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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Summary of Team Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Review Team Comments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to Focused Criteria Identified from Previous Site Visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Performance Criterion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3 Physical Resources</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Appendices:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. The Review Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The Review Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Report Signatures</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments

Our team was impressed by the vigor and completeness to which each item identified in the scope of the FE was planned and addressed by the University and Program since 2011. The University and Program have planned and addressed each item in the scope of the Focused Evaluation. This scope included many areas of concern in the woodshop including staff supervision, small size, and overall safety, lack of tools, and ventilation and dust collection.

The University and Program formulated a plan and built an expanded woodshop facilities with appropriate equipment clearances, hired a shop monitor, created a shop safety course to be taken by all architecture students, purchased new tools, and installed a new ventilation and dust collection system. The Program Focused Evaluation Report documented and addressed each item identified in the scope of the FE in a narrative with photographs summarizing and illustrating the changes they made to their facilities and program accordingly.

Given the thoroughness of the supporting documentation, reports, plans and photographs, a site visit is not required as part of our review.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

Program Response to the NAAB Focused Criteria

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

I.2.3 **Physical Resources**: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:

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

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

**FE team assessment**: The program addressed each item identified as being the scope of the Focused Evaluation first by formulating a plan for expanding the woodshop and hiring an adjunct professor to serve as a shop monitor and to deliver a required shop safety course to all architecture students. Next the University moved forward to create a new woodshop area that increased the size by 72% designed for appropriate clearances and safety of each piece of equipment. Finally a separate exhaust ventilation and dust collection system was installed keeping the room in negative pressure from the adjacent program spaces.

The construction was to be complete in August of 2014. Both photographs of the construction and a detailed plan of the mechanical system were included as part of our review.
III. Appendices
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IV. Report Signatures
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