

Syracuse University
School of Architecture
Mark Robbins, Dean
Last Accreditation Visit: 10-14 April 2010

Part II (Narrative Report) - November 29, 2011

1.4. Conditions/Criteria Not Met

2. Program Self-Assessment: The team found instances of anecdotal evaluation but the programs do not have a formalized plan or procedure for self-assessment. Significantly the APR mentions numerous activities that were not sufficient to provide insight into the program's focus and pedagogy. Confusion about the differences between individual, course, and program assessment is evident in the APR and was similarly evident during the visit

Response: Formal assessment of the dean by the University occurs every five years. The process is conducted by a committee composed of faculty and staff appointed both by the faculty of the School of Architecture and the Provost. Formal assessment of tenured faculty occurs through a process of annual review by the dean. Formal assessment of tenure-track faculty occurs through a process of annual review by the associate dean. A report of this assessment is sent to the faculty member, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs. Furthermore, each tenure-track faculty member is reviewed by the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee twice during the tenure process.

All faculty instructors must distribute course evaluations each semester. These are tabulated and returned to the individuals and the dean's and the associate dean's office for review. Where issues are apparent, the instructor meets with the associate dean of dean to discuss resolution.

Regular program assessment occurs in three separate venues. First is the Curriculum Committee. This committee is charged with the responsibility of making ongoing assessments of the curriculum and proposing ways in which it can be improved. Program assessment also occurs through the Executive Academic Committee composed of the dean, the associate dean and the chairs. This committee meets on a regular basis to evaluate and discuss strategic planning issues related to the development of the existing programs and plans for the creation of new programs. The third principal venue is the annual faculty retreat in which a major agenda item is program assessment and discussion of issues.

Finally, The School is working with the SU Office of Institutional Review and Assessment to review our procedures for individual, course and program assessment with a view to improving how we do this. This will be an ongoing initiative.

13.9 Non Western Traditions: The team found evidence in ARC 133 and 134 for the B. Arch. students. The team did not find evidence in required coursework for the M. Arch. students.

Response: We are reviewing the content of the graduate introduction to history course to find opportunities where material related to non-western traditions can be provided.

13.13 Human Diversity: The team found evidence in ARC 134 for the B. Arch. students. There was no evidence found in required coursework for the M. Arch. students.

Response: We are reviewing the content of the graduate required history sequence to find ways to include a greater focus on human diversity issues.

13.26 Technical Documentation: While the team found evidence in ARC 308 & 607 of technically precise drawings, it found no evidence of the ability to write outline specifications.

Response: This required content will be addressed in revisions to the Advanced Building Systems Course.

1.5. Causes of Concern

- A. *Academic and Professional Standards: The junior faculty reports that expectations for scholarship are not clear. The team could not find documentation for the criteria for achieving promotions, retentions, and tenure as well as leaves and salary increases. The criteria are not clear to the faculty*

Response: The Reappointment Promotion and Tenure Committee is revising its by-laws. Proposed changes include clarifications and standardization of candidate submissions and review schedule. The School has also initiated a faculty mentoring program, and encourages all tenure-track faculty to participate. This program pairs each junior faculty with two senior faculty mentors, and represents a valuable source of information and guidance for newer faculty. Finally, the university has recently issued new guidelines describing the tenure review process, including descriptions of the different types of research, teaching, and service work as reviewed for tenure. Taken together, these programs and initiatives offer tenure-track faculty ready access to adequate information concerning general policies and their individual cases.

- B. *Non-Western Traditions: The team is concerned that while non-western traditions are covered in a variety of electives and travel opportunities for M. Arch. students, the team could not find evidence that the criterion is addressed in required courses.*

Response: We can demonstrate clear evidence showing that non-western traditions are conveyed in the required history sequence in both the undergraduate and graduate program.

Changes in Program since last NAAB visit: There are no changes since April 2010 when the last accreditation visit occurred.