chancellor stated the dean has a creative entrepreneurial structure.

There was a 27% cut to the total university budget in 2008, of which a 10% budget cut was imposed onto each academic unit including the School of Architecture. The result of this budget reduction was the elimination of the associate dean position. We believe that eliminating this position has had a negative impact on the program.

This condition is met, but there is still a concern for the future considering the above factors.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

Part One (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Part One (I): Section 1. Identity and Self-Assessment

[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2012 Team Assessment: The history of the school is fully described on the School of Architecture web site. The mission of the university is contained in the APR. The mission and vision of the school are described in detail on the web site and are also repeated in the strategic plan.

1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

- Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff in all learning environments both traditional and non-traditional.

  Further, the program must demonstrate that it encourages students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers, and it addresses health-related issues, such as time management.

  Finally, the program must document, through narrative and artifacts, its efforts to ensure that all members of the learning community: faculty, staff, and students are aware of these objectives and are advised as to the expectations for ensuring they are met in all elements of the learning culture.

- Social Equity: The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2012 Team Assessment: The school is culturally rich due to both the distinct Hawaiian lifestyle and culture and the diversity of the faculty. In addition, the faculty and administration have shown a commitment to exposing students to several facets of intellectual thought to avoid isolation due to location. This commitment is evident not only in the diligent work of providing literature, attracting lecturers, and allowing opportunities to travel, but also by integrating students with a non-architecture background into the D. Arch. program to allow opportunities to learn by exposure to different disciplines in a studio environment.

1.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives: Programs must demonstrate through narrative and artifacts, how they respond to the following perspectives on architecture education. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently within the context of its history, mission, and culture and to
Further identify as part of its long-range planning activities how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community. That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching. In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The School of Architecture finds success from its Hawaiian culture and metropolitan Honolulu settings. Faculty members actively participate in school-wide committees and governing bodies. The dean is very active in the School of Architecture and is at the center of financial decision-making. Faculty find that reasonable requests for travel, equipment, books, etc. are often accepted.

The D. Arch program encourages engagement with the entire UHM community and provides opportunities for interdisciplinary research and cooperation throughout the professional curriculum. The D. Arch. project requires a diverse committee of university-wide faculty and community members. The Environment Research Design Laboratory, Heritage Center, and Community Design Center as well as the university’s cluster hiring encourage collaboration and interdisciplinary work.

The university (chancellor and vice chancellor) believes that the School of Architecture, while smaller in numbers, is a positive asset to the university and its goals. As the university moves to further explore sustainability through the local ecology and climate, the School of Architecture will prove to be a valuable team member. Along with the university, the School of Architecture looks to expand its understanding of the local Hawaiian culture and further expand its community outreach.

The newly created Tongji Dual Degree program is nothing short of fantastic. The students are exposed to a dramatically growing area of the world of which very few other U.S. institutions get to experience. The university strongly supports this program, which has just kicked off this year.

B. Architectural Education and Students. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to live and work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured and respected; to emerge as leaders in the academic setting and the profession; to understand the breadth of professional opportunities; to make thoughtful, deliberate, informed choices and; to develop the habit of lifelong learning.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: Through the unique culture of Hawai‘i, travel opportunities through studios and outreach programs as well as access to a faculty diverse in both background and discipline, students are given ample opportunity for exposure to a diverse and distinctive education.

In addition, a great deal of the curriculum and advising efforts focuses on goals for creating students who are confident in their design and research abilities as well as the direction of their education.

Due to the financial support of the administration, the school's AIAS chapter has been instrumental in establishing the distinct culture of the program.

C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located, and; prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 433 Professional Practice Law & Ethics discusses preparing for professional practice, NAAB SPCs, intern goals, IDP, the ARE, and licensure. ARCH 547P Professional studio allows students to earn IDP credits simultaneously with academic credit. ARCH 545 Advanced Practice also addresses the NAAB SPC.

In addition, Homer Williams, the IDP education coordinator, encourages all students to enroll in IDP early. There are three ways currently for students to earn IDP credits: practicum, alternative experiences, and the community design center.

D. Architectural Education and the Profession. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to practice in a global economy; to recognize the impact of design on the environment; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to the multiple needs of a diversity of clients and diverse populations, as well as the needs of communities and; to contribute to the growth and development of the profession.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: Through relationships with professionals, students are exposed to both international and local practitioners through visiting and adjunct professors. In addition, the twelve-credit Professional Studio offers students professional experience specific to their identified research interests. Both of these efforts are well supported through the faculty. Program director Spencer Leineweber is past president of AIA Honolulu.

E. Architectural Education and the Public Good. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to be active, engaged citizens; to be responsive to the needs of a changing world; to acquire the knowledge needed to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges through design, conservation and responsible professional practice; to understand the ethical implications of their decisions; to reconcile differences between the architect's obligation to his/her client and the public; and to nurture a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service and leadership.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The school shows deep commitment to community service by offering community-based design studios, research, and service. Community-based projects also occur through opportunities at the Community Design Center. Further evidence of this commitment is the percentage of D. Arch. projects related to serving the public good. In addition, the school supports the AIAS chapter's efforts to serve the public through working with neighborhoods, schools, and nonprofit organizations.
1.1.4 Long-Range Planning: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and, where appropriate, the five perspectives. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform its future planning and strategic decision making.

[X] The program's processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: The School of Architecture has created a 2010-2014 strategic plan that incorporates the following goals:

Strategic Goal 1: Integrate Asia-Pacific throughout the School of Architecture.
Strategic Goal 2: The School of Architecture will be a recognized leader on campus, in the State and regionally, on issues of sustainability and environment design.

While the selected goals are admirable, the visiting team would encourage thinking beyond 2014. In addition, the School of Architecture is searching for three full-time faculty members, and their influence on long-range goals is not entirely clear.

The Tongji program, after more than three years in the making, has just started this year. Though the preparation and implementation of this program has been impressive, its specific growth plans remain to be seen.

1.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How the program is progressing towards its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.
- Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:
  - Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
  - Individual course evaluations.
  - Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.
  - Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.

The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.

[X] The program's processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: The team finds that, aside from student evaluation, there exists no formal review process for teaching, projects/assignments, and results. Students evaluate each course and instructor at the end of each semester, and the results are made available to the instructor, who can choose to share with the dean, the directors, and the students in an online forum. As the faculty is a part of the university union, they are not required to engage in formal reviews and evaluations.

The faculty does complete annual workload evaluations. These surveys explore teaching loads, committee service, D. Arch. advising and research time allocations. Each faculty member meets with the dean to review these surveys and is able to request research assistants, graduate assistants, and teaching assistants. The faculty finds that these surveys are useful ways to engage in dialogue with the dean regarding their needs.
The school has adopted the NAAB Student Performance Criteria as its metric for the Design Portfolio Guidelines (reviewing incoming transfer and new graduate students) as well as each course's syllabus. Students must maintain a minimum, university-required GPA and must have their GPA and portfolio reviewed for SPC completeness before proceeding from the 4th year to the professional program.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

- Faculty & Staff:
  - An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions.
  - Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
  - Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.

[X] Human Resources (Faculty & Staff) are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: Through funds allocated for travel opportunities, materials for research efforts, teaching assistants, and graduate assistants, the faculty is well supported through the university.

In addition, the Office of Research Services serves as a resource to the faculty by offering training assistance in requesting grants through myGrant application.

Tenured faculty members may receive sabbatical leave with pay by request, as well as travel opportunities to present work and other professional development opportunities, after six years of university employment. These funds are allocated in the annual budget, the most having been funded to date in 2011.

- Students:
  - An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This documentation may include, but is not limited to application forms and instructions, admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshman, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.

[X] Human Resources (Students) are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: Admission to the program is evaluated on transcripts, portfolio, letters of recommendation, and philosophy statement. Admission for transfer students is evaluated on set SPC criteria, all made available to prospective transfer students.

The School of Architecture is committed to providing students access to a variety of learning opportunities and activities on campus and to university outreach programs. In addition, students are required to choose at least three D. Arch. advisors: one within the architecture department, one from
the university at large, and one outside of the university entirely. This system supports the school’s commitment to offering an education integrated with interdisciplinary and community-based values.

Financial resources to support students in these opportunities have been made available through scholarships and advising by the director of student services.

1.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

- **Administrative Structure:** An accredited degree program must demonstrate it has a measure of administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm the program’s ability to conform to the conditions for accreditation. Accredited programs are required to maintain an organizational chart describing the administrative structure of the program and position descriptions describing the responsibilities of the administrative staff.

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

**2012 Team Assessment:** There exists a clear administrative structure within the School of Architecture with the dean at its head.

Issues regarding staff human resources are directed to the dean. Faculty human resource issues are reviewed by committee with input from the dean and the university.

Decisions regarding funding for equipment, resources, and personnel are directed to the dean for his review and approval. There is positive support from the dean for most requests, although no formal request process is in place.

- **Governance:** The program must demonstrate that all faculty, staff, and students have equitable opportunities to participate in program and institutional governance.

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

**2012 Team Assessment:** There exists a strong collegial environment for governance within the School of Architecture. Faculty serves on multiple committees based on their expertise or interest. Students are encouraged to participate in the committee structure as well. Committees inform items from physical resources to curriculum.

Informal sessions between the students, faculty, and the dean occur often. Classes at the end of each semester are canceled to encourage student participation in Design Review Week.

Every course and instructor is evaluated by students at the end of each semester, and the results are made available to the instructor who can choose to share them with the dean, the directors, and the students in an online forum. In addition, faculty felt welcome to discuss mutual concerns and aspirations with the dean.

1.2.3 Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program
2012 Team Assessment: The building was completed in 1995 and is still in relatively good condition. There are a few leaks, which the university is planning to repair. There are adequate studio spaces, classrooms, laboratories, and faculty offices to support the program. A downtown community design center is housed in rented space that is substandard, but the school is negotiating to lease newer space and renovate, which should be accomplished within the next year.

1.2.4 Financial Resources: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: Although there are financial issues that beg clarification, it is clear that access to financial resources is adequate to administer the D. Arch. program. The School of Architecture has registered a surplus in funds in the last several years.

1.2.5 Information Resources: The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

Further, the accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resources professionals who provide information services that teach and develop research and evaluative skills, and critical thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The School of Architecture has demonstrated that the Information Resources are distributed between the School of Architecture and the university and are accessible to all students and faculty. They currently have 41,300 volumes dedicated to architecture. There is a concern that in FY2010 and FY2011 the approved plan was closed because of a statewide budget shortfall, and they would have added an additional 200+ volumes. In response to students gravitating toward online research, the robust online database, ARTSTOR, has been made available for students’ use. In addition, within the School of Architecture there is a reading room of donated books and periodicals.
PART I: SECTION 3—REPORTS

1.3.1 Statistical Reports. Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

- Program student characteristics.
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.
  - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
    - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
  - Time to graduation.
    - Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the "normal time to completion" for each academic year since the previous visit.
    - Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.

- Program faculty characteristics
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.
  - Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.

[X] Statistical reports were provided and provide the appropriate information

2012 Team Assessment: The APR provides a chart of the demographics of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s); the chart from the previous visit was also included, as well as a comparison to the student population for the institution overall.

1.3.2. Annual Reports: The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2009 NAAB Procedures. Beginning in 2008, these reports are submitted electronically to the NAAB. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the NAAB will provide to the visiting team all annual reports submitted since 2008. The NAAB will also provide the NAAB Responses to the annual reports.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports

---

3 In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

[X] Annual Reports and NAAB Responses were provided and provide the appropriate information

**2012 Team Assessment:** The APR provided information that certified that all data submitted to the NAAB through the Annual Reporting System is accurate and consistent.

**I.3.3 Faculty Credentials:** The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty are adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history and context of the institution.

In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit\(^4\) that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

[X] Faculty credentials were provided and demonstrate the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The APR provides faculty credentials and Appendix 2 provides faculty CVs. The School of Architecture also provided an exhibit that highlighted the faculty’s professional development.

---

\(^4\) The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team’s ability to view and evaluate student work.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW
The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

[X] The policy documents in the team room met the requirements of Appendix 3

2012 Team Assessment: The evidence for this section is found in a separate binder in the team room.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE -- EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria: The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:
Architects must have the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This ability includes facility with the wider range of media used to think about architecture including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making. Students' learning aspirations include:

- Being broadly educated.
- Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.
- Communicating graphically in a range of media.
- Recognizing the assessment of evidence.
- Comprehending people, place, and context.
- Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.

A.1. Communication Skills: Ability to read, write, speak and listen effectively.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Students’ ability to communicate effectively through reading, writing, speaking, and listening is well integrated in the body of student work, specifically available in ARCH 539 Research Methods.

A. 2. Design Thinking Skills: Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Students’ ability to raise clear and precise questions, consider diverse points of view, test alternative outcomes, and reach well-reasoned conclusions is evidenced in ARCH 539 Research Methods through thoughtful, self-driven research in preparation for their D.Arch. project.

A. 3. Visual Communication Skills: Ability to use appropriate representational media, such as traditional graphic and digital technology skills, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Students’ ability to use appropriate representational media to convey essential formal elements at each stage is evident by the work provided in the team room for ARCH 548 Doctorate Project II.
A.4. Technical Documentation: *Ability* to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Students' ability to articulate design through technical documentation is evident by the work provided in the team room for ARCH 544 Architecture Studio V: Comprehensive Design

A.5. Investigative Skills: *Ability to* gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Students' ability to effectively investigate as an integral part of the design process is evident by the work provided in the team room for ARCH 542 Architecture Studio III.

A.6. Fundamental Design Skills: *Ability to* effectively use basic architectural and environmental principles in design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Fundamental design skills are successfully used in Intermediate Design Studios [ARCH 341 + ARCH342] as well as the ARCH 540 Intro to Design.

A.7. Use of Precedents: *Ability* to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Precedents are studied and analyzed extensively within ARCH 542 Architecture Studio III.

A.8. Ordering Systems Skills: *Understanding* of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Ordering Systems are very successfully explored and understood within ARCH 544 Comprehensive Design Studio.

A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture: *Understanding* of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.
2012 Team Assessment: While global cultures and traditions are met within ARCH271 and ARCH272, the curriculum is extremely Asia-centric. The visiting team understands that the School of Architecture has put a focus on its Asia-Pacific location but would encourage continued exploration of outside areas, not only Europe but also areas within the hemisphere such as South America and Australia.

A. 10. Cultural Diversity: Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects.


2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of applied research understanding in student work in courses ARCH 539 Research Methods: Seminar, ARCH 546 Doctorate Project I, and ARCH 548 Doctorate Project II.

Realm A: General Team Commentary: The School of Architecture provides a broad architecture education stemming from its deep Hawaiian culture and strong beginning design. The program includes extensive studies of ordering systems, design thinking, and research techniques, all of which lead to in-depth design studies.

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Incorporating life safety systems.
- Integrating accessibility.
- Applying principles of sustainable design.

B. 1. Pre-Design: Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of
their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 544 Comprehensive Design Studio and ARCH 542 Architecture Studio III extensively explore and reinforce concepts of pre-design. From site selection through code analysis to building programming and diagramming, pre-design is studied completely.

B. 2. Accessibility: Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical (including mobility), sensory, and cognitive disabilities.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 544 Comprehensive Design Studio requires an understanding of accessibility. This item is also found in the course work for student projects presented in the team room.

B. 3. Sustainability: Ability to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction and operations on future generations through means such as carbon-neutral design, bioclimatic design, and energy efficiency.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 544 Comprehensive Design Studio requires an understanding of accessibility. This item is also found in the course work for student projects presented in the team room.

B. 4. Site Design: Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 544 Comprehensive Design Studio requires an understanding of site design. It is also clearly indicated in the student design solutions presented in the team room.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The course syllabus for ARCH 541 Architecture Studio II states that the need for life safety consideration is an SPC. It is also found in the student projects where the necessary egress paths are indicated in the presented designs in the team room.
B. 6. Comprehensive Design: Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student’s capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following SPCs:

A.2. Design Thinking Skills  
A.4. Technical Documentation  
A.5. Investigative Skills  
A.8. Ordering Systems  
A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture  
B.2. Accessibility  
B.3. Sustainability  
B.4. Site Design  
B.7. Environmental Systems  
B.9. Structural Systems  

B. 5. Life Safety

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 544 Comprehensive Design Studio successfully demonstrates the students’ ability to create and implement design and technical ideals across multiple SPCs. The work shown expresses a strong understanding of the multitude of elements that ultimately form building design.

B. 7. Financial Considerations: Understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: An understanding of financial considerations is found in the student work in course Arch 542 Architectural Studio III.

B. 8. Environmental Systems: Understanding the principles of environmental systems’ design such as embodied energy, active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar orientation, daylighting and artificial illumination, and acoustics; including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 522 Architecture Systems I covers heating/cooling systems and active HVAC system - class assignment cover solar also in ARCH 321 Introduction to Architectural Systems.

B. 9. Structural Systems: Understanding of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 524 Architecture Systems III provides understanding of concrete and masonry construction, and ARCH 523 Architecture Systems II provides understanding of wood and steel design.
B. 10. Building Envelope Systems: Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Building Envelope Systems provide understanding in student work in course ARCH 526 Architecture System V: Integration.

B. 11. Building Service Systems Integration: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Building Service Systems Integration understanding was presented in the lectures of ARCH 525 and student work in courses ARCH 522 Architecture Systems, Introduction to Systems and ARCH 526 Architecture Systems V: Integration.

B. 12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration: Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Students present understanding of building materials and assemblies in ARCH 522 Architecture Systems I.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The School of Architecture has a strong understanding of pre-design through site documentation and planning. General technical documentation is also strong with weaker areas regarding environmental systems and controls as well as accessibility and conveying systems. The Comprehensive Design Studio provides a rich culmination of these items that can only get strong with an increase of technical awareness.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

- Knowing societal and professional responsibilities
- Comprehending the business of building.
- Collaborating and negotiating with clients and consultants in the design process.
- Discerning the diverse roles of architects and those in related disciplines.
- Integrating community service into the practice of architecture.
C. 1. Collaboration: *Ability to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The Professional Studios are not only good opportunities for collaboration but also professional experience. The binders produced show wide ranging professional scenarios to which students are exposed.

The Environment Design Research Laboratory and Heritage Center are dynamic and enriching atmospheres that promote collaboration across a variety of student, professional, and faculty groups. The work produced is of very high quality.

C. 2. Human Behavior: *Understanding* of the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment and the design of the built environment.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Students presented understanding of human behavior in ARCH 516 Architecture and Urban Design Theory through written work and required readings.

C. 3 Client Role in Architecture: *Understanding* of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and reconcile the needs of the client, owner, user groups, and the public and community domains.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The evidence for this item is found in the course syllabus for course ARCH 200 where one of the learning objectives is for students to gain an understanding of the value of client relationships and to understand how architecture firms develop and retain client relationships.

C. 4. Project Management: *Understanding* of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The evidence for this criterion is found in the course syllabus for ARCH 545, where a quiz for this course requires knowledge of project management principles.

C. 5. Practice Management: *Understanding* of the basic principles of architectural practice management such as financial management and business planning, time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The course syllabus for ARCH 545 indicates testing knowledge of practice management principles. These tests were presented in the team room.
C. 6. Leadership: *Understanding* of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Student understanding of leadership in collaborative work in the architecture profession and allied disciplines is presented in ARCH 545 Advanced Practice through readings and case studies.

C. 7. Legal Responsibilities: *Understanding* of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of understanding of legal responsibilities was found in student work for ARCH 433 Professional Practice Law and Ethics; ARCH 545 Advanced Practice; ARCH 547C Professional Studio; ARCH 547P Professional Studio-Practicum; and some in ARCH 547E Professional Practice—Alternative.

C. 8. Ethics and Professional Judgment: *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues, and responsibility in architectural design and practice.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of understanding of ethics and professional judgment was found in student work for ARCH 545 Advanced Practice; ARCH 547C Professional Studio; ARCH 547P Professional Studio-Practicum; and some in ARCH 547E Professional Studio—Alternative.

C. 9. Community and Social Responsibility: *Understanding* of the architect's responsibility to work in the public interest, to respect historic resources, and to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of understanding of community and social responsibility was found in student work in ARCH 516 Architecture and Urban Design Theory; ARCH 546 Advanced Practice; ARCH 547C Professional Studio; ARCH 547P Professional Studio-Practicum; and ARCH 547E Professional Studio—Alternative.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The school continues its significant achievement in leadership and practice areas. In addition to course work, there are often opportunities for interdisciplinary cooperation. Professional practice courses are strong and taught by seasoned practitioners. The professional studios and the Practicum and Alternative Experiences options allow practice skills to be developed.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Regional Accreditation: The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The APR provides the regional accreditation letter from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges to Virginia S. Hinshaw, chancellor, University of Hawai‘i at Manoa.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The School of Architecture at the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa has structured its program to award the professional Doctor of Architecture (D.Arch.) degree in accordance with the requirements of the National Architectural Accrediting Board. There are two NAAB-approved tracks leading to the professional D.Arch. degree at UHM: a 90-semester-hour track for students with an approved undergraduate pre-professional degree, and a 108-semester-hour track for students with an approved undergraduate degree other than a pre-professional degree. Students entering either D. Arch program tracks [or transferring into the undergraduate program] are reviewed to ensure all SPCs are met.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

The program must describe the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications (e.g., changes or additions) are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Further, the NAAB expects that programs are evaluating curricula with a view toward the advancement of the discipline and toward ensuring that students are exposed to current issues in practice. Therefore, the program must demonstrate that licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: A significant curricular overhaul was completed in the last year. This three-year process, spearheaded by the school Curriculum Committee, included extensive interaction with administration, faculty, and staff. As with all School of Architecture committees, faculty members volunteered to participate in this committee. Faculty meetings and retreats continue to reevaluate the curriculum.

Every course and instructor is evaluated by students at the end of each semester, and the results are made available to the instructor who can choose to share them with the dean, the directors, and the students in an online forum. In addition, faculty felt welcome to discuss mutual concerns and aspirations with the dean. A more formal review of all tenured faculty occurs every five years.
PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

In the event a program relies on the preparatory/pre-professional educational experience to ensure that students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist. Likewise, the program must demonstrate it has determined how any gaps will be addressed during each student's progress through the accredited degree program. This assessment should be documented in a student's admission and advising files.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The school has adopted the NAAB Student Performance Criteria as its metric for the Design Portfolio Guidelines (reviewing incoming transfer and new graduate students) as well as for each course's syllabus. If any of the SPC are not confirmed in the submittals, additional course work from the accelerated semester is assigned as an additional requirement. Undergraduate course work in pre-calculus and physics is also required. If not met in the undergraduate program, these courses are required before the beginning of the graduate sequence. Students proceeding from the 4th year to the 5th year have their GPA and portfolio reviewed for SPC completeness.

Students entering with a non-pre-professional undergraduate degree are required to enter the school during the spring semester to take the accelerated semester course work. The accelerated semester course work is determined by the portfolio submittal; most students take all the required classes.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees
In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The university provides the statement on NAAB-accredited degrees in the "About" section of the web site for the School of Architecture and in the 2012-2013 Course Catalog.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:
   - The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
   - The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The university provides access to the NAAB Conditions and Procedures in the "About" section of the web site for the School of Architecture.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:
   - www.ARCHCareers.org
   - The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
   - Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
   - The Emerging Professional’s Companion
   - www.NCARB.org
   - www.ajla.org
   - www.aias.org
   - www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The university provides access to career development information in the "Research and Resources" section of the web site for the School of Architecture.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs
In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:
   - All Annual Reports, including the narrative
   - All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
   - The final decision letter from the NAAB
   - The most recent APR
   - The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

   29
These documents must be housed together and accessible to all. Programs are encouraged to make these documents available electronically from their websites.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The university provides access to APRs and VTRs in the “Research and Resources” section of the web site for the School of Architecture.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The university provides access to the ARE and ARE pass rates in the “Licensure Information” section of the web site for the School of Architecture through direct links to the NCARB web site.
III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

A. History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)
   Reference University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, APR, pp 1-2.

B. History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)
   Reference University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, APR, pp. 2-3.

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)
   Reference University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, APR, pp. 6-8.

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)
   Reference University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, APR, pp. 8-9.
2. **Conditions Met with Distinction**
   
   A.11 Applied Research
   
   B.3 Sustainability
   
   B.4 Site Design
   
   B.8 Environmental Systems
   
   C.1 Collaboration
   
   C.3 Client Role in Architecture
   
   C.9 Community and Social Responsibility
The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the NCARB
H. Carleton Godsey, FAIA
Godsey Associates Architects
207 West Market Street
Louisville, KY 40202-1333
(502) 583-6611
(502) 584-4537 fax
cgodsey@godseyassociates.com

Non-voting member
Richard Lessard
POB 455
17 Kilby Farm Lane
Sperryville, VA 22740
(540) 987-3148
(571) 259-6933 mobile
ricklessard@gmail.com

Representing the ACSA
David Shove-Brown, AIA, NCARB
Director International Programs
School of Architecture
Catholic University of America
Washington, DC 20064
(202) 319-5786 direct
(202) 319-5188
(202) 319-4288 fax
shovebrown@cua.edu

Representing the AIAS
Laura Meador
4615 North Park Avenue, #1213
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
(713) 213-2282
lr.meador@gmail.com

Representing the AIA
Kenneth Martin, AIA, NOMAC
Principal
The OBSIDIAN Group
1513 Walnut Street
Suite 250
Cary, NC 27540
(919) 380-6700
(919) 656-6474 mobile
(919) 380-6464 fax
kmartin@theobsidiangroup.com
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

H. Carleton Godsey, FAIA  Representing the NCARB
Team Chair

David Shove-Brown, AIA, NCARB  Representing the ACSA
Team member

Laura Meador, Assoc., AIA  Representing the AIAS
Team member

Kenneth Martin, AIA, NOMAC  Representing the AIA
Team member

Richard Lessard  Non-voting member
Program Response to the Final Draft Visiting Team Report
January 30, 2013

Cassandra R. Pair
Accreditation Manager
1101 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Cassandra,

Thank you for the final draft of the 2012 University of Hawai'i at Mānoa Visiting Team Report. I found the VTR to be very informative, generally positive, and constructive. There are only a few issues remaining in the final draft that I would like to address, which are outlined below.

First, I greatly appreciate the team’s interest in regards to Student Fees. Because of their inquiry, we were able to obtain the information from the University after the visit and confirmed the School of Architecture receives 100% of student fees collected.

Lastly, there seemed to be a disconnect on the understanding of faculty evaluations. I have addressed that in the following paragraph in hopes that it is clarified that faculty do indeed undergo yearly reviews and evaluations per the conditions of the union contracts.

All faculty are required to engage in formal reviews and evaluations. This occurs for tenure-track, tenured and non-tenured faculty. Faculty are evaluated per the terms of the UHPA contract (which includes the ability to evaluate, direct or terminate faculty with due process), the FPC and the Dean are required to evaluate non-tenure track faculty annually, tenure-track bi-annually and tenured faculty are reviewed every five years by the FPC Chair, and Dean if required. All areas of teaching, research and service are reviewed.

Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to review the final draft of the VTR. Please contact me if you have any questions or need further clarification.

Sincerely,

Clark E. Llewellyn, FAIA, NCARB
Dean and Professor