Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architecture education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.
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*Figure 2: The NAAB visiting team, left to right: Dan Taylor, Michaele Pride, Christine Snetter, Elizabeth Widaski, Ben Vargas*
I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgements and Observations

The visiting team appreciated the efforts of the program leadership in organizing the visit, including curating the exhibits and responding to the team’s questions and requests. The visit proceeded without disruption and included focused meetings with various groups of faculty, staff, and students. The school organized a gathering at which nearly 70 M. Arch students engaged in a lively discussion with the team.

As the program approaches its 50th anniversary, the team sees a school that is both maturing and evolving in response to opportunities and constraints, particularly the financial constraints that it has encountered due to declining state appropriations and a state-mandated freeze on tuition and fees. The school hosts a cohesive faculty, a committed student body, and a thoughtful administration. It is housed in the Architecture and Urban Planning (AUP) Building, which has held up well under heavy use during its 24-year life. The building appears both calm and alive with creative activity.

Consistent with national trends since the 2008 recession, student, faculty, and staff numbers have continued to decrease since the last accreditation visit in 2011. The number of incoming M. Arch students has dropped from a peak of 71 in 2012, to 40 in 2016. However, the dean of the School of Architecture and Urban Planning (SARUP) reported that the school is on the brink of enrollment recovery.

b. Conditions Not Achieved

SPC A.7 History and Culture

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2009 Criterion B.5, Life-Safety: Ability to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

Previous Team Report (2011): Although there was some evidence of egress stairways there was no evidence, even in high pass projects, demonstrating the ability provide the complete path of travel or any other life safety systems.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: Through evidence found in ARCH 825 Comprehensive Design Studio, the team determined that this issue is resolved.

2009 Criterion 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 SPC:

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.5. Life Safety
B.8. Environmental Systems
B.9. Structural Systems

Previous Team Report (2011): The team found excellent evidence of comprehensive design in the high pass project but unfortunately the evidence for B.2, B.3, B.4, B.5 & B.7 was not present in the low pass projects.
2017 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found this issue to be resolved. As a result of evidence found in student work from ARCH 825 Comprehensive Design Studio, the team notes that this SPC, now C.3 Integrative Design, is Met with Distinction.

2009 Criterion 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

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

The team found evidence via links to these documents on the school's website, under "programs: Master of Architecture: accreditation."

Previous Team Report (2011): Technically this criterion was met but the team felt it was not met in the spirit of NAAB requirements. The documents are housed in the archives of the main library. They are not available on the website.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: All documents required by Condition II.4.4 are now available online at https://uwm.edu/sarup/architecture/accreditation.
III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

PART ONE (I): SECTION 1 – IDENTITY AND SELF-ASSESSMENT

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission, and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program’s pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. This includes the program’s benefits to the institutional setting, and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university’s academic plan. This also includes how the program as a unit develops multi-disciplinary relationships and leverages opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.

2017 Analysis/Review: Recently designated as a Carnegie Research One University, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM) houses the Department of Architecture (DAR), which is the largest component of SARUP. Established over 47 years ago, the UWM architecture program is the only accredited architecture program in Wisconsin. The dean of SARUP has served for more than 20 years, and has overseen the design and development of the school’s current facilities, as well as the significant growth of the school and its programs. The school hosts a community of 44 faculty and 126 graduate and 474 undergraduate students in architecture and urban planning who “engage in real-world problem solving while also inventing approaches for projects yet to be imagined” (SARUP website). The Marcus Prize and the Urban Edge Prize, which are funded by donors, bring world-renowned practitioners to the school to enhance teaching and learning.

The school’s Community Design Solutions program continues to provide design advocacy services for the region on campus and in the communities of greater Milwaukee. It also contributes to the local dialogue concerning growth, development, and inclusion, often in collaboration with other UWM units. The school and the program are well respected within the university, and enjoy enthusiastic support from local members of the American Institute of Architects (AIA), practitioners, and alumni. The school generously seeds its coursework with opportunities for engagement with Milwaukee’s diverse neighborhoods and regional firms, including an externship program. Recently, the school established online courses for students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (the state’s flagship university), as well as for high school students throughout Wisconsin.

I.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages 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.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy that also includes a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition to the matters identified above, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.
- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include, but are not limited to, participation in field trips, professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

2017 Analysis/Review: The school’s studio culture policy is posted on the school website and is disseminated in the Graduate Handbook. During the team visit, students reported learning about the
policy via class syllabi, but most of the syllabi do not include the published studio culture policy, nor do they refer to it. Some course syllabi contain similar rules and guidelines that have been developed on an individual course basis. The school’s M. Arch Committee, which includes five architecture faculty members and two students, reviews the policy on a yearly basis and has just completed the process of reviewing it this year. Students are involved in a range of extracurricular activities. These include membership in student organizations such as the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS) and the National Organization of Minority Architecture Students (NOMAS); membership in professional groups such as Women in Design; and supplemental learning experienced through class field trips, visits to firms, school-wide interview days, and study abroad opportunities (in the summers only).

Figure 3: Team meeting with M. Arch students

I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students as compared with the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution during the next two accreditation cycles.

- The program must document that institutional-, college-, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

2017 Analysis/Review: While the architecture program and the university have policies on diversity and inclusion that are widely disseminated, these policies are not fully reflected in the distribution of the program’s faculty and student body. Several international students are among the M. Arch students, but African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans are significantly underrepresented in this student body compared to the university student body. The program appears to be reaching out to high schools and implementing other strategies in order to attract students from underrepresented groups.

The team noted the lack of progress in enhancing architecture faculty diversity, which bears little resemblance to the diversity of the university faculty. The balance in the program has not changed since the last visit in 2011, when this issue was raised as a “cause of concern.” According to the most recent Annual Statistical Report filed with the NAAB, 4 of the 44 members of the architecture faculty, including adjuncts, were identified as Native American, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, African American, Hispanic, multiracial, or non-resident alien. However, at the time of the visit, the team learned that 2 of the 4 have since left the school. Eleven members of the faculty are women, with 4 of the 22 tenure-track faculty being women (one is tenured). Of the 22 part-time faculty, 7 are women and none are ethnic/racial minorities.

There appears to be little or no assertive planning to address this issue. In team discussions, faculty and administrators acknowledged the issue, while focusing on the challenges of hiring to tenure-track lines. When faculty diversity was raised as a cause of concern during the previous visit, the school said that this diversity was to be increased with the retirement of professors, but the team found no evidence of such
an effort during this visit. Three of the recent hires are women, replacing 3 women who have left the school. Despite the recent hiring of 6 new faculty members, the architecture faculty is now less diverse than it was in 2011.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Collaboration and Leadership. The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders.

B. Design. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multi-dimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed at addressing increasingly complex problems, engaging a diverse constituency, and providing value and an improved future.

C. Professional Opportunity. The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and career paths for architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings, and in local and global communities.

D. Stewardship of the Environment. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and the natural resources that are significantly compromised by the act of building and by constructed human settlements.

E. Community and Social Responsibility. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens that are able to understand what it means to be a professional member of society and to act on that understanding. The social responsibility of architects lies, in part, in the belief that architects can create better places, and that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program’s response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to positively influence the development of, conservation of, or changes to the built and natural environment

2017 Analysis/Review:

Collaboration and Leadership. The program provides opportunities to develop collaborative skills and leadership potential both inside and outside of the classroom. Every graduate student is required to take ARCH 581 Law and Professional Practice, which covers professional practice issues. In the classroom, students collaborate by forming teams for specific projects. Outside of the classroom, there are leadership opportunities in student organizations, the Community Design Solutions program, and DAR committees.

Design. SARUP remains steadfastly committed to a tectonic conception of architectural practice. The architecture program provides maximum curriculum choice, with flexibility. This was confirmed in the team’s conversations with students. Required visualization courses—ARCH 282 Visualization 1 (Track I)/ARCH 782 Visualization 1 (Track II) and ARCH 283 Visualization 2 (Track I)/ARCH 783 Visualization 2 (Track II)—have been revised to accommodate the myriad technics required for clear visual communication. Several architecture systems courses have been revised to include project-based assignments that take advantage of computational analysis tools.

Professional Opportunity. UWM exposes students to opportunities for mentorship. The MENTARCH program provides networking between students and practicing architects on a one-on-one basis. This program includes a series of architectural office and construction tours, as well as presentations by
professionals. Organizations, such as the AIA Wisconsin Chapter, interact with students through the Dean’s Advisory Council to provide scholarships and internships.

**Stewardship of the Environment.** The goal of the school’s Institute for Ecological Design is to advance sustainability research and practice, and to lead ecological design education and curriculum development. The recently revised Architecture 1 and 2 courses address environmental issues and contemporary tools and techniques. Some Milwaukee agencies are collaborating with UWM to provide educational opportunities in issues regarding sustainability.

**Community and Social Responsibility.** Community and social responsibility is a recurrent theme at SARUP, whether through coursework, the Community Design Solutions program, or student organizations. SARUP has revised ARCH 302 Human Behavior to address Student Performance Criteria related to cultural diversity and stakeholder roles. Through data collection and analysis, students consult with various regional stakeholders to propose neighborhood improvements. The university’s “urban mission” is to use the diverse city of Milwaukee as an “urban laboratory.” To achieve this mission, design studios utilize actual sites in the city for projects, which incorporate social, economic, political, and physical realities that students can experience first-hand. In this way, students encounter real-life scenarios that make them aware of their responsibility to the community.

**I.1.5 Long-Range Planning:** The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement with a ratified planning document and/or planning process. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources, to identify patterns and trends so as to inform its future planning and strategic decision making. The program must describe how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college, and university.

**2017 Analysis/Review:** The school documented its long-range planning process in the APR, including the ongoing curriculum review within the architecture program and the school’s participation in university-level planning processes. During the team visit, the staff, faculty, students, and administrators consistently confirmed their involvement in planning processes at multiple levels—program, school, and university. The university has deferred implementation of a more robust planning process until after its leadership transition; however, coordination among the various university units is cultivated through bi-weekly meetings of the deans. The DAR’s planning process laid the groundwork for emphasis on five central and strategic themes—energy, water, health, technology, and entrepreneurship—which have been the focus of progress in faculty hires, the development of facilities, and funding.

**I.1.6 Assessment:**

**A. Program Self-Assessment Procedures:** The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated objectives.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives.
- Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

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

**B. Curricular Assessment and Development:** The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments, and must identify 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.
2017 Analysis/Review: Evidence of the program’s assessment procedures was found in the APR and was further confirmed in team discussions with faculty and administrators. The program participates in periodic assessments as mandated by the university and the state. In fact, the UWM Graduate School evaluation process was taking place while the NAAB review was underway. The DAR regularly reviews and evaluates the curriculum using multiple methods, including course evaluations. Students, faculty, and staff serve on three committees that monitor the architecture program and recommend changes in the curriculum: the IT Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Mentoring Committee. Each semester, studio work is reviewed for publication in the school’s annual journal entitled *Calibrations*.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has 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.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and the teacher that promotes student achievement.
- The program must demonstrate that an Architect Licensing Advisor (ALA) has been appointed, is trained in the issues of the Architect Experience Program (AXP), has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the ALA position description, and regularly attends ALA training and development programs.
- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including, but not limited to, academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

[X] Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment: Annual reports enumerate the full complement of faculty and students—both full-time and part-time—by rank, gender, ethnicity, and citizenship. The statistics presented in the reports were confirmed during the team visit in meetings with faculty, students, and staff. The faculty workload balance and opportunities for professional development were demonstrated by information on faculty course loads, the sharing of committee responsibilities among faculty, and teaching release time for faculty who chair key committees. University, school, and program policies regarding workload and faculty development are shared through the Graduate School’s faculty website and individual faculty contracts.

Workload. Faculty reported a standard annual load of five courses (studios count as two). In addition, faculty support individual student theses on an ad hoc basis. Junior faculty may receive course releases to support their research production, though recent budget constraints have limited application of this policy. Chairs of standing committees are entitled to one course release per year. Both students and faculty reported that distribution of thesis advising is uneven, with junior faculty perhaps carrying a disproportionate amount of this load. Thesis students are responsible for securing a thesis committee, including a chair, and some students reported difficulty in securing thesis committee chairs. Questions arose regarding which faculty are expected to serve as thesis committee chairs and members, who is carrying this load, and how the thesis committee process is tracked.

Architect Licensing Advisor. The program has a designated ALA, who deals with all Architect Experience Program (AXP/IDP) matters.

Professional Development. The school offers a new mentorship program for junior tenure-track faculty, which includes a mentoring committee and the assigning of individual mentors to each individual. In
addition, the school provides a computer as well as research and travel funding for faculty (junior faculty have priority). Faculty also have access to graduate department travel funding (sometimes foregone by senior faculty in order for junior faculty to have more opportunities to develop tenure-supporting research). The dean of SARUP sponsors a STAR Fund to support faculty research.

Support Services. Student support services are available at both the school and university levels. At the school level, students enjoy the support of dedicated staff in the fabrication lab, wood shop, computer labs, and resource center, in addition to support from the school store manager. Staff and students noted changes in recent years due to budget cuts, which have resulted in reduced lab hours, fewer student work hours, and the loss of one IT person a few years ago. IT and lab staff reported little to no support for professional development. These staff members are periodically able to take advantage of online offerings, such as webinars, and to leverage project funding to support participation in national meetings, such as those held by the Association for Computer Aided Design in Architecture (ACADIA).

I.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including labs, shops, and equipment.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- Information 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, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

[X] Described

2017 Team Assessment: The physical resources are adequately identified in the school’s APR. The team toured the facilities housing the program, including the buildings, computer labs, wood shop, and laser-cutting facilities. The team also visited several studio rooms, classrooms, and the resource center. The facilities are relatively new and/or upgraded and have adequate staff support. The design of the buildings is refreshing and environmentally friendly. The students’ needs are adequately met by the functional spaces provided for labs, studios, research, classrooms, shops, and exhibit areas, and by the equipment used to perform their daily tasks in a productive manner. While using equipment that requires minimal supervision, students are provided with assistance and are encouraged to work in a safe manner. Each student has access to computers. The university also has a program that allows students to purchase used computers at minimal cost to enable them to work from home with access to the school’s web-based resources. Growth with regard to the labs depends primarily on donations and contract funding for projects from outside sources.

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment: The team found information on financial resources in the APR and confirmed this information in meetings with the dean of SARUP, as well as the program’s chief financial officer and his assistant. Differential tuition, scholarships, departmental assistantships, indirect cost recovery, and other funding sources provide support to students and faculty. Members of the IT Committee raised questions regarding the way differential tuition is allocated. Although the state budget allocation to UWM—and thus to SARUP and the architecture program—has declined over recent years, and tuition and fees have been frozen, the program appears to have adequate resources to support its current 126
graduate students, 474 undergraduate students, and 44 total faculty members. The school benefits greatly from the generosity of donors and sponsors, which have been secured through the efforts of the dean and the faculty.

Figure 4: Fabrication lab
I.2.4 Information Resources: The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

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

[X] Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment: The team met with the SARUP special librarian, the senior assistant director of libraries, and the digital publishing librarian at the UWM Library. The SARUP library provides design-oriented material, which includes multi-cultural architecture periodicals and architecture course textbooks that are not available at the UWM Library. It also has digital data on faculty, student, and studio work with regard to the Community Design Solutions program. The SARUP library provides spaces for both study groups and individual browsers.

The SARUP special librarian assesses student, faculty, and staff requests for resources, and provides support and guidance in obtaining the resources that they need. She conducts research in order to obtain material, both new and archival, in response to those requests. In the event that the SARUP library does not have the requested material or it is closed, students are received at the UWM Library, which is open 24 hours, 7 days a week. The digital publishing librarian, who is specialized in Research Services for Art, Architecture, and Foreign Languages, is the contact person for architecture students at the UWM Library. These students are provided with guidance, information, and support through the wider, state-linked resources at the UWM Library.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

- Administrative Structure: The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and the school, college, and institution.
- **Governance:** The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[X] Described

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence satisfying this condition was found in the APR and in supplemental information provided before the visit. The evidence was confirmed in discussions held by the team during the visit.

*Figures 6 and 7: Exhibits in team room—Comprehensive Studio (left) and Independent Thesis (right)*
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE – EDUCATIONAL REALMS AND 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: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

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

A.1 Professional Communication Skills: Ability to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 102 Architecture Thinking 1, ARCH 104 Architecture Thinking 2, ARCH 302 Human Behavior, and ARCH 300 Survey of Architectural History.

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

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in ARCH 410 Architecture Design 1 and ARCH 420 Architecture Design 2, which satisfy course requirements for the Bachelor of Science, Architectural Studies (BSAS) (the preprofessional degree). Among the courses that satisfy requirements for the M. Arch Track II, evidence was found in ARCH 810 Architecture Design 1.
A.3 Investigative Skills: Ability to gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 302 Human Behavior, which is required for both undergraduate BSAS students and M. Arch Track II students. This course builds upon a human-centered design approach and includes readings, guest lectures, and extensive fieldwork as the basis for building skills in observation, mapping, and historical and cultural research. The final project—an intervention proposal—is supported by this systematic investigation.

A.4 Architectural Design Skills: Ability to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in ARCH 410 Architecture Design 1 (Track I), ARCH 420 Architecture Design 2 (Track I), ARCH 810 Architecture Design 1 (Track II), and ARCH 820 Architecture Design 2 (Track II).

A.5 Ordering Systems: Ability to apply the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met
2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 283 Visualization 2 (Track I)/ARCH 783 Visualization 2 (Track II) in exercises that analyze work by renowned architects in diagrammatic form. Evidence of the ability to apply the fundamentals of this SPC was found in student work prepared for ARCH 420 Architecture Design 2 (Track I) and ARCH 820 Architecture Design 2 (Track II), which used structure and/or site characteristics to inform organization of space and/or program.

A.6 Use of Precedents: Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 283 Visualization 2 (Track I)/ARCH 783 Visualization 2 (Track II) in exercises that analyzed work by renowned architects in diagrammatic form. Syllabi and assignments presented in binders for ARCH 420 Architecture Design 2 (Track I) and ARCH 820 Architecture Design 2 (Track II) indicated analysis of precedents. Additional evidence was found in ARCH 410 Architecture Design 1 and ARCH 825 Comprehensive Design Studio.

A.7 History and Culture: Understanding of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, and regional settings in terms of their political, economic, social, and technological factors.

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: In the courses that satisfy the requirements for the M. Arch Track II, this SPC is Not Met. The team requested additional evidence, which was provided by the school. The team was still unable to locate appropriate material.

A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity: Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to buildings and structures.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 302 Human Behavior.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: M. Arch students develop the foundational knowledge and skills of the discipline early in the curriculum through a variety of methods and contexts. Exploration is a strong theme—in design inspiration, development, and visualization. These skills are further developed and integrated in the work completed in upper-level courses. The program engages students in local communities as a vehicle for pursuing cultural appreciation and competence.

Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. Additionally, the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:
- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately.

**B.1 Pre-Design:** 
*Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: This SPC is Met with Distinction. Evidence of this was found in ARCH 825 Comprehensive Design Studio. As part of the curriculum, students integrated pre-design into the studio design process and documented it thoroughly.

**B.2 Site Design:** 
*Ability* to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation in the development of a project design.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 410 Architecture Design 1 and ARCH 420 Architecture Design 2.

**B.3 Codes and Regulations:** 
*Ability* to design sites, facilities, and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 301 Architectural Systems 1 and ARCH 825 Comprehensive Design Studio. The students’ evaluation of the means of egress with calculations for occupant loads, exits, exit corridors, and exit stairs demonstrated understanding of code requirements and the ability to apply them in a design project.

**B.4 Technical Documentation:** 
*Ability* to make technically clear drawings, prepare outline specifications, and construct models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 516 Building Construction and ARCH 825 Comprehensive Design Studio. Students exhibited their understanding of the use of building materials and the methods of conveying the intent of the design by documenting decisions for the conceptual design. They provided site and building analyses with code evaluations, specifications, a budget analysis, a clear delineation of structural systems and materials, and constructed models of the design.
B.5  **Structural Systems:** *Ability* to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravity, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 301 Structures and Construction and ARCH 510 Survey of Structural Analysis and Design.

B.6  **Environmental Systems:** *Understanding* of the principles of environmental systems’ design, how systems can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This must include active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 301 Structures and Construction (Track I), ARCH 301 Architectural Systems 1 (Track II), ARCH 303 Environmental Response (Track I), and ARCH 303 Architectural Systems 2 (Track II).

B.7  **Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies:** *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 301 Structures and Construction (Track I), ARCH 301 Architectural Systems 1 (Track II), and ARCH 516 Building Construction.

B.8  **Building Materials and Assemblies:** *Understanding* of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components, and assemblies based on their inherent performance, including environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 516 Building Construction. Students clearly demonstrated their understanding of the use of specific building materials and their purpose by providing detailed drawings, outline specifications, and models showing the effective and expressive use of the materials.

B.9  **Building Service Systems:** *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems, including mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation security, and fire protection systems.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 301 Architectural Systems 1 and ARCH 303 Architectural Systems 2. The courses showed a basic understanding of all building service systems. This SPC was represented in lectures, assignments, and tests.
B.10 **Financial Considerations:** Understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work provided to the team.

**Realm B. General Team Commentary:** All components of Realm B regarding comprehension of the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and how they are applied in comprehensive and environmentally responsible architectural solutions, are Met. B.1 is singled out as being Met with Distinction.

**Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions:** Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.
- Responding to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.
- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.

C.1 **Research:** Understanding of the theoretical and applied research methodologies and practices used during the design process.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 825 Comprehensive Design Studio.

C.2 **Evaluation and Decision Making:** Ability to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 825 Comprehensive Design Studio. The students’ work demonstrated a thought process that led to the production of construction detailing to define the design. Students provided an analysis of site conditions, code requirements, and multiple schematics.

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.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** This SPC is Met with Distinction. Evidence of this was found in student work prepared for ARCH 825 Comprehensive Design Studio. There was both high and low pass work in which
the depth of knowledge varied. The students' graphics and written work demonstrated an understanding of and integration of multiple factors in the design project, from programming to design development.

**Realm C. General Team Commentary:** All components of Realm C for integrated architectural solutions are Met. The students demonstrated a clear level of understanding of the requirements by researching, analyzing, and documenting findings to produce a set of options and a final design with fully integrated complex building systems. The comprehensive project included site analysis; code analysis; structural and mechanical systems analysis; material selection; and the development of building plans, elevations, details, outline specifications, and a budgetary cost estimate. All of these factors were pulled into one cohesive project, resulting in the designation of C.3 as being Met with Distinction.

**Realm D: Professional Practice:** Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction.
- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.
- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

**D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture:** Understanding of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect, and other key stakeholders, such as user groups and the community, in the design of the built environment, and understanding the responsibilities of the architect to reconcile the needs of those stakeholders.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 581 Law and Professional Practice and ARCH 302 Human Behavior.

**D.2 Project Management:** Understanding of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams; identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements; and recommending project delivery methods.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 581 Law and Professional Practice.

**D.3 Business Practices:** Understanding of the basic principles of business practices within the firm, including financial management and business planning, marketing, business organization, and entrepreneurialism.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 581 Law and Professional Practice.
D.4 Legal Responsibilities: Understanding of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 581 Law and Professional Practice.

D.5 Professional Ethics: Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice, and understanding the role of the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 581 Law and Professional Practice.

Realm D. General Team Commentary: The professional practice course, ARCH 581 Law and Professional Practice, covers all of the elements in Realm D well through a combination of case studies and legal, contract, and commentary materials. ARCH 302 Human Behavior also addresses some of these elements. The high and low pass student work in these courses indicates appropriate student achievement with respect to the Realm D elements.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation:

In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. 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 Higher Learning Commission (formerly the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

2. Institutions located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program’s country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: In the APR and in published material on the UWM website, evidence was provided indicating that the school is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following 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.

The B. Arch, M. Arch, and/or D. Arch are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.
Any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch, M. Arch, or D. Arch for a non-accredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Every accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The program’s degree designations comply with the NAAB criteria for the professional (M. Arch) and preprofessional (BSAS) degrees, as demonstrated in the APR and described on the school website. The M. Arch Track I program relies significantly on the preprofessional curriculum to satisfy the NAAB requirements. M. Arch Track II students are also required to complete courses that are listed (ARCH 301, 302, and 303) or cross-listed (ARCH 782 and 783) as undergraduate courses. The chart below shows the distribution of credit hours for each track compared to the NAAB requirements. The distribution varies from the program-provided totals since it includes directed/topical electives (e.g., Arch Practice Elective) as professional studies rather than as optional studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NAAB Required Minimum</th>
<th>UWM M. Arch Track I (4+2)</th>
<th>UWM M. Arch Track II (3 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies</td>
<td>As defined by program</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Credits</td>
<td>As defined by program</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Credits</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credits</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student’s prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB Student Performance Criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.
- In the event that a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate that it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence for satisfying this condition was found through the team’s review of the policies and procedures for evaluating the prior coursework of incoming students with the graduate student advisor. A course from another institution is evaluated using the course syllabus and the coursework completed by the student to determine if the course meets both the Graduate School’s requirements and the program’s requirements. If students would like to be considered for advanced placement, they may submit a waiver request along with the syllabus of the course for approval. The DAR periodically reviews programs in other schools that refer students to the DAR in order to ensure that the
courses in those schools—for which incoming students are given credit—satisfactorily meet the appropriate Student Performance Criteria.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the general public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online.

II.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.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Documents with the exact language required by this condition are available online at https://uwm.edu/sarup/architecture/accreditation.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty, and the public:

- The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
- The Conditions for Accreditation in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004, depending on the date of the last visit)
- The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: All documents required by this condition are available online at https://uwm.edu/sarup/architecture/accreditation.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Both the architecture program and the university offer career development services. There is a separate advisor for the DAR's graduate students. Many firms routinely recruit graduates from the DAR, and the program is active in arranging internships as well as the placement of students in permanent positions in firms.

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 electronically available to the public:

- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- All NAAB Responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB.
• The most recent APR.¹
• The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: All documents required by this condition are available online at https://uwm.edu/sarup/architecture/accreditation.

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/post-secondary 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.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The pass rates are available online at https://uwm.edu/sarup/architecture/accreditation.

II.4.6 Admissions and Advising:

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

• Application forms and instructions.
• Admissions requirements, admissions decision procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing.
• Forms and process for the evaluation of preprofessional degree content.
• Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships.
• Student diversity initiatives.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of the requirements and resources for applicants to the program is clearly articulated on the UWM website. The admissions page outlines the requirements for entry into advanced placement and provides links to the online application; financial aid information; information about assistantships, fellowships, and scholarships; curriculum tracks; and general program information. Students can access links to the school's policies on diversity and studio culture through the SARUP website. The school is planning to start accepting students for spring admission.

II.4.7 Student Financial Information:

• The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.
• 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.

¹ This is understood to be the APR from the previous visit, not the APR for the visit currently in process.
[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of financial aid information was found on the UWM website and was confirmed by the team in a meeting with the graduate student advisor. The advising office disseminates information on the cost of attending the architecture program to prospective students who visit the campus, and tuition information is available on the UWM website. The cost of attendance is updated regularly through evaluations of student spending and costs. Information on financial aid options, such as scholarships, fellowships, and assistantships, is publicly available through the SARUP website and is included in the Master Handbook, which is given to all graduate students. Scholarships are available on both a need and merit basis, with some scholarships being directed toward minority students specifically.
PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit Annual Statistical Reports in the format required by the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to the 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.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Copies of these reports are included in the APR.

III.2 Interim Progress Reports: The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (see Section 10, NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2015 Edition).

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Because the program received a 6-year term of accreditation in 2011, no IPR is required under the 2015 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation.
IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

B.1 Pre-Design. In particular, the team was impressed by the comprehensive and detailed investigative and analytical reports prepared as part of ARCH 825 Comprehensive Design Studio. These included documentation and analysis of site conditions, code requirements, environmental considerations, and technical systems.

C.3 integrative Design. The projects reviewed by the team in ARCH 825 Comprehensive Design Studio were remarkably clear and concise. The depth of the graphics and modeling delineated the progress from concept to final representation, and the diagrammatic studies backed up the design.
## Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

### UW-M/SPC/NAAB Visiting Team Matrix

### TRACK 1

#### [4 + 2YR]

| Professional Degree/Prep | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
|--------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Analytical | 012 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analytical 2 | 014 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics | 022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics 2 | 023 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Structures & Materials | 031 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Structures & Materials 2 | 032 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture | 041 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture 2 | 042 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture 3 | 043 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture 4 | 044 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

### TRACK 2

#### 2/2YR

| Professional Degree/Prep | 021 | 022 | 023 | 024 | 025 | 026 | 027 | 028 | 029 | 030 | 031 | 032 | 033 | 034 | 035 | 036 | 037 | 038 | 039 | 040 | 041 | 042 | 043 | 044 |
|--------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Analytical 2 | 022 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics 2 | 023 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Structures & Materials 2 | 024 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture 2 | 025 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture 3 | 026 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture 4 | 027 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

### TRACK 3

#### 4/2YR

| Professional Degree/Prep | 031 | 032 | 033 | 034 | 035 | 036 | 037 | 038 | 039 | 040 | 041 | 042 | 043 | 044 | 045 | 046 | 047 | 048 | 049 | 050 | 051 | 052 | 053 | 054 |
|--------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Analytical 3 | 032 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics 3 | 033 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Structures & Materials 3 | 034 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture 3 | 035 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architecture 4 | 036 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

---

*Note: The matrix details specific courses and their corresponding assignments across different tracks and years. Additional notes and details can be found in the report.*

---

*University of Wisconsin Milwaukee  
Visiting Team Report  
April 8-12, 2017*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arch: 3 Yr Accredited Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coursework: 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coursework: 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey of architectural history 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architectural systems: 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human behavior: 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architectural systems: 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey of structural plan and design 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building materials: 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental science: 502, 521, 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury of architectural projects: 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architectural design: 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architectural design: 809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparative design studio: 823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table above represents a matrix for tracking courses and credits for a 3-year accredited architectural degree program.*
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bartizan2@gmail.com

Representing the AIAS
Elizabeth Widaski
23046 N. Waterlily Drive
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V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Michaela Prude, AIA, NOMA
Team Chair

Representing the ACSA

Benjamin Vargas, FAIA
Team Member

Representing the AIA

Elizabeth Widaski
Team Member

Representing the AIAS

Christine Snetter, AIA
Team Member

Representing the NCARB

Daniel Taylor, Esq.

Special Observer

Sheila Feay-Shaw, PhD

Non-Voting Member, UWM
Confidential Recommendation – Continuing Accreditation

Upon consideration of the terms of accreditation in Section 3 of the 2015 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation and an assessment of compliance with the 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, the team unanimously recommends to the NAAB Board:

Institution, Academic/Administrative Unit: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Department of Architecture (DAR)

Degree Title: Master of Architecture
Track I (preprofessional degree + 60 graduate credit hours)
Track II (non-preprofessional degree + 90 graduate credit hours)

The team finds (choose one of the following)

☐ That deficiencies, if any, are minor, the intent to correct them is ensured

OR

☐ That major deficiencies are present in at least three areas listed in Section 3.4.b of the 2015 Procedures for Accreditation, and the intent to correct them is ensured or in progress;

OR

☐ That the following SPC (list by number and title) has/have been identified as not met for a second, consecutive accreditation visit, and the intent to correct them is ensured or in progress;

The team recommends:

☑ Eight-year term of accreditation

The team finds (choose one of the following)

☐ That major deficiencies are present in at least three areas listed in Section 3.4.b of the 2015 Procedures for Accreditation, and may also have been present at the time of the previous visit, and the intent to correct them is not ensured or in progress;

OR

☐ That the following SPC (list by number and title) has/have been identified as not met for a second, consecutive accreditation visit, and the intent to correct them is not ensured or in progress;

The team recommends:

☐ Four-year term of accreditation

By signing below, the team affirms that it has been thorough in its assessment of the SPC

The team finds that the deficiencies are severe enough to have eroded the quality of the program and that the intent or capability to correct these deficiencies is not evident; the team recommends:

☐ Two-year probationary term of accreditation

The team finds (choose one of the following)

☐ That insufficient progress was made during a two-year probationary term to warrant a four-year term;

OR

☐ Substantial and uncorrectable noncompliance with the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation during any site visit;
The team recommends:

Michaele Pride, AIA, NOMA  
Team Chair  
Representing the ACSA

Benjamin Vargas, FAIA  
Team Member  
Representing the AIA

Elizabeth Widaski  
Team Member  
Representing the AIAS

Christine Snetter, AIA  
Team Member  
Representing the NCARB
Program Response to the Final Draft Visiting Team Report
Re: UWM final response to 2017 VTR Accreditation Report

07/05/2017

To the NAAB Board:

While there are no errors of fact in the 2017 Visiting Team Report, we have attached some statistics relevant to comments made on page 4, Section I.1.3 Social Equity. These statistics provide additional context about student diversity. While our student body is not as diverse as we would like it to be, in fact since 2011 minority and female enrollment has increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BSAS</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>BSAS</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>BSAS</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>M.Arch</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M.Arch</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M.Arch</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your consideration.  
Sincerely,

\[Signature\]

Karl Wallick  
Department of Architecture Chair  
Associate Professor  
414-229-4014  
wallick@uwm.edu