## **Drury University**

# **Interim Progress Report for Year Two**

November 30, 2018

### 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF 2016 NAAB VISIT

#### **CONDITIONS NOT MET**

2016 VTR	
None	

#### STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA NOT MET

2016 VTR	
B.2 Site Design	
D.2 Project Management	

#### 3. TEMPLATE

## **Interim Progress Report**

# Drury University Hammons School of Architecture Master of Architecture (168 semester credits) Year of the previous visit: 2016

Please update contact information as necessary since the last APR was submitted.

#### Chief administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located:

Dr. Robert Weddle, PhD, AIA email: <a href="mailto:rweddle@drury.edu">rweddle@drury.edu</a> phone: 417-873-7450

#### Provost:

Dr. Beth Harville, PhD email: <a href="mailto:bharville@drury.edu">bharville@drury.edu</a> phone: 417-873-4085

#### President of the institution:

Dr. J. Timothy Cloyd, PhD email: <a href="mailto:itcloyd16@drury.edu">itcloyd16@drury.edu</a> phone: 417-873-7201

#### **Individual submitting the Interim Progress Report:**

Dr. Robert Weddle

#### Name of individual(s) to whom questions should be directed:

Dr. Robert Weddle

#### **Current term of accreditation:**

8 years (next scheduled visit 2023-24)

Text from the most recent VTR or APR is in the gray text boxes. Type your response in the designated text boxes.

#### 1. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria

#### **B.2 Site Design**

**2016 Team Assessment:** Although the team looked for evidence of student achievement in site design in work prepared for ARCH 213 (Architectural Design III), ARCH 214 (Architectural Design IV), ARCH 315 (Architectural Design V), ARCH 334 (Structures II), and ARCH 417 (Architectural Design VII: Community Studies Studio), the team did not find evidence of achievement at the prescribed level. Specifically, the work did not adequately illustrate the ability to respond effectively to site characteristics, particularly regarding social equity/site accessibility, site/building integration, building orientation, and environmental sustainability. Students' site design work reflected some response to context, topography, ecology, and climate, but in abstract and superficial ways (e.g., isolated course assignments). Examples of work were not at the level of complexity and integration required for this SCP.

Drury University, 2018 Response: Addressing this deficiency has become a priority across a number of our studios. Our emphasis has been on both strengthening the role of site-design exercises within the ARCH 213 (Architectural Design III) studio, but also demonstrating greater sophistication in site response throughout our studio sequence. Because the 2016 Visiting Team noted the isolated nature of site design evidence, we have become more aware of the need to demonstrate fulfillment of this criterion though final studio project design and documentation, including in more advanced studios beyond those cited for evidence in the 2016 APR and SPC matrix. At the same time, we believe a more focused introduction to site-design principles—particularly in regard to concerns for solar orientation, climate, and environmental sustainability—in the ARCH 213 Design III course will result in stronger understanding and more detailed application of site-design principles in upper-level studios. The ARCH 213 syllabus and assignments have been revised since our reaccreditation, and a link to that information is included in the appendix to this report. Subsequent studios have addressed this deficiency not so much through syllabus revision but through faculty focus on site design issues within the context of existing syllabi and curricular expectations.

#### **D.2 Project Management**

**2016 Team Assessment:** Partial evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for MARC 569 (Professional Practice). The importance of project management and the role of a project manager are clearly addressed, as well as project delivery methods and when they should be recommended. However, an understanding of assembling consultant teams (who typically work with an architect), and identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements is not evident in the student work.

**Drury University, 2018 Response:** Along with our long-time adjunct faculty member in MARC 569 (Professional Practice), school administration has reviewed MARC 569 content and assessments through student work. Following this review, our conclusion has been that students are indeed introduced to this material through course lectures and reading assignments. However, as noted in the 2016 Team Assessment, student work did not previously demonstrate sufficient understanding in this area. The course syllabus and key lectures now place greater emphasis on Project Management issues. The course syllabus and example lecture materials pertinent to this issue are included in the Appendix of this report.

#### 2. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program

Please report such changes as the following: faculty retirement/succession planning; administration changes (dean, department chair, provost); changes in enrollment (increases, decreases, new external pressures); new opportunities for collaboration; changes in financial resources (increases,

decreases, external pressures); significant changes in educational approach or philosophy; changes in physical resources (e.g., deferred maintenance, new building planned, cancellation of plans for new building).

#### **Drury University, 2018 Response:**

#### **Faculty**

As discussed in our 2015-16 *Academic Program Report*, moderate university-wide reductions in (non-tenured or non-tenure-track) faculty were announced during the fall 2015 semester. These reductions affected the architecture program by eliminating two non-tenured tenure-track faculty members as well as one non-tenure-track faculty member. The latter was reinstated on a one-semester per year basis through the procurement of outside funding. The enrollment and financial pressures that led to these reductions have largely been reversed, both through increases in enrollment (see below) and through the more sustainable financial picture that resulted from the faculty reductions.

Beyond this situation, which was presented in our *APR* and discussed with our Visiting Team in 2016, no substantive changes in our faculty complement have occurred since reaccreditation. At the end of the current academic year we will experience the retirement of a significant member of our faculty—program founder and Director of our Center for Community Studies Professor Jay Garrott. A nationwide search to fill this position is currently underway. Two faculty members have been promoted to the rank of Professor since reaccreditation.

#### Administration:

The architecture program administration has remained stable since reaccreditation.

At the university level, both the president and provost have changed. Dr. J. Timothy Cloyd became Drury's 18<sup>th</sup> President in July of 2016, replacing Dr. David Manuel. Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost Dr. Steven Combs stepped down in the fall of 2016, and Dr. Beth Harville replaced him. This new leadership team has taken important and effective steps to increase enrollment and strengthen the university's financial situation. A comprehensive master-plan was undertaken for the university's campus, and a new and innovative general education curriculum has been crafted by faculty following a year-long study. The administration is highly supportive of the architecture program, and the working relationship with program administration is strong.

#### **Enrollment:**

Since our 2016 reaccreditation, enrollments have increased both at the university level and within the architecture program. Drury's total undergraduate enrollment has increased 12% in the past three years, and the architecture program has helped to lead this growth. The overall enrollment in the architecture program has increased 25% since 2016 and now stands at 185. The number of entering students has increased by 65% over the same period.

#### Opportunities for Collaboration:

Collaborative relationships that were reported on in our 2015-16 *APR* have been strengthened over the past five semesters. The school's partnership with professional practices in China has allowed students to undertake internships in the cities of Shanghai and Hangzhou, and a Drury team was invited to participate in a week-long charrette to identify urban-design strategies for the Shangyu District of Shaoxing. Three students traveled to China to present their work.

#### **Financial Resources:**

Our financial resources are tied to our enrollments, since each architecture student at Drury pays a \$1000 program fee that is assessed through eight of the ten studios they take during the five-year curriculum. Revenues from these program fees pay for all non-salary operations expenses within the school. Due to this arrangement, the significant increases in enrollments experienced by the program over the last three years has helped the school to further support the student

experience through increases in funding for field trips, access to outside critics and lecturers, acquisition and maintenance of digital design and fabrication technology, and studio furniture enhancement.

#### **Educational Approach:**

No substantial changes have occurred in the educational approaches underlying our program. We continue to focus on defining a model for architectural education that balances rigorous professional training with the flexibility and breadth of education made possible by our location within a small liberal arts university.

#### **Physical Resources:**

Several physical resource issues have been addressed since our 2016 reaccreditation. New rolling window blinds have been installed in all studio spaces and offices throughout our building, in response to persistent student concerns about the previously existing (and largely ineffective) blinds. New LED lamps have also been installed in all of the pendant lighting fixtures in the open second-floor studios, vastly improving the quality and consistency of lighting in those studios. We have also initiated phased replacement of all studio furniture, with two of our five studio areas already completed. All of these projects were identified in our 2015-16 *APR* as priorities for the school.

In addition to the essential work described above, donor funding has allowed us to create a more consolidated Design Technology Center, with construction of a new space that has allowed relocation of our digital input/output lab and better communication between that space and our fabrication shop.

Drury's facilities staff have also addressed some crucial deferred maintenance issues affecting our building, including complete replacement of our chiller during the summer of 2016.

## 3. Summary of Activities in Response to Changes in the NAAB Conditions 2014 NAAB Conditions

Drury University, 2018 update: Not Applicable

**4. Appendix** (include revised curricula, syllabi, and one-page CVs or bios of new administrators and faculty members; syllabi should reference which NAAB SPC a course addresses)

#### **Drury University, 2018 update:**

Substantial curricular revisions were not deemed necessary in order to address the two non-met SPCs, so revised curricula are not included here.

Our program has no new administrators or faculty members since our 2016 reaccreditation, so CVs/bios are not included here.

Revised syllabi addressing the two non-met SPCs are included in this appendix as follows:

#### B2 Site Design:

ARCH 213 Architectural Design III
See syllabus on the following pages of this appendix.
See syllabus and other course materials at:
https://sites.google.com/view/arch-213-18/home

#### **D2 Project Management:**

MARC 569 (previously numbered 590) Professional Practice See syllabus and sample lecture materials on following pages of this appendix.