

## RESPONSE TO VTR with PLAN TO CORRECT

NAAB Visiting Team Report March 28-30, 2022; p. 14

### Conditions Not Achieved

#### SC.5 Design Synthesis – Not met (p. 14)

*SC.5 Design Synthesis—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions.*

*[X] Not Met*

*Team Assessment: This criterion is not met. The program matrices indicate four courses across the curriculum where this criterion is addressed (Arch 601, Arch 602, Arch 603, and Arch 604, required for track 1 and track 2 students). We found evidence through student work at the level of ability of synthesis of user requirements, site conditions, and consideration of measurable environmental impacts at the level of ability for all students in Community Engaged Applied Learning Design Studio (Arch 601) and Integrated Architecture Design Studio (Arch 602). **In Arch 601 and Arch 602, we found evidence of synthesis of regulatory requirements and accessible design in the work of some students, however evidence was not found consistently in the work of all students.** The program provided evidence of plans for recurring assessment and modification of these courses through student work.*

#### Narrative Response

We have questions over the team's assessment of SC.5 Design Synthesis in that the successful demonstration of this multi-bundled condition (synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and consideration of measurable environmental impacts) requires a consistent mastery of all outcomes by all students all of the time. The bolded portion of the Team Assessment above is important to consider as it implies that "every student submitting work has to demonstrate mastery of every aspect of the outcome in order for the condition to be met." Our concern in the interpretation by the team is that a student can show evidence of synthesis of regulatory requirements and accessible design, but may not have mastery of all conditions and still receives a passing grade for the work submitted. Passing work does not mean you have to be masters of all aspects of all outcomes.

Furthermore, we believe the content of **all five criterion to be evidenced in SC.5 were met in ARCH 601, ARCH 602, and ARCH 603\_618 studios** as seen in the syllabi, teaching material, assignments, rubrics, and evidenced in the student work provided. We have included the following three folders in OneDrive with student work and background documents for review:

- 1. Original Work Provided for SC.5 Design Synthesis in ARCH 601, ARCH 602, ARCH 603, and ARCH 604 Studios.** All work in these course folders is organized according to **1.Narrative, 2.Supporting Material, 3.Assessment and 4.Student Work** (required) as was originally shared with the review team.
- 2. Additional Information Requested on Regulatory Requirements and Accessible Design for ARCH 601, ARCH 602, and ARCH 603\_618** as asked during the Team's review of our APR and NAAB material. In this submitted material, we included student work from **ARCH 601, ARCH 602, and ARCH 603\_618** that most effectively pertains to accessible design and regulatory requirements as was demonstrated in the original student work material provided.
- 3. Changes Made to ARCH 602 in Spring 2022** that successfully shows student work and clearly provides evidence of synthesis of regulatory requirements and accessible design. We have also included the final work of **ARCH 601 Studio's Solar Decathlon Build Project** that has been ushered through Indianapolis Permit Review, further attesting to regulatory conditions having been met in the design synthesis and design integration of this project (although this happened after the NAAB Team Review). **Changes to be Made to ARCH 601 and ARCH 603\_618 in Fall 2022 Plan to Correct** is discussed and a brief plan to correct is included.

**1. Original Work Provided for SC.5 Design Synthesis in ARCH 601, ARCH 602, ARCH 603, and ARCH 604 Studios.** We believe the original work submitted for ARCH 601 and ARCH 602 clearly meets all criteria of SC.5. We note that ARCH 603 meets SC.5 when considering the co-curricular work done in ARCH 618. We have removed ARCH 604 from meeting SC.5 from our matrix because a students' *Thesis* may not actually involve a building and therefore, we find it difficult to meet regulatory requirements and accessible design, although there is design synthesis represented successfully in all final thesis books. **Below is the course narrative summary of ARCH 601, ARCH 602 and ARCH 603\_618 and synthesis of regulatory requirements (1a.) accessible design (1b.) and evidence (1c.) in the work of all students.**

### **ARCH 601 Original Narrative and Material Submitted**

**ARCH 601: Community Engaged Applied Learning Studio** focuses on *Building Community*, first on building community of students and faculty, recognizing the uniqueness, diversity of experiences, and life situations that bring us together to embark on the professionally accredited Master of Architecture degree. Secondly, on building community with the people and place in which we are a part of, the CAP: Indy Center Community and the residents of Elevator Hill Campus, Holy Cross Neighborhood Association, and the Near Eastside. Community-oriented design explorations allow students to embrace a collaborative spirit, strong work ethic, applied research design, careful attention to details, service to the community, and best practices toward achieving quality design, economic viability, equitable procedures, and community livability. The ARCH 601 Community Engaged Applied Learning Design Studio 2021 will participate in a multi-disciplinary project to design and build a net-zero energy home in Indianapolis as part of the 2023 U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Solar Decathlon Build Challenge (SDBC) student competition. The project is to design and construct a net-zero energy home in Indianapolis with the help of local community partners and sponsors. A particular strength of utilizing the U.S. Department of Energy's Solar Decathlon Build Competition as a vehicle for the ARCH 601 studio is the breadth, scope, and rigor required to effectively compete in this internationally-contended student design competition. The contest requires students to compete on qualities related to: Energy performance, Engineering feasibility / integration, Financial feasibility / cost estimating / affordability, Resilience, Architectural design, Operational practicalities, Market potential, Comfort / human health / environmental quality, Innovation in design and/or construction and Project communication qualities.

**1a. ARCH 601: Assessment SC.5-B: Regulatory Requirements:** Please see Schedule and Solar Decathlon Contest Area Architecture, Design Brief 2: Net Zero Design and Site Zoning, Presentation 5: Zoning and Building Codes, and Interim Design Review 1 and 2. Students are assessed on their ability to develop a residential project that complied with local zoning ordinances, regulatory requirements, state-level building and energy code requirements, met ADA accessibility requirements for residential design, and adhered to life-safety design requirements. Design Review 1 addressed the zoning regulations of site development as students reviewed 20 sites before selecting the site on which they deemed the best choice. Design Review 2 looked closely at the residential building code and addressed site massing for solar access and design layouts that encouraged compactness, met minimum design buildable footprint on ground level of 650 sf, but were spatial in feel within a very small overall square footage of 1350 sf per unit.

**1b. ARCH 601: Assessment SC.5-D: Accessible Design:** Please see Schedule and Contest Areas Durability and Resilience, Integrated Performance, and Occupant Experience; Presentation 5: Zoning and Building Codes; and Interim Design Review 1 and 2. Students are assessed on their ability to develop a project that meets local code, state code, and federal civil rights regulation for accessibility. Most project sites had a slope to the sidewalk so the design of accessible approach to the home was essential. The building code required visitability for the duplex dwelling, so the two-family homes had to have an affordable, sustainable, and inclusive design approach for integrating a few core accessibility features as a routine construction practice into the new homes. This led students to create an accessible bathroom on the main level, one zero-step entrance, and doors with a minimum of 32 inches of clear passage space. Additionally, teams placed a bedroom on the main floor and created clear circulation within the home and accessible placement of electrical controls.

**1c. ARCH 601: Weekly Feedback Provided on 15 Design Briefs:** You will find the Schedule and Design Briefs in Instructional Material. Each design brief covers a different aspect of design in the development of the project, beginning with site selection, analysis, synthesis, and site implementation strategies for design decision making, to market analysis and end user requirements in affordable, appropriate design for two-family living, to detailed research and innovation on the building systems, building envelope, and mechanical systems to informed decisions on the energy performance, renewable energy production, and embodied environmental impacts of their design. The weekly design briefs are shared as a team presentation as we collectively assess students'

progress on the overall design. Each design brief has an individual requirement where the student considers the choices made in the evolving iterative, design project. This ensures that individual students develop the ability to make informed design decisions and demonstrate synthesis of the design and technical elements being considered. **Regulatory Regulations** were evidenced in **Design Brief 2 Site Selection and Zoning Ordinances**. **Accessible Design** was evidenced in all interim reviews especially **Interim Design Review 1 + 2**.

### ARCH 602 Original Narrative and Material Submitted

**ARCH 602: Integrated Architecture Design Studio:** This studio leverages the framework of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Solar Decathlon Design Challenge (SDDC) for SC.5 Design Synthesis. The SDDC is an internationally-contended student design competition operated by its National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). The competition is built on the premise that high-performance buildings include an integration of building science, energy efficiency, optimized mechanical systems, indoor air quality, resilience, and water conservation. However, the competition's requirements also impart to the student teams that building occupants expect more – including great design that is affordable, comfortable, durable, and safe. A particular strength of utilizing the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Solar Decathlon Design Competition (SDDC) as a vehicle for the (ARCH 602) **Integrated Architecture Design Studio** is the breadth, scope, and rigor required to effectively compete in this internationally-contended student design competition.

**1a. Assessment SC.5-B: Regulatory Requirements:** Students are assessed on their ability to develop a project that complied with local regulatory requirements, complied with state-level building and energy code requirements, met ADA accessibility requirements, and adhered to codified life-safety design requirements.

**1b. Assessment of SC.5-D: Accessible Design:** Students are assessed on their ability to develop a project that met local code, state code, and federal civil rights regulation for accessibility.

**1c. Evidence of each self-assessment:** Cited in the table below. The references are for actual page numbers of the documents, not necessarily the exhibited page numbers.

Self-Assessment	Example Evidence	ES Page #	OB Page #
Assessment SC.5-B: Regulatory Requirements	Design Portfolio	3	6
Assessment SC.5-D: Accessible Design	Technical Design Documents	2	3 - 8

### ARCH 603\_618 Original Narrative and Material Submitted

**ARCH 603: Multi-Disciplinary Design Knowledge Studio:** This studio furthers student consideration of urban design in the students' design processes while practicing their ability in design synthesis (SC5) and systems integration (SC6). The ARCH 603 studio's focus is SC5 Design Synthesis; **the project students develop in studio is also the focus for the layered consideration of systems integration guided by ARCH 618**. Faculty and students in ARCH 603 and ARCH 618 are aware of, and contributing to, this coursework alliance.

In **ARCH 603**, following preliminary research and analyses of aligned considerations, students generate a preliminary design proposal to be reviewed at the end of week 5 in the semester. This schematic design is informed by research and analysis of regulatory requirements specific to the project, site, context (historical, social, physical), urban design considerations, environmental influences, user needs and programming, and regulatory requirements. The expectations for the 5-week schematic design proposal include student identification of values and ideas their design will pursue, as well as drawings (site plan, plan, section) and massing (in context) that convey initial approach to site design, program organization, environmental response (daylight, climate, water, energy), accessibility analysis, and regulatory compliance.

This schematic will continue to be developed for the next six weeks (5<sup>th</sup> -11<sup>th</sup>) in the studio and parallel in **ARCH 618** through week-long assignments layering in focused design considerations (one at a time) of envelope systems, building assembly systems, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the use of performance modeling metrics (ex. Sefaira, cove.tool, Ladybug, and/or Honeybee) as part of the design process. Through this coordinated approach between ARCH 618 with 603, the student design process and proposals get layered with more integrated systems content; prior design decisions impacted by the focused consideration of new considerations need to be adjusted during this iterative process.

Through the frame of 618's content schedule and studio focus, student's systematic integration of each system as well as the use of feedback metrics from environmental performance modeling, prods the design development process. **The ARCH 603\_618 Final Project**, through its weekly design critiques with ARCH 603 faculty, assignments with ARCH 618, and Interim Design Reviews, helps students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects **while demonstrating synthesis of the following requirements:**

**1a. Assessment SC.5-B: Regulatory Requirements** Students are assessed on their ability to develop a project proposal that complies with local regulatory requirements including a review of the relevant zoning and building codes in Muncie and the state of Indiana.

**1b. Assessment SC.5-D: Accessible Design** Students are assessed on their ability to develop a final project that meets local code, state code, and federal civil rights regulation for accessibility. A particular emphasis is applied to this urban project to universal design, where the ADA requirements form a more integral design proposition. A student pursuing the *Social and Environmental Justice* Certificate may address accessible design through a more inclusive, and equitable approach requiring that the project promotes fair, equitable, and affordable engagement for all, without regard to income, race, ethnicity, status, or class and that the design improves the community as a whole.

**1c. Evidence of SC.5-B and D: Final Portfolio Review:** With feedback provided in the final design review, students again adjust their designs through the frame of ARCH 618's content schedule and ARCH 603's studio design development focus. The systematic integration of each system as well as the feedback metrics from regulatory requirements including accessible design and environmental performance and building modeling, prods the design development process. The work from both classes are integrated in the Final Portfolio.

## **2. Additional Information Requested on Regulatory Requirements and Accessible Design for ARCH 601, ARCH 602, and ARCH 603\_618**

### **ARCH 601 Additional Narrative and Material Submitted**

**2a. ARCH 601: Assessment SC.5-B: Regulatory Requirements** is accommodated in zoning ordinance and code lecture and evidenced in Design Brief 2 where 20 sites were analyzed to determine best use for the Solar Decathlon net zero energy, two-family housing. Students carefully considered zoning requirements including site setbacks, percentage of coverage, view corridors, and buildable area. Additional requirements set by Department of Energy (DOE) on Energy Standards and the Federal Tax Credits in terms of housing requirements were addressed in terms of minimum square footage of unit, number of bedrooms and baths, equipment that is Energy Star rated and other items expressed in the Midterm review and Final design portfolio. The response of the visiting team was as follows: *We see 'regulatory' addressed in 601, design brief 2 and interim review 1, but not for all students.* We are not sure where this material is missing in the original material from the 4 students that was provided to the NAAB team.

The [Ball State Permit Set](#) from ARCH 601 studio that advanced to the Solar Decathlon Build Competition, *The Alley House*, **has addressed all code requirements and is in the Permit Review process for the city of Indianapolis.** Permit set drawings are included to evidence this thoroughness in code compliance.

**ARCH 601: Folder Background Information on Regulatory Requirements** (including ADA guidelines) Specific places to evidence student work in regulatory (Indianapolis Zoning, Residential Building Code, DOE Energy Code) and accessibility (visitability): Background Information Folder has material they had been given, assignments, or lectures, or documents. This information was provided to all students in ARCH 601 and discussed in the schematic design, design development, and final design of their projects.

**2b. ARCH 601: Assessment SC.5-D: Accessible Design** is evidenced in the Solar Decathlon Build Design project by addressing visitability and aging in place accommodated for in the student's design of the duplex housing units. The requirement of visitability we consistently held to was: *A house is visitable when it meets three basic requirements: 1. one zero-step entrance. 2. doors with 32 inches of clear passage space. 3. one bathroom on the main floor you can get into in a wheelchair.* All student work met the faculty's and client's requirement for visitability in the design. Accessibility and universal design were also discussed in lectures and reviews. Accessible design synthesis is shown in the student's preliminary design decisions made on the spatial arrangement and planning of the duplex dwelling (with bathroom and bedroom on main level) and accessible entrance from either the alley axis or street axis to each unit (visitability). The response of the Visiting Team was as follows: *We see accessible design in ARCH 601 assessment 1 review 1, but not for all students.* We are not



sure where this material is missing in the original material from the 4 students' work that was provided to the NAAB team, however some students may have placed a higher emphasis on accessible design (beyond the requirement for visitability).

Please see [Accessible Prototype Unit](#) that was discussed with students and is being built as a part of the overall project development that the students designed and developed their duplex prototypes for. Accessible design for the work we did require visitability as mentioned above and all student projects met this criteria. The student's work in the duplex design was not required to be a fully accessible unit as it was part of a larger group of 40 units or 20 duplex buildings and a percentage of the total number of units were fully accessible. One of the team's initial design (student Mary) did aim to be an accessible unit on the main level and has met that as part of their schematic design proposal. The final build project *The Alley House* also meets accessible design on the main level unit.

**ARCH 601: Folder Background Information on Accessible Design** Information includes each of 4 students' folders that highlights accessible design synthesis in: Brief 02 Net Zero + Site, Brief 05 Integration + Sustainability (for design layout especially lower level for visitability), Interim Review 2a.b. Midterm, and Final Model Photos and Brief 13 Final Portfolio.

### **ARCH 602 Additional Narrative and Material Submitted**

**ARCH 602: Regulatory Requirements and Accessible Design** is evidenced in the student work projects for the Office Building *Fresh Aire* submitted for the Solar Decathlon Design Challenge and the Education Building *Mallory Park*. In ARCH 602, there are a number of "workshops" that address specific subject matter realms that need to be assessed, responded to, and synthesized into the final ARCH 602 / NREL Solar Decathlon deliverables. There are 4 regulatory context and 4 community engagement workshop sessions. The regulatory context sessions included accessibility. Each week, subject matter was presented, assessed, and responded to with the design solutions.

### **Evidence of an interim exercise to introduce content and prompt students for analysis and demonstrate an ability to apply knowledge prior to synthesis:**

Prior to the current Spring 2022 session of ARCH 602, we did not archive artifacts from the regulatory context or community engagement workshops as their project outcomes were only directed to be evident in the ARCH 602 / NREL Solar Decathlon deliverables. Workshop slide decks can be provided. Please see [ARCH 602 - CE RE Lecture 2 - Site Analysis, Program and Codes.pdf](#), which demonstrates codes and accessibility being explicitly addressed and then assessed in the context of the studio work. Again, this is evident in the schedule.

### **Regulatory Context: Education Building (Spring 2021)**

[DC ES BSU SUP 2021-03-30.pdf](#)

See pages 2 through 4 for a summary of site restrictions and project response.

Please note that building construction types, height restrictions, setbacks, zoning requirements, etc. are integrated into the final design solution. This was addressed through studio engagement and the studio deliverables prior to Spring 2022 did not ask for an explicit clarification document regarding regulatory context. In response to the latest NAAB Conditions, starting in Spring 2022, a specific Regulatory Context summary document will be required. Please see [ARCH 602 – Supplement B \(Regulatory + Accessible Conditions\)](#) for a definition of how this information is becoming explicitly recorded.

[DC ES BSU CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS 2021-05-03.pdf](#)

Pages 2 through 8 demonstrate competencies regarding accessibility and life-safety synthesized into the site and building design. The plans were considered the consistent artifact through which accessibility and life-safety was communicated.

### **Regulatory Context: Office Building (Spring 2021)**

[21DC OB BSU NARRATIVE 2021-03-30.pdf](#)

See page 8: This project team's regulatory and site analysis yielded a concern about a flood hazard – therefore, this component was elevated to the main narrative document.

Please note that building construction types, height restrictions, setbacks, zoning requirements, etc. are integrated into the final design solution. This was addressed through studio engagement and the studio deliverables prior to Spring 2022 did not ask for an explicit clarification document regarding regulatory context. In response to the latest NAAB Conditions, starting in Spring 2022, a specific Regulatory Context summary

document is required. Please see [ARCH 602 – Supplement B \(Regulatory + Accessible Conditions\)](#) for a definition of how this information is becoming explicitly recorded.

#### [602 OB CD Set 050321.pdf](#)

Pages 2 through 8 demonstrate competencies regarding accessibility and life-safety synthesized into the site and building design. The plans were considered the consistent artifact through which accessibility and life-safety was communicated.

#### **ARCH 603\_618 Additional Narrative and Material Submitted**

**ARCH 603\_618 Studio and Co-curricular Required Course for SC.5 Design Synthesis** allows the students to develop their individual projects in studio with a focus for the layered consideration of systems integration guided by ARCH 618. Sixteen (16) [Weekly Assignments](#) are related to the studio design in ARCH 618 and cover regulatory requirements and accessible design especially through Assignments 7, 8, and 9 (life safety considerations). Assignments 14, 15, and 16 (final portfolio) are representative of the final design synthesis and integrated design emphasis in the individual design projects and [ARCH 603 Final Presentations and ARCH 618 Assignments](#) represents the communication of this design synthesis and integration. The final design shows a complete and thorough understanding of SC.5 Design Synthesis, including Regulatory Requirements and Accessible Design.

#### **3a. Changes made to ARCH 602 in Spring 2022**

##### **ARCH 602 Changes Made in Spring 2022 (NAAB reviewed ARCH 602 Spring 2021)**

We have made changes to the structure of ARCH 602 by having a specific exercise tied to the regulatory requirements and accessible design in advance of the required plan to correct date. We now have student deliverables organized and available on OneDrive that show this change.

You can see this folder for all student deliverables from ARCH 602 Spring 2022:

#### [03 - ASSIGNMENTS - COMPLETED](#)

However, we would like to draw your attention to two specific locations for NAAB related info for Regulatory Context and Accessible Design located in **09 - MAR 30 - SUPPLEMENT (A, B, C, D) SUBMISSION**. Please see Supplement B for individual exercise on Regulatory Context and Accessible Design. The second NAAB related information for Regulatory Context and Accessible Design is located in **14 - MAR 2 - SELF EVALUATION EXHIBIT**. This folder contains individual artifacts, which includes references to contributions individual students made relative to Design Synthesis and Design Integration overall with reference to the Regulatory Context and Accessible Design as well.

If necessary, moving forward we can create individual exercises related to both Regulatory Context and Accessible Design in addition to the assignments identified here. Also, ARCH 602 Regulatory Context and Accessible Design workshop series lecture slides can be found here: [LECTURES](#)

#### **3b. Changes to be made to ARCH 601 and ARCH 603\_618 in Fall 2022**

As noted in 2022 Teaching of ARCH 602 changes made above, we have added specific assignments that address regulatory requirements and accessible design for all students. This is in addition to the assignments on user requirements, site conditions, and consideration of environmental impacts and performance analysis. New exercises will be added to **ARCH 601 in Fall 2022** to reflect synthesis of regulatory requirements and accessible design for all students. These additional exercises seek to address this comment made by the visiting team: *We see this information in some of the student work, but not consistently in any one assignment and we are wondering if there are specific assignments where we can see this 'synthesis of regulatory requirements' and 'synthesis of accessible design'.*

Finally, the exercises in **ARCH 618 that work with the ARCH 603** studio content will continue to provide excellence in both integrated design and design synthesis. A specific assignment related to accessibility in public buildings will be added to **ARCH 618 in Fall 2022** explicitly to show how the student is making design decisions relative to this synthesis early in the process of design.

**ARCH 601 Plan to Correct**, we will have specific Design Briefs for both Regulatory Requirements and Accessible Design synthesis in Fall 2022. **ARCH 603\_618 Plan to Correct** will have a specific Assignment on Accessible Design in Fall 2022 in addition to Assignment 9 on Life Safety Considerations.

## RESPONSE TO VTR with PLAN TO CORRECT

NAAB Visiting Team Report March 28-30, 2022; p. 21-22

### 5—Resources

#### 5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion – Not Demonstrated (p. 21)

*The program must demonstrate its commitment to diversity and inclusion among current and prospective faculty, staff, and students. The program must:*

- 5.5.1 *Describe how this commitment is reflected in the distribution of its human, physical, and financial resources.*
- 5.5.2 *Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's faculty and staff demographics with that of the program's students and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.*
- 5.5.3 *Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its students since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's student demographics with that of the institution and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.*
- 5.5.4 *Document what institutional, college, or program policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other social equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.*
- 5.5.5 *Describe the resources and procedures in place to provide adaptive environments and effective strategies to support faculty, staff, and students with different physical and/or mental abilities.*

#### [X] Not Demonstrated

*Team Assessment: This condition is not met. The commitment to social equity, diversity, and inclusion in regards to resources is reflected in equitable salaries, salary adjustments when not equitable, a hiring process based on qualifications, advertising to diverse pool groups, and HR diversity assessment. How this commitment is reflected in the distribution of physical resources was not described.*

*Diversity of faculty and staff has shifted since the last visit mostly in terms of gender, seeing a rebalancing with more female faculty joining the department. **Comparison of faculty/staff diversity to students was not provided. Additional benchmarking that the program saw as relevant was not provided.** In discussion with the department chair and program head, they noted ideal benchmarks would be the state of Indiana, with a focus on urban centers such Indianapolis. **A future plan of maintaining and improving faculty and staff diversity was not clear.***

*Student diversity has increased from the last visit. The APR describes the creation of the Inclusive Excellence Task Force within CAP. Through this, they held an Implicit Bias Workshop, and covered other topics included in the Universities Inclusive Excellence Plan. The Inclusive Excellence Plan extends to 2024, and the department looks to further implement the strategies contained within. Compared to the diversity of the entire student body, the M.Arch program is slightly more diverse. **Other benchmarks were not provided regarding student diversity.***

*Team Assessment - continued: Social equity, diversity, and inclusion can be found as pillars in the new BSU Strategic Plan, as well as the Faculty and Staff Handbook and the Inclusive Excellence Plan which was created by their Office of Inclusive Excellence. A culture of inclusive excellence is reflected in the college and department through various activities. In addition, the **university is currently building a new Multicultural Center in the heart of campus**. BSU's EEOC policy is listed in the Faculty and Professional Handbook. The importance of social equity, diversity, and inclusion as a main focus for the university was confirmed in the visiting team's meeting with the provost.*

*The university's Office of Disability Services lists services and resources for students and employees, on their website and through respective handbooks. A Human Resource Coordinator is available for employees and staff for any accommodations. For students, the Office of Disability Services is available for accommodations.*

## **Narrative Response**

It is our understanding that the NAAB Team's assessment found the data contained in our APR and from the Spring 2022 visit, to be generally acceptable in response to Articles 5.5.1, 5.5.2, 5.5.4, and 5.5.5; however, it has been concluded that provisions contained in Article 5.5.3 were not adequately addressed; therefore, the determination of the Team was that 5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion was "Not Demonstrated" or as per the Team Assessment, the condition was "not met" in its entirety. It is the intent of this narrative response to not only demonstrate our plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of our faculty and staff, compare our program's faculty and staff demographics with that of the program's students and other benchmarks the program deems relevant, but to also provide evidence of results produced under the implementation of our plan.

On Page 118 of the Department of Architecture APR, it was indicated that "since the last APR (2013), the demographic of the faculty and students, has slowly changed mostly in terms of gender." This is consistent with the evolution of the academy and profession in terms of gender at a national level. With respect to the diversity of our faculty and staff, the APR indicated that "all searches within the last four years have been assessed as excellent in their 'diversity' of applicant pools by Ball State Human Resources metrics." This development was acknowledged by the NAAB Team. It is understood however, that a more creative, progressive, and frankly aggressive means of truly achieving diversity among faculty and staff must be implemented in order to begin to approach the level of diversity that is present in the urban and rural demographics of this region. We can provide charts and graphs (and indeed we have – see below), discuss our Inclusive Excellence initiatives at the college and university level (and in theory, our Inclusive Excellence programs are "excellent" as indicated in the APR and acknowledged by the Team). We can employ all of the buzzwords that generate approval among auditors, reviewers, and visiting teams. Or, as with our undergraduate and graduate programs in Social & Environmental Justice, we can engage in a degree of activism through administration, with faculty and staff support, that exceed goals not only at Ball State University, but as a model for design schools nationwide.

As with other sectors of the profession, said goals never seem to be met. There may be programs that demonstrate commitment to diversity and inclusion among current and prospective faculty, staff, and students though goals and nomenclature; but notwithstanding historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) there is a general lack of evidence that ANY program in the sphere of NAAB accreditation can truly demonstrate actual achievement in meeting such goals. We are committed to building a foundation for a truly diverse academic environment that at a minimum, is reflective of the diverse population of students served. For the upcoming Fall 2022 semester, twelve (12) new faculty members will be hired in various capacities. This opportunity is the direct result of retirements and other forms of transition, combined with growth of undergraduate and graduate student enrollment. Of the twelve new faculty, eight (8) will be faculty of color and from under-represented populations. Of the eight, five (5) will be African American. Of the twelve faculty mentioned herein, seven (7) will teach in our Graduate Programs. Of the seven additional faculty, three (3) are faculty of color from under-represented populations.



Whether tenure-track, full-time contract, or adjunct, the composition of instruction in the Department of Architecture will be dramatically altered with respect to the demographics of the faculty. In addition to our Inclusive Excellence initiatives, myriad of progressive tools have been, and will continue to be used to achieve our objectives. We did not have the opportunity to share our unique approach(s) with the NAAB Team during the virtual visit as the tools were being developed at the time of the assessment. However, in regard to the designation as “not demonstrated” or “not met” by the NAAB Team, we respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the designation. The following summarizes techniques employed thus far. As we continue to address decades of disparity, we are devoted to being progressive and creative while simultaneously assuring that our practices are in strict accordance with all policies, legal parameters, and hiring metrics.

- Not only shall we advertise for positions in a wide range of publications, journals, and other platforms (as indicated on Page 118 of the APR), it is imperative that we actively recruit and encourage prospective and highly qualified applicants from diverse backgrounds (with particular emphasis on individuals from under-represented populations) to consider our program and apply. This requires research, networking, and attendance in regional and national conferences including, but not limited to the annual National Organization of Minority Architects Conference.
- Establish formal relationships with minority owned, operated, and staffed design firms. Approach principals about the critical importance of inspiring aspiring architects of color through representation in the academy. Our first attempt at developing such a relationship has been with Indianapolis-based Meticulous Design + Architecture. This is by far, the most diverse Indiana-based Architecture firm and is led by two alumni of our program with a particular understanding of the detrimental aspects of lack of representation for students from under-represented populations in a predominantly white institution. In addition to expressing willingness to offer principal staff to serve as faculty in our undergraduate and graduate degree programs, Meticulous has relocated its offices to the former Angie’s List campus adjacent to our graduate program’s physical location in downtown Indianapolis. This provides convenient access for Meticulous personnel to offer instruction, inspiration, and a pipeline to professional experience including our Integrated Path to Licensure (IPAL) Program. During Fall 2022 Semester, three (3) Meticulous personnel, (two principals and one project manager) will serve as faculty in our Department of Architecture. <https://www.meticulousda.com/about>
- Foster an academic environment that enables, encourages, and supports faculty from under-represented populations to develop and evolve from adjunct faculty, to full-time contract faculty, to tenure-track faculty, and to tenured faculty. We understand that there is a limited pool of candidates, for the profession and the academy has a dismal record in developing a critical mass of students, graduates, practitioners, and educators of color. We can no longer rely on the excuse that “we can’t find . . .” we must endeavor to “create.” As a profession and academy ground in principles of creation and innovation, it is our collective responsibility to be creative and innovative toward social equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Our benchmark will be to ultimately arrive at a level of diversity and inclusion that is equal to that of society in general. Only then can we express any degree of satisfaction or honestly suggest to our accrediting body that our goals have been reached. In the meantime, we will continue the use of creativity as indicated herein by example to first, have parity with the diversity of students enrolled, then with society in general. In conclusion, the Team Assessment states that “the university is currently building a new Multicultural Center in the heart of campus.” As a minor correction-of-fact, and as indicated in our APR on Page 119, in 2021, “the university *built* a new Multicultural Center in the heart of the campus in an effort to enhance diversity and inclusion of under-represented student populations.” It should be noted that the delivery of the Multicultural Center was led by a young African American designer who later served on our faculty at the time of the NAAB Visit as an adjunct faculty member. In Fall 2022, the designer has been hired to serve as a full-time contract faculty in our department. This highly regarded faculty member is only the second African American to serve as a full-time faculty member in the Department of Architecture in its nearly sixty (60) years of existence (the current Department Chair being the first). This is no longer an acceptable statistic and the Ball State, College of Architecture and Planning, Department of Architecture is committed to addressing social equity, diversity, and inclusion by means and goals described herein.

**ARCHITECTURE GRADUATE STUDENTS**

	2014		2018		2021	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Gender						
American Indiana or Alaskan Native						
Black or African American	2%	1%	5%	1%	3%	2%
Non Resident Alien	14%	15%	13%	4%	10%	5%
Asian			1%	1%	2%	
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander					1%	
Two or More Races			1%	1%	2%	1%
Hispanic	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	5%
Unknown	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%
<b>White</b>	22%	39%	30%	36%	32%	32%
<b>Historically Underrepresented Race</b>	18%	22%	22%	12%	21%	15%

**DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE FACULTY**

	2014		2018		2021	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Gender	24%	76%	22%	78%	26%	74%
American Indiana or Alaskan Native		3%			3%	
Black or African American		6%		6%		3%
Non Resident Alien						
Asian	3%		3%		3%	
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander						
Two or More Races		3%				
Hispanic	3%			6%		5%
Unknown						
<b>White</b>	18%	65%	19%	66%	21%	67%
<b>Historically Underrepresented Race</b>	6%	12%	3%	12%	6%	8%

**COLLEGE (CAP) FACULTY**

	2014		2018		2021	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Gender	30%	70%	29%	71%	31%	69%
American Indiana or Alaskan Native		2%			1%	
Black or African American		3%		6%		4%
Non Resident Alien						
Asian	5%	3%	3%		2%	2%
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander						
Two or More Races		2%				
Hispanic	2%			3%		2%
Unknown						
<b>White</b>	23%	60%	26%	62%	28%	60%
<b>Historically Underrepresented Race</b>	7%	10%	3%	9%	4%	8%

**BALL STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY**

	2014		2018		2021	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Gender			52%	48%	53%	47%
American Indiana or Alaskan Native						
Black or African American			2%	1%	2%	2%
Non Resident Alien					1%	1%
Asian			4%	3%	4%	3%
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander						
Two or More Races			1%	1%	1%	1%
Hispanic			1%	1%	1%	1%
Unknown						
<b>White</b>			43%	41%	44%	40%
<b>Historically Underrepresented Race</b>			8%	7%	9%	7%

**DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE STAFF**

	2014		2018		2021	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Gender	33%	67%	37%	63%	30%	70%
American Indiana or Alaskan Native						
Black or African American						5%
Non Resident Alien						
Asian		7%				
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander						
Two or More Races						
Hispanic						
Unknown						
<b>White</b>	33%	60%	37%	63%	30%	65%
<b>Historically Underrepresented Race</b>		7%				5%

**COLLEGE (CAP) ARCHITECTURE STAFF**

	2014		2018		2021	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Gender	38%	62%	41%	59%	43%	57%
American Indiana or Alaskan Native						
Black or African American		2%			1%	1%
Non Resident Alien						
Asian	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander						
Two or More Races						
Hispanic		4%		2%		1%
Unknown						
<b>White</b>	36%	53%	39%	56%	38%	55%
<b>Historically Underrepresented Race</b>	2%	8%	2%	4%	4%	2%

**BALL STATE STAFF**

	2014		2018		2021	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Gender	57%	43%	56%	44%	57%	43%
American Indiana or Alaskan Native						
Black or African American	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%
Non Resident Alien						
Asian		1%			1%	1%
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander						
Two or More Races			1%		1%	
Hispanic	1%			1%	1%	1%
Unknown			1%		2%	
<b>White</b>	52%	40%	51%	40%	50%	39%
<b>Historically Underrepresented Race</b>	4%	3%	5%	3%	6%	4%

**2020 DELAWARE COUNTY CENSUS**

					2020	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Gender					51.80%	48.20%
American Indiana or Alaskan Native					.040%	
Black or African American					7.20%	
Non Resident Alien						
Asian					1.30%	
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander					0.10%	
Two or More Races					2.40%	
Hispanic					2.60%	
Unknown						
<b>White</b>					86.60%	
<b>Historically Underrepresented Race</b>					14%	



**2020 INDIANA CENSUS**

					2020	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Gender					50.70%	49.30%
American Indiana or Alaskan Native					.040%	
Black or African American					9.0%	
Non Resident Alien						
Asian					2.60%	
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander					0.10%	
Two or More Races					2.20%	
Hispanic					7.30%	
Unknown						
<b>White</b>					78.40%	
<b>Historically Underrepresented Race</b>					23%	