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Introduction

The University of Maine at Augusta’s Bachelor of Architecture program (B.Arch), begun in fall 2013, is a five-year professional degree program designed for qualified students from Maine, northern New England, and beyond. Growing out of a successful four-year Bachelor of Arts in Architecture degree, the new B.Arch allows high school seniors, existing University of Maine at Augusta (UMA) architecture students, and regional transfer students the opportunity to successfully apply for and complete a professional degree in central Maine. The program is centered at UMA, part of the University of Maine System, within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Since our last NAAB visit, we have continued to work on strengthening our curriculum, specifically in our Integrated Design Studio, and in the area of critical thought. We believe that new coursework and better-integrated coursework have addressed some of NAAB’s concerns, as well as strengthened our program.

We have also made strides to address concerns of human, physical, and financial resources as relates to our B.Arch, specifics of which can be found in this report. Overall, we continue to work to create a strong, robust architecture program for our University and region, one that responds to the needs of our students, our community, and our accreditation.

Note on this APR

Per agreement reached between our program and the NAAB, our fall 2017 visit for continued candidacy will “focus on areas of concern raised by the NAAB visiting team at our fall 2015 continuing candidacy visit. Rather than a review of the entire program, [UMA Architecture] will share proposed plans and actions underway in response to these concerns. We recognize that the NAAB team for this proposed fall 2017 visit would need to appreciate the specific nature and potentially unique structure for this visit.”

The full agreement letter can be viewed at “00-Timeline Agreement” found here: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/4jrirl91raqifcj/AADqzide7XVw5jjaZyStNhUGa?dl=0.

With this in mind, we have limited our responses in this APR to those areas of concern raised in 2015. For areas not of concern at our previous visit, we have directed the reader to our 2015 APR to help team members gain a clearer understanding of our program and our accreditation history.
Section 1. Program Description

I.1.1 History and Mission


I.1.2 Learning Culture

Studio Culture Policy

Our Studio Culture Policy can be found online: http://www.uma.edu/academics/programs/architecture/mission-philosophy-core-values/.

Learning Opportunities

I.1.3 Social Equity


I.1.4 Defining Perspectives

Although no specific concerns were raised over the Perspectives in the 2015 VTR, the 5 perspectives have changed with the new 2014 Conditions. We offer responses to the new perspectives to facilitate a better understanding of our program today.

A. Collaboration and Leadership. The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences and opportunities for leadership roles.

We have worked to develop a culture of collaborative experiences and opportunities through coursework and projects built around a school culture of respect and collaboration. A significant piece of our curriculum and program, the Community Design Charrette, is the focal point of this practice. This project, undertaken at the start of each spring semester, groups second, third, and fourth-year students together in collaborative teams. The studio teams work with a community partner to propose design solutions at the end of a two-week charrette. Projects have included a fire station for Randolph,
Maine; a community library for Readfield, Maine; and a Nordic ski center for the Augusta Bond Brook Community Forest. Most recently, in the spring semester of 2017, students worked with the town of Chelsea, Maine on the design of a new Town Hall.

For these projects, two fourth-year students are selected to work with the community design partner to collect information and subsequently write the project brief. The charrette is organized in such a way that each fourth-year student takes a leadership role for his or her team: organizing their approach to the project, the interactions with the community client, and the final presentation. The second and third-year students are exposed to the intellectual and design rigor of the older students, and the fourth-year students are tasked with understanding how to listen to their team members and move the group towards a cohesive solution. During the charrette, design faculty from across the three years rotate through the studios for desk critiques and pin ups. The charrette culminates in a presentation to the community partner, and the models and drawings produced are displayed in community spaces throughout the year.

We bring the same intention to our travel courses, where third, fourth, and fifth year students work both individually and in teams to research, analyze, and visually document their travel experiences, culminating in collaborative publications and exhibits of their work. We have intentionally structured these travel courses so that students can find success in individual research and investigation, as well as achievements in collaborative writing, analysis, and problem solving.

Our creation of a positive, supportive studio environment, supported by coursework and projects built around respect and collaboration, builds in each student traits and experiences for working with diverse colleagues, communities, and clients, and fosters skills that result in professionals that are prepared for the collaboration of practice, as well as the opportunity for leadership.

B. Design. The program must describe its approach to developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multidimensional process involving problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value.

We begin our students’ education with ARC 101, Introduction to Architectural Design, a first studio course that teaches fundamental design skills and processes, and is run in parallel with ARC 110, Introduction to Architectural Representation which introduces foundational representation skills. ARC 101 introduces design as a conceptual discipline, and exercises are focused around the analysis, interpretation, organization, and transformation of architectural space and form. The focus of these introductory courses is the establishment of a fundamental understanding of representation, abstraction, and principles of architecture, involving an iterative investigation into the relationship of technique, form, and meaning through study, invention, testing, and evaluation. That design process, one that is grounded in iteration, becomes a foundation of making and understanding throughout the remainder of their education.

In the nine remaining design studios, we have created a curriculum that systematically breaks the essential elements of architectural design into their basic components. By giving students these skills, piece by piece, we help to educate designers that skillfully utilize these tools, clearly understand how they are intrinsically intertwined, and use
them to support thoughtful and socially meaningful design intentions. We fundamentally believe that design intelligence is the result of a slow process of assimilation; it takes time, effort, and a lot of concentration.

While our studio pedagogy is rooted in the fundamentals of architectural design, we recognize that architecture is also a complex discipline, with multiple means of making, investigating, and integrating various disciplines throughout the design process. We have intentionally focused our upper level curriculum around integrating coursework across these disciplines; projects in studio are overtly and intentionally influenced by our students’ coursework in Analysis, Theory, Technology, Materials, Digital Practice, and Sustainability courses. In these studios, we layer the fundamental understandings of the first year with projects about site interventions as well as architectural materiality, projects about the fabric of a city and the assembly of a building, about the design of connections and the search for, and development of, an appropriate tectonic language for building. Students learn to diagram a site in order to record the complex forces which shape it, they demonstrate an understanding of how to analyze as a means of understanding a complex situation, and they learn to use that analysis as a means of generating design ideas.

Throughout this process they continue to develop an individual design process which is generated by exploration and iteration, and continue to practice discussing, defending, and describing design ideas using architectural terms, drawings, models, and diagrams. Most importantly, our students learn that architecture is a problem solving discipline, and that in their solutions are opportunities to positively impact their environment, the cities and communities they live in, and the people they design spaces for.

C. Professional Opportunity. The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunities and career paths, including the transition to internship and licensure.

Like many of these perspectives, our intention and work is integrated throughout the curriculum. We have made it a priority to engage our students with the practice and opportunity of architecture before even they apply to the program. Most of our applicants attend our Info Day, which we hold annually in November. In this open house, we discuss the profession of architecture, the various paths towards licensure, and the job opportunities available to our graduates. This discussion is continued in our architecture orientation, held each August, which is mandatory for all incoming freshman and transfer students, and reinforced in conversations with advisors throughout our students’ tenure at UMA.

In our curriculum, we have developed three significant courses that educate students on the professional practice and responsibilities of architects. The first is ARC 421, Professional Practice which explores both traditional and innovative methods of running a professional practice. Topics include firm structures and business practices, services provided by architecture firms, various methods of project delivery, contracts, and ethics. This foundational understanding is then reinforced with our required ARC 406, Architectural Apprenticeship course, where students are provided with a substantive opportunity to practice applying their expertise and skills in a real world setting. The course requires students to work with practitioners and industry experts to explore their
interests in depth and to expand their knowledge of current practices in the fields; our AXP coordinator, Assistant Professor Sanjit Roy works with each student individually to support them in this endeavor. Additionally, internships provide students with an inside view of the building industry and the chance to develop connections in their professional network. Students analyze their progress through reflection on their work advancement, the progression of their skill development, the connection to their current coursework, and their exposure to certain areas within their industry. Lastly, in their fifth-year, as our students prepare to find employment after graduation, they are required to take ARC 361, Portfolio Development which culminates in a presentation of their work, through a digital portfolio, to a panel of practicing architects.

Currently our success is based on our small numbers and the strong relationships our full-time and adjunct faculty have with the professional community. We recognize that this is not necessarily scalable, and our long-range plan, as our program grows, is to develop a more systematic way of assisting students with internship placement and promoting our apprenticeship program.

In addition to these formal and intentional structures, our students and faculty are actively involved with the greater social and professional design community in Maine, through design work with nonprofits, volunteering on various architecture-related organizations, and work with AIA Maine. In addition, practicing architects attend our final reviews and thesis presentations, are involved in our program’s advisory board, and form the backbone of our talented adjunct faculty. We fundamentally believe in the integration of practice and education, and our students graduate well informed and prepared for careers as responsible practitioners, familiar with the process and practice of becoming licensed practitioners.

D. Stewardship of the Environment. The program must describe its approach to developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and natural resources.

The idea of stewardship is intentionally ingrained into our curriculum on multiple different levels: in our foundational design studios, in our energy course sequence, in our building assembly sequence, and in our comprehensive studio. The idea is introduced in the first-year studio, where the culminating project is centered on the idea of environmental and material limitations. In second year, it continues in our Energy and Sustainability Sequence where our mechanical systems course starts from an understanding of climate, both regionally and at the level of the building. Thermal comfort and daylighting are thus integrated into the heating, cooling and lighting strategies that the students consider. The course in Sustainable Design Concepts has been aligned with this course to further synchronize with the integration offered by this holistic approach to environmental system design.

This approach is sustained in the third year, when the materials and construction techniques sequence are taught through the lens of embodied energy, an understanding of fundamental building science principles, and the importance of sustainable choices in the development of high performance building envelopes. This stewardship is then integrated into studio projects, and reinforced in the fourth-year Comprehensive Studio. It is fundamentally important to us that “Sustainability” is more than merely a stand-alone
course; that the foundational ideas of stewardship are integrated throughout the curriculum, and discussed and taught through multiple different lenses, by multiple different instructors, and through multiple modalities.

On a fundamental level, our belief, which is evidenced through the intentionality of our curriculum, is that stewardship is at the core of what we teach; stewardship for both the communities our students will practice in, as well as for the environment.

E. Community and Social Responsibility. The program must describe its approach to developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens able to understand what it means to be professional members of society and to act ethically on that understanding.

Much of our program is centered on cultivating the architect’s responsibility to his or her community. Our desire is to think beyond the classroom, and even beyond architecture, to empower our students to be good citizens and good stewards of the built environment. We approach this goal in multiple ways.

As mentioned in our response to Perspective A, students are introduced to community design work in their second year, as part of a multi-year team. This design exercise teaches them collaboration, and demonstrates first-hand the potential of good design as it relates to real world issues. The fact that students will undertake the Community Design Charrette three times as they move through the program helps to ingrain community work as part of architectural practice. As the students grow in knowledge and ability, they are given more responsibility as it relates to the community project, and so understand various roles they can play in such work.

In addition to the annual community design charrette, the ARC 408 Architectural Design VII studio, taken in the spring semester of the fourth year, focuses on community design work. This dedicated semester-long studio allows students the opportunity to work with selected community partners over a longer time, allowing for in-depth research exploration and design iteration. Projects to date have included, among others, work with the homeless community, with historic downtowns, and with veterans.

Through our curriculum and other community-focused events, our students engage with a variety of constituents and their respective issues. Students are given, and accept, the responsibility of designing for those in need, and this engagement shows them that they have the power, talent, and responsibility to put their architectural skills to use in improving our collective world.

I.1.5 Long Range Planning

I.1.6 Assessment

I.1.6.A. Program Self-Assessment

Our response to this condition can be found in this report under Section 2, Program Response to Conditions Not Met.

I.1.6.B. Curricular Assessment and Development

As stated in Section 2 of this report, with the AY 2017-18 we are implementing a series of five end-of-year architecture faculty workshop days to formalize curriculum self-assessment. Please see that section for details on our plan regarding this area.

These workshop days will be organized and run by the Architecture Program Coordinator. All full-time architecture faculty members are required to attend, while all part-time faculty members are invited to attend. Through these workshops specific suggestions to better the curriculum and program are made. Minor suggestions will be recorded in our UMA Course Charters; documents that describe each course, its goals and outcomes, and the SPCs it is required to address. Should major changes be required, the program will submit proper paperwork to the College of Arts & Sciences for review by the college, the UMA curriculum committee, the college Dean, and if required the Provost.

Section 2. Progress Since the Previous Visit

Program Response to Causes of Concern

The following are our responses to the five (A-E) causes of concern raised in the 2015 VTR. For more background on these concerns, please see the 2015 VTR here: http://www.uma.edu/academics/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2017/03/2015-Continuation-of-Candidacy-Visiting-Team-Report.pdf.


A. Critical Thought: There is a concern that critical thought, a fundamental element of architectural education, is not integrated throughout the curriculum. Information literacy, investigative research, and writing are not on par with drawing and representation as crucial tools for successful student learning.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

We've responded to this concern in multiple ways and have made a significant effort in the last year to develop critical thinking skills earlier in the curriculum. We aim to integrate those skills across technology, studio, theory and history courses, and to have students demonstrate their skills more clearly in focused assignments. In review of the work of the ARC 509/510 thesis sequence, you can see that this effort has culminated in fifth year students who are able to propose and substantiate arguments for their thesis through investigation, reflective writing, and investigative research, and who are able to apply critical thinking skills in an integrative way.

Architecture students build foundational skills in information literacy and writing in their General Education foundational courses in first and second year. These courses are the ENG 101/ENG 102W (W = Writing Intensive) sequence, as well as the ARH 105/106 Art and Architectural History Sequence. Recognizing that we needed to build a stronger bridge between these courses and the Architecture curriculum, we've introduced a new course, ARC 212, Building a Human World, and revised and strengthened two existing courses: ARH 312, History of Modern Architecture and ARC 431, Architectural Theory. We've also intentionally incorporated more information literacy, writing, and investigative research in our ARC 441 Architecture Travel Experience courses; this work can be evidenced in our recent ARC 441, Finlandia course, as well as ARC 441, India Research Group, both taught in AY 2016-2017.

ARC 212, Building a Human World, will be taught for the first time in the spring of AY 2017-2018. Adjunct Professor Dr. William Klingelhofer and Assistant Professor Amy Hinkley designed this course to build and develop critical thinking skills. Typically taken in the spring semester of the second year, the course will examine important historical building forms in a global context. This course is not intended as a strictly chronological or regional survey but as an exploration of distinctive architectural forms and features found in building traditions around the world. Typologies, elements of design, basic building technologies, architectural iconographies, social functions, and decorative approaches will all be considered as students explore major monuments representative of human building, primarily in pre-modern times. An emphasis on building critical thinking skills is intentional:
Students will be asked to conduct basic research, develop and apply critical analysis skills, practice both verbal and written communication skills, and utilize basic architectural design, drawing and modeling skills on a regular basis. Students will gain a broad overview of key examples of global architecture, the ability to properly contextualize and compare these works, and a foundation of historical knowledge and cultural approaches with which to inform their own design work.

-From the course syllabus

While this course will not have been taught prior to the Fall 2017 NAAB Team visit, the course proposal and charter have passed through the UMA Curriculum Committee process, and, as of AY 2017-2018, the course will be a required part of the B.Arch degree requirements. This course was specifically proposed in response to NAAB concerns.

You will see evidence of the development of critical thinking skills in ARC 441, Finlandia, where two of the course objectives were to develop writing skills in both critical inquiry as well as the description and analysis of space and form, and to develop architectural analytical skills related to both primary and secondary research, as well as in situ understanding. One of the course outcomes was that students demonstrate critical thinking skills in both their written and visual work. The work that students completed for these courses demonstrates their ability to think critically and to formulate ideas and responses to architecture based on research, investigation, and direct engagement.

A member of the Art department has historically taught ARH 312, The History of Modern Architecture. In AY 2017-2018, Assistant Professor Sanjit Roy, who is using the course as a way to develop and refine critical thinking skills and to integrate these skills into the architectural curriculum, will teach this course. Instead of being a “stand alone” history course, Assistant Professor Roy intends to use the course as a bridge between theory, history, and contemporary practice.

By integrating critical thinking earlier in the curriculum, by building on foundation skills developed in the General Education curriculum, and by developing new courses and assignments that reinforce investigation, research, and writing, we have strengthened our students’ ability to think critically, write cogently, as well as understand the role of research and investigation in architecture.

B. Comprehensive Design: There is a concern regarding the allotment of time provided for the comprehensive design studio. In addition to the studio being limited to four credit hours, the 10-day Community Design Charrette inhibits the completion of a full semester of study in this crucial studio. Additionally, successful co-requisite alignments observed elsewhere in the curriculum are not currently aligned with the comprehensive design studio.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

We have responded to this concern through several significant steps. The first is that we moved the 10-day Community Design Charrette to the spring semester. This allows two additional weeks to develop comprehensive studio projects. Implemented in AY 2016-2017, this looks to be a very successful move.
While we are currently restricted by the university to keep studio courses at four-credit hours, we were able to shift existing credits around (by eliminating ARC 511, a 1-credit senior seminar course, and by changing ARC 406, the apprenticeship course, to 1-credit from 3-credits) in order to introduce ARC 417, Integrated Building Systems, a co-requisite to ARC 407, Architectural Design VI, our integrated design studio. This allows for 7 credits focused on integrative design. It also builds on our successful alignments elsewhere in the curriculum, and is considered the “Technical Lecture” parallel for much of the content of the ARC 407 integrated studio. The ARC 417 course is designed to support the comprehensive design studio process with an emphasis on the ability to conceptually design and comprehensively document integrated details of systems within a building. A series of modules that parallel the design studio deadlines consist of lectures, work sessions, and critiques that enable the work of Integrated Studio to be developed at a greater level of detail than otherwise possible.

Offered as an “E” (experimental) course in AY 2016-2017, ARC 417 now has full University approval, is a required part of our degree program, and must be taken concurrently with ARC 407, Architectural Design VI (Integrated Studio).

Lastly, our new faculty member, Assistant Professor Sanjit Roy, has taken over the ARC 407 studio, bringing his experience teaching the comprehensive studio at Morgan State University, Baltimore, MD to UMA. By shifting some components of the studio, by focusing the efforts of the students on the specific learning outcomes, and through extensive collaborations and reviews with Maine’s professional architecture community, the ARC 407/417 Integrative Design sequence has been improved and significantly reworked.


**C. Faculty Alignment with Key Course Content:** Faculty credentials, such as teaching experience and professional expertise, are not aligned closely enough with the course content that the faculty members are teaching.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

We have made significant progress in aligning faculty with course content, perhaps most significantly with the addition of Sanjit Roy as an Assistant Professor in AY 2016-2017. Professor Roy comes to UMA from Morgan State University in Baltimore. His research and expertise is in structural systems and urban planning. He brings a valuable intellectual diversity to the full time faculty, and is tasked with teaching Comprehensive Studio, Structures I, India Research Group, History of Modern Architecture, as well as upper level courses in Digital Tools.

The addition of Sanjit Roy to our full-time faculty gives us three complementing realms of expertise:

Lecturer Amy Hinkley - Fundamental Design Skills, Material & Construction Tectonics
Assistant Professor Sanjit Roy - Structures, Digital Tools, Urban Theory
Associate Professor Eric Stark - Design Theory, Architectural Research and Analysis
In addition, we have added several professionals to our adjunct teaching staff, as well as maintained successful adjunct relationships with faculty who are practicing professionals and experts in their field, most notably:

Adjunct Professor Joseph Leasure, PE - ARC 332, Structures II - Mr. Leasure brings over 30 years experience as a licensed professional engineer who has worked with architects on a wide variety of building types and structures.

Adjunct Professor Andrew Holbrook, PE - ARC 350, Mechanical Systems - Mr. Holbrook is a licensed mechanical engineer with over 30 years of experience in the field, working on a wide variety of projects.

Adjunct Professor Dr. William Klingelhofer - ARC 212, Building a Human World - Dr. Klingelhofer has extensive teaching experience in architectural and global history.

Adjunct Professor Luc Demers - ARC 120, Introduction to Digital Tools - Mr. Demers is an award-winning photographer with extensive teaching experience.

Associate Professor Peter Precourt - ARC 110, Architectural Representation - Professor Precourt comes to us from the UMA Art faculty, and brings excellence in teaching as well as a broad knowledge of various means of representation.

The resumes of these faculty, and all our faculty, with their relevant professional and academic experience, can be found in folder “05-Faculty Resumes” found here:
https://www.dropbox.com/sh/4jrirl91raqjfcj/AADqzide7XVw5jjaZyStNhUGa?dl=0


D. Issues of Faculty Workload/Compensation and Recruitment/Retention: There is a concern that the potential loss of key personnel, who bear heavy workloads, may have detrimental effects on the program. Additionally, there is a concern that lower rates of compensation may have detrimental effects on faculty recruitment and retention.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

Since last visit, the architecture faculty has successfully recruited a third architecture faculty member, Sanjit Roy, who was hired onto the tenure track. Professor Roy comes to us from Morgan State University in Baltimore, MD. His is a replacement position for the fixed length position previously held by Rosemary Needham-Curtis. The success of this search indicates the program’s capability of attracting faculty through a national search. We also continue to retain two longer term faculty members, Eric Stark and Amy Hinkley, who bear a great deal of the workload in the department. The addition of a part-time shop steward and part-time administrative assistant position in the architecture program will help support faculty and address some of the workload issues that NAAB has identified. These positions are budgeted in our 2017-2018 budget and will be hired for the summer and fall of 2017 respectively.

In order to attract Professor Roy, we had to offer a salary range higher than originally used to recruit other tenure track faculty in the department. This demonstrates that UMA
is prepared to acknowledge the salary requirements for recruitment of architecture faculty in a Bachelor's of Architecture program.


**E. Student Recruitment:** *The program’s financial success hinges upon its ability to attract and retain additional viable students at all levels (true freshmen, non-traditional students, and transfer students). Program-specific marketing, broader recruitment, and university commitment to future student housing were presented to the team as potential strategies.*

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

Since the 2015 NAAB Team visit, direct action has been taken to address this concern in the two areas of marketing and recruitment. Since summer 2016, we have worked with Mark Tardiff, Executive Director of Strategic Marketing and Public Affairs (no longer with UMA), on a number of different marketing projects. Marketing efforts include:

- An architecture specific television commercial which can be view here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WkeS37uLSv0
- A radio commercial based on the new TV spot
- Architecture-specific print advertisements have been run in regional newspapers
- Facebook ads for the program have been running during the last two digital contracts
- The video ad was run on Time Warner Cable's Premium video on demand service

Recruitment has also seen solid improvement. Over the last year and a half, in collaboration with the Office of Enrollment and Admissions, the following projects have taken place:

- Signed a MOU with Holland College, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Canada
- Working with regional community colleges on transfer agreements. These schools include Southern Maine Community College, Central Maine Community College, Kennebec Valley Community College, and York County Community College
- High school visits focused on larger, regional schools were conducted by UMA Architecture faculty and included Brunswick, South Portland, Lewiston, and Portland, Maine
- Attended the east coast architecture college fair hosted by the Boston Society of Architects
- Participated in the 2016 ACSA Virtual College + Career Expo
- The Enrollment and Admissions office has implemented the use of Target X software, allowing for targeted marketing efforts that have already shown results
- Architecture Info Day, November 2016 – This open house attracted 26 students and 50 guests. The improvement in this annual event was partially made possible using the new “Target X” system that allows the enrollment office to target very specific demographics

Our efforts on marketing and recruitment have led to a solid increase in our 2017-18 early applications and admit. As of May 15, 2017 we had a total of 42 applications. This
is more than double of what we have experienced in years past at this time of year. Of these 42, 26 have been accepted by the program, an increase of 24% over last year's totals. We are currently working on enrolling these students at UMA to start in the 2017 fall semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017 (as of 5/15/17)</th>
<th>% Increase over previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered Admission by Program</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Offered Admission by Program</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined Offer</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application incomplete or under review</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;30%&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled (as of 5/15/17)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing at UMA remains an active topic of discussion, but frankly a clear path forward has not yet been identified. The topic was brought up at the last UMaine System Board of Trustees meeting, a recent "fireside chat" visit by the UMaine Chancellor, and also at the most recent UMaine System Finance, Facilities & Technology committee meeting held on April 27th. The topic was also on the agenda of the May 2nd UMA Executive Leadership Team meeting. There have been some inquiries from private developers to create public-private development to address students' needs, but these have been limited to discussions only.

Program Response to Conditions Not Met

The following are our responses to the conditions that were deemed Not Met Yet in the 2015 VTR.


**I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures** - This condition is Not Yet Met. Though the program has started to make progress on this condition, it remains as a deficiency. The architecture program has led a university-wide effort to provide successful course evaluations that allow student feedback to be sent immediately and concisely back to the faculty at the end of the semester.

The program continues to have only three full-time faculty members. The program has developed a robust structure for a Long-Range Plan and has developed the framework for a
curriculum and learning culture, but has yet to identify best steps proceeding forward as it relates to its own identified mission and vision.

To date, the program has relied on the input from the NAAB as its primary assessment tool and has not become self-sufficient in providing and implementing its own self-assessment policies. Though the APR refers to a B. Arch. Advisory Board, this group has not been formed and thus its perceived actions have yet to come to fruition.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

We have made two significant changes to address this concern. The first is the formation of our UMA Bachelor of Architecture Advisory Board. The current board includes thirteen individuals who have agreed to serve two-year terms. The board includes architects, landscape architects, educators, a Maine State legislator, designers, UMA Architecture alumni, as well as people involved in regional community work. We held the inaugural meeting on May 1, and plan to hold meetings each semester going forward. The intent of our first meeting was to introduce the board to the program, our accreditation status, and our students. In addition, we asked board members specific questions related to the profession’s relationship to architectural education, the integration of topics of sustainability in our curriculum, and the advancement of technology (digital and building) in the profession. The results and actions stemming from this meeting will be available at our fall 2017 NAAB team visit.

The second action is the creation of end-of-year architecture faculty workshop days to formalize curriculum self-assessment. Continuing to develop curriculum - to recognize both where we are succeeding and to identify areas where we need continued support and work - is critical to our success as educators, to our professional degree accreditation, and to our students’ success as architects. The workshops take place over five days at the end of the academic year, and are attended by all FT faculty, with PT faculty invited as well. Each workshop day is focused on a discussion of pedagogy, curriculum, assessment, or reflection of the year.

In anticipation of these meetings, each faculty member (FT, PT, & Adjunct) submits a one-page assessment for each course they have taught over the past academic year. Each faculty member is asked to respond specifically to what he or she feels their course successes were, what the areas of struggle were, what skills they feel that students developed, what skills they feel should have been developed, how they might change the course if they were teaching it again, if, and when, they had a peer evaluation, and what they learned from that peer evaluation. We ask faculty to pay specific attention to their NAAB Student Performance Criteria and evaluate their students’ work in relationship to specific SPCs. We ask faculty to be honest about the successes and failures they experienced so that we can continue to refine and tweak our curriculum and content.

These assessments and a summary of the work from the 2016-17 faculty workshop days will be available for review at the fall 2017 visit.

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development - This condition is Not Yet Met. This condition is now adequate for students, but remains inadequate for faculty. The program currently has three full-time faculty members. All of them continue to be tasked with an unsustainable range of responsibilities, including curricular development, student advising, admissions committee work, coordinating one of the five years of the program, responding to the challenges of achieving initial accreditation, and fulfilling a broad range of teaching responsibilities. In addition to having the previous list of responsibilities, the program coordinator is responsible for hiring, community outreach, and recruiting, and has now taken on the additional role of licensing advisor to guide students into the IDP program.

Currently, the staff serving the architecture department are insufficient. Additionally, the team notes a reduction from three administrative assistants in the College of Arts and Sciences to two since the writing of the APR. The team is concerned about the workload and the stress it places on the two remaining administrative assistants, as well as their ability to effectively serve the needs of the architecture program and other programs in the college.

The program has a talented pool of adjunct faculty but is hindered by a union-enforced credit limit that does not allow adjunct faculty to teach both a studio and a seminar per semester.

In the area of professional development, the team notes that UMA staff members have access to pursuing their first degree at no charge. The full-time faculty in the program are provided with annual faculty development funds, which must be split between the three faculty members and may limit the extent of their participation in development activities to only regional opportunities.

Since the architecture program has begun the transition from a Bachelor of Arts degree to a professional Bachelor of Architecture degree, the team observed that the full-time salaries of the architecture faculty may not be transitioning in order to be comparable with salaries in other professional programs at UMA.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

Starting in the 2017 FY, UMA administration has increased the architecture budget to include funds for two new part-time hires. The first is a part-time administrative help dedicated to the architecture program (20+ hours/week). This will allow full-time faculty to focus on elements of the program requiring their expertise. This new position will be responsible for a variety of responsibilities including:

- Maintaining Richmond Gallery displays, coordinating Openings & Press Releases for gallery exhibits
- Assisting with ARC Transfer Evaluation Documentation, including Syllabi & SPCs documentation for NAAB
- Assisting with recruiting at community colleges, high schools, and technical schools
- Assisting with Community Work coordination including emails, phone calls, and outreach
- Assisting with ARC Apprenticeship coordination, Employment inquiries, and Job Postings
• Responsibility for Digital Lab Maintenance including Laser Cutter, 3D Printer, and large format plotters
• Help in maintaining the UMA Architecture Webpages
• Designing posters, postcards, and promotional materials for architecture related events and recruitment
• Assisting with Travel Administration and Planning for Travel Programs for the program
• Assisting with general outreach including maintaining a database of addresses and emails
• Organizing building tours, open houses, and workshops
• Performing other duties as assigned

The second position is a part-time shop supervisor. Please see our responses in Section 2 to Concern D and I.2.3 Physical Resources for additional information. This position will:
• Maintain day-to-day equipment operations of all lab tools and maintenance of all components, which includes changing and repairing of broken blades, sanding belts, pads for all sanding tools, drum sander, sanding drums, drill press, table saws and blades, laser cutter, disk sanders, compressor and dust collectors
• Maintain inventory of all equipment, which includes ordering and updating of inventory lists
• Responsible for the maintenance, cleanliness, and safety of all equipment and lab areas
• Supervises, attends, assists, and guides students in the Shop Lab on safety procedures, and proper functioning of equipment and its components
• Works with faculty for set-up for labs and cleans up upon completion
• Perform other duties as assigned

Regarding faculty salaries in the professional degree program, full-time salaries of exiting faculty members have not transitioned to be comparable with salaries in other professional programs at UMA. UMA administration would like to indicate that differences might reflect differences in degree status (Ph.D. MArch, BArch) as well as differences in subject matter (allied health is not always easily comparable with non-allied health fields).

However, we would note that in order to attract our newest full-time hire, Professor Sanjit Roy, UMA did offer a salary range higher than originally used to recruit other tenure track faculty in the department. This demonstrates that UMA is prepared to acknowledge the salary requirements for recruitment of architecture faculty in a Bachelor's of Architecture program.

To date, funding for professional development has not changed.

As regards course loads for adjunct hires we have made some agreed upon progress. UMA administration has stated, “the UMA administration has and continues to support allowing adjunct faculty to teach multiple classes for the architecture program, thereby making these PT teaching positions more attractive.” This change allows the program to hire adjuncts to teach a studio course (4 credits) + another course (3 credits) thereby making scheduling and compensation more attractive.

I.2.3 Physical Resources: This condition is Not Yet Met. This condition remains inadequate for the program. Since fall 2011, the program has been located in Handley Hall (previously named the Gannett Building) in downtown Augusta. The program occupies two floors, the second and the fourth, totaling 7,842 square feet. The fifth floor of Handley Hall is currently on short-term lease to a nonprofit and is potentially available to accommodate the growth of the program. The building is well appointed with classrooms, faculty offices, critique pin-up spaces, lecture rooms, computer stations, a student lounge, and a gallery on the main street in Augusta. All of the architecture courses are taught in this building, while the general education courses and those offered by other departments are taught on UMA’s main campus, located 2.2 miles away.

Since the previous visit, dedicated studio space has been given to all architecture design students (fall 2014) and a basic digital fabrication lab has been created. The lab contains a Universal Laser Cutter and MakerBot 2X 3-d printer, and is monitored, maintained, and managed by students.

Security card access has been added throughout the building since the previous visit, so students have more after-hours access. However, many of the students commute long distances, are non-traditional, and may work full time, and they do not have extended access to studios—beyond the current access—on weekends, evenings, and holidays.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

Starting in fall 2016, studio access has been increased to allow students access 24 hours a day, 7 days per week; this includes weekends, evenings, and school holidays. A group of designated student monitors are being trained to allow for building coverage. Please note that Handley Hall is still closed for national holidays, as is the entire University.

A dedicated workshop space has been approved and funded by UMA administration. The workshop budget includes part-time staffing (20+ hours/week), basic hand and power tools, routine maintenance, and will be located on the B1 level of Handley Hall (currently used for storage). The hiring for this position (see our response to I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development above) and the remodel of this space is planned for summer 2017 in preparation for the fall 2017 semester.

In addition, the program made formal requests in spring 2017 for funds from the UMA Technology Fund to secure additional digital equipment. These requests look to add a second laser cutter, a second 3D printer, large-scale TV monitors for digital studio presentations, and a CNC router to our digital lab. We will learn if these projects are successfully funded in early summer 2017.


I.2.4 Financial Resources: This condition is Not Yet Met. This condition remains inadequate for the program. The team found that the chief financial officer (CFO), the provost, and the dean of the College of Arts of Sciences were all cognizant of the need to improve the financial resource allocations for the B. Arch program as an investment in its future. The new Long-
Range Plan, with its multi-year budget projections, is moving in the right direction and establishes a road map for meeting the financial challenges of the growing program. High on the priority list of unmet program needs outlined in the Long-Range Plan is additional administrative support for the program, as well as a new workshop and an expanded digital fabrication lab accompanied by the requisite staff to manage those facilities.

In the APR, the team noted that the budget to FTE student ratios in the two most costly professional degree programs in UMA’s College of Professional Studies were significantly higher (42% and 75%) than in the architecture program. Similarly, the team found that full-time faculty salaries at the ranks of assistant professor and associate professor in those same programs may also be significantly higher (27% to 39%) than they are in architecture.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

Starting in the 2017 FY, UMA administration has increased the architecture budget by approximately $55,000 for two architecture hires, a part-time administrative assistant, and a part-time workshop supervisor. Realizing that a monitored shop space is a new endeavor for the University, the Dean has stated that administration recognizes “that we may (after a certain period of time) have to adjust the hours if the shop is being used too little, or alternatively too much.” This allows us some flexibility depending on students’ use of these new and expanding spaces, as well as the possibility for increased shop hours should the demand be high. This increase in funding and staff is in direct response to NAAB concerns raised in the 2015 VTR. For additional information on this area please see our response to I.2.1 Human Resource condition above.

In response to the issue of faculty salaries, and due to this concern raised in the 2015 NAAB VTR’s, we were able to justify a higher salary for our newest hire, Assistant Professor Sanjit Roy, above the initial offer as advertised. While there has been no discussion regarding any increase to salaries of current faculty in our professional degree, our response to “Concern D. Issues of Faculty Workload/Compensation” states that administrative action demonstrates that UMA is prepared to acknowledge the increased salary requirements for recruitment of architecture faculty in a Bachelor’s of Architecture program.

Documents related to budget and FTE comparison can be found in Appendix D.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development: This condition remains Not Yet Met. The team noted that, since the previous team visit, there had been substantial improvements in the curriculum, including the development of new courses, effective co-requisite pairings of courses in the fall semesters of the first, second, and third years, deliberate sequencing of content areas across multiple semesters, and a higher level of complexity of studio problems for students to address. Faculty that are licensed architects have been directly involved in the development of the curriculum. Nevertheless, the program has no formal process for curriculum review and development, and has not implemented a clear and inclusive formal process on how curricular modifications are made.
Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

Please see I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures for our response to this Not Yet Met area.


II.3 Evaluation of Preparatory/Pre-professional Education: *This condition remains Not Yet Met.* Many aspects of this condition have been addressed. An admissions process and policy is in place for the B. Arch. program. The program has established an in-depth process, including an Artistic Review Challenge (ARC) or portfolio review, letters of recommendation, and an interview for all incoming students, including transfer students. In general, transfer students can receive transfer credit for courses in general education, structures, and CAD software-related content.

Though a policy is in place, there is no evidence that the program is demonstrating that it has established standards for ensuring all SPC are met by all students. It is important to note that the current assessment process for the evaluation of transfer student education is not documented in students’ advising files, which makes it difficult for the program to consistently identify gaps in a student’s full educational track and maintain consistency across the entire student body.

As the program matures and identifies specific matriculation agreements with other universities and community colleges, this documented evaluation process will become eminently more important to address through a thorough and clear process that is specific to UMA.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

We have addressed this concern through two significant efforts. The first concerted effort is work to form matriculation agreements with the community college system. This year we signed a formal matriculation agreement with Holland College, Prince Edward Island, Canada, and are actively developing agreements with community colleges across Maine. These include York County Community College, Southern Maine Community College, Central Maine Community College, and Kennebec Valley Community College. These agreements pursue a 2+4 strategy, and the work of aligning SPCs from existing community college courses to UMA SPCs will be the first big project undertaken over fall 2017 by our new part-time administrative assistant.

The second is a standardization of the process for admitting and evaluating transfer students, as well as aligning course SPCs. We have formulated a four-step process to facilitate this transfer process.

**Step 1:** When a transfer student applies to the program their transcript is evaluated by the Academic Coordinator to establish a tentative equivalency schedule. This evaluation compares course titles and descriptions in order to determine, fairly quickly, a rough equivalency between institutions. This in turn allows potential transfer students to understand their likely placement within our curricular sequence. This review chart (an example of which can be found in the Appendix A) is uploaded to a commonly accessible folder.
Step 2: If a student is accepted into the program, and chooses to attend, the student will work with the Architecture Administrative Assistant and their assigned academic advisor to document the course equivalencies through review of UMA course charters in order to establish that SPCs from have been met. Once this process is complete, a packet is made with a final course equivalency table (see Appendix A), the course charters or syllabi that document the equivalencies, and a course schedule for the remaining years in the program. This packet is signed by the student, the advisor, and the academic coordinator, and uploaded to a commonly accessible folder.

Step 3: The advisor notifies the UMA transfer equivalency office, by email, of the course substitutions by sending them the final course equivalency table.

Step 4: The advisor and the student review the student’s Degree Progress Report in Mainestreet to confirm that course substitutions were made according to the table.

We are instituting this process in the AY 2017-2018 year and have been implementing it for this admissions cycle. Examples of our first “beta” students’ tables will be shown at the fall 2017 NAAB Team visit.

Program Response to SPCs Not Met

The following are our responses to the SPCs that were deemed Not Met Yet in the 2015 VTR. Please note that the SPC listed as “Not Met Yet” and the VTR Assessment are based on SPCs from the 2009 Conditions. While we are responding to the 2009 areas of concern, we have shifted our curriculum to respond to the 2014 SPCs.


This criterion remains Not Yet Met. The team noted a wide range of writing, speaking, and listening abilities across the coursework of the curriculum. ARC 510: Architectural Design, Thesis—which is the primary course that is anticipated to satisfy this criterion—had not yet been taught at the time of this visit.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

The 2014 SPC that covers this area is A1. Professional Communication Skills. We meet this SPC primarily through ARC 361, Portfolio Development, and secondarily by ARC 408, Architectural Design VII and ARC 510, Architectural Design IX (thesis).


2009 Criterion A.4., Technical Documentation: Ability to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design

This criterion remains Not Yet Met. All requirements of this criterion are well met in ARC 332: Construction Techniques, with the exception of the ability to write outline specifications.
Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

The 2014 SPC that covers this area is **B4. Technical Documentation**. We address this SPC primarily through **ARC 332, Construction Techniques**, and secondarily through **ARC 407, Architectural Design VI**.

In response to this critique, an assignment has been added in **ARC 332, Construction Techniques** course. This course focuses on technical documentation, and the culminating assignment tasks students with developing a wall section, choosing and understanding materials for that wall section, modeling the tectonic assembly using a three dimensional digital model, and writing outline specifications for the project. This assignment builds off the successful integration of ARC 332 with students’ parallel ARC 407 studio course.


2009 Criterion A.5., Investigative Skills: Investigative Skills: Ability to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes. *This criterion remains Not Met Yet.*

The ability to gather and record visual information permeates the studio work throughout the program. However, evidence of the assessment and evaluation of this information within the design process cannot be found in the work of all students. It is anticipated that this criterion will be taught in **ARC 509: Architectural Design, Pre-Thesis**, which had not yet been completed at the time of the visit.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

The 2014 SPC that covers this area is **A3. Investigative Skills**. We meet this SPC primarily through **ARC 241, Architectural Research & Analysis**, and secondarily through **ARC 204, Architectural Design III**.


2009 Criterion A.9., Historical Traditions and Global Culture: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.

*This criterion remains Not Yet Met.* The syllabus for **ARC 431: Architectural Theory** identifies this course as being the primary course for this criterion to be met; however, this course had not yet been taught in full at the time of the visit. Work provided in the team room from **ARC 441: Required Architectural Travel Experience** supports meeting portions of this condition. *Evidence provided for ARH 105: History of Art and Architecture I, ARH 106: History of Art and Architecture II, and ARH 312: History of Modern Architecture did not support meeting this criterion.*

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

The 2014 SPC that covers this area is **A7. History and Global Culture**. We meet this SPC primarily through **ARC 212, Building the Human World**, and secondarily through **ARC 431, Architectural Theory**, **ARC 441, Architectural Travel Experience**, and **ARC 312, History of Modern Architecture**.
We have introduced a new course, ARC 212, *Building the Human World*, which focuses on meeting this SPC. This course examines important historical building forms in a global context. It is not intended as a strictly chronological or regional survey but as an exploration of distinctive architectural forms and features found in building traditions around the world. Typologies, elements of design, basic building technologies, architectural iconographies, social functions, and decorative approaches will be considered as students explore major monuments representative of human building, primarily in pre-modern times. Students will be asked to conduct basic research, develop and apply critical analysis skills, practice both verbal and written communication skills, and utilize basic architectural design, drawing, and modeling skills on a regular basis. Through this course, students will gain a broad overview of key examples of global architecture, the ability to properly contextualize and compare these works, and a foundation of historical knowledge and cultural approaches with which to inform their own design work.

While this course will not have been taught by the fall 2017 visit, the course outline can be found in “01-Course Descriptions” located here: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/4jrirl91raqjfcj/AADqzide7XVw5jjaZyStNhUGa?dl=0. Student work done in the course will be in evidence at the fall 2018 NAAB visit.


**2009 Criterion A.11., Applied Research: Understanding the role of applied research in determining function, form, and systems and their impact on human conditions and behavior.**

*This criterion remains Not Yet Met. Evidence of a clear translation of the research into the function, form, and systems and their impact on the human conditions and behavior in the final design project was not found in ARC 407: Architectural Design VI, Comprehensive Design Studio.*

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

The 2014 SPC that covers this area is **C1. Research.** We meet this SPC primarily through ARC 509, *Architectural Design VIII* (pre-thesis), and secondarily through ARC 510, *Architectural Design IX* (thesis).

The understanding of theoretical and applied research methodologies is conceptually introduced in ARC 241, *Architectural Research and Analysis*, and developed in the ARC 509/510 studio sequence, which had not been taught at the time of the last visit. We have removed this SPC from ARC 407, which was burdened with meeting too many SPCs.


**2009 Criterion B.1., Pre-Design: Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their**
implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

This criterion remains Not Yet Met. ARC 509: Architecture Design, Pre-Thesis, the primary course that is anticipated to satisfy this criterion, had not yet been completely taught at the time of this visit.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:
The 2014 SPC that covers this area is B1. Pre-Design. We meet this SPC primarily through ARC 305, Architectural Design IV, and secondarily through ARC 306, Architectural Design V.

2009 Criterion B.2., Accessibility: Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical (including mobility), sensory, and cognitive disabilities.

This criterion remains Not Yet Met. The curriculum reiterates the importance of accessible site and building design throughout the studio sequence. Evidence provided for ARC 204: Architectural Design III, Site Design Studio and ARC 407: Architectural Design VI, Comprehensive Design Studio does not consistently exhibit a level of ability in site design and in meeting the design needs of individuals with sensory and cognitive disabilities.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:
The 2014 Conditions no longer has an SPC specific to “accessibility.” The 2014 SPCs that cover this area are B3. Codes and Regulations and C3. Integrative Design. We meet these SPCs primarily through ARC 306, Architectural Design V and ARC 407, Architectural Design VI respectively, and secondarily through ARC 407, Architectural Design VI and ARC 417, Integrated Building Systems respectively.

The ability to design systems that are responsive to relevant codes and regulations is evidenced in the ARC 407, Architectural Design VI (Integrated Studio) and ARC 417, Integrated Building Systems coursework, which has been significantly revised since the 2015 NAAB Team visit.

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:

This criterion remains Not Yet Met. In ARC 407: Architectural Design VI, Comprehensive Design Studio, each student’s ability and capacity to make design decisions across scales, while integrating each of the required SPC, were not yet demonstrated in the work exhibited within the team room.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:
The 2014 SPC that covers this area is **C3. Integrative Design.** We meet this SPC primarily through **ARC 407, Architectural Design VI,** and secondarily through **ARC 417, Integrated Building Systems.**

**ARC 407, Architectural Design VI** is now run in parallel with **ARC 417, Integrated Building Systems** thereby increasing the credit hours allocated to Integrated (Comprehensive) Studio from 4 to 7, and allowing for a more in-depth consideration of building integration.


**2009 Criterion B.8., Environmental Systems:** Understanding the principles of environmental systems' design such as embodied energy, active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar orientation, daylighting and artificial illumination, and acoustics, including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools.

This criterion is **Not Met Yet.** All requirements for this criterion are well met in **ARC 350: Mechanical Systems in Architecture** and **ARC 251: Sustainable Design Concepts,** with the exception of an understanding of acoustical systems.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

The 2014 SPC that covers this area is **B6. Environment Systems.** We meet this SPC in our energy sequence, primarily through **ARC 350, Mechanical Systems in Architecture** and secondarily **ARC 251, Sustainable Design Concepts.** A module on acoustics has been added since our 2015 NAAB Team visit, and will be in evidence at the fall 2017 visit.


**2009 Criterion B.11., Building Service Systems Integration:** Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems.

This criterion remains **Not Yet Met.** Evidence in the team room from **ARC 350: Mechanical Systems in Architecture** demonstrated that students have an understanding of the basic principles of plumbing and fire protection systems, but not electrical, vertical transportation, or security systems.

Program Activities in Response [Year of previous visit, 2015 / Year of APR, 2017]:

The 2014 SPC that covers this area is **B9. Building Service Systems.** We meet this SPC primarily through **ARC 350, Mechanical Systems in Architecture** and secondarily through **ARC 417, Integrated Building Systems.**

**Changes made to the program due to new 2014 Conditions**

The following are actions taken in full or partial response to the new 2014 Conditions.

- Review and update of SPC alignment to existing, proposed, and new coursework
- Response to the new 5 Perspectives and how our program addresses them
- New Realm C - In response to a 2015 VTR concern, we have reconsidered our Integrated Design coursework. Our response to this concern brings us better in line with the new realm.
Section 3. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development

Please see our response to this area under Section 2: Program Response to Conditions Not Met.

Faculty resumes can be viewed in “06-Faculty Resumes” located here: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/4jrirl91raqfcj/AADqzide7XVw5jjaZyStNhUGa?dl=0

The following faculty matrix covers the two academic years prior and identifies each faculty member, the courses he/she was assigned during that time. In the case of adjuncts or visiting professors, only those individuals who taught in the two academic years prior to the visit are identified. A copy of the faculty matrix will be made available at the fall NAAB Team visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Roles and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belleau, Michael</td>
<td>Studied and worked in Boston and London, published articles on Maine’s Urban Planning potential and interested in engaging the public in an architectural dialogue around those issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll, Jesse</td>
<td>Jessee approaches design work with the benefit of a diverse professional experience. She worked at Little Inc, Cannon Design Inc., and Chan Krieger Sineswicz (now NBBI), where she became well versed in commercial architecture in an urban context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Malcolm</td>
<td>Focused in architecture, preservation, and planning. Has worked on NTIHP conferences, including the Community Preservation Workshop, and directed numerous Main Street revitalization design and planning projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delano, Chris</td>
<td>Interested in well-crafted spaces and the dynamics between materials, space, light, and the surrounding landscape. His studies include varying buildings types from folk structures to cathedrals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demers, Luc</td>
<td>MFA in Visual Art at Vermont College of Fine Arts. Currently, Demers is a working and exhibiting photographer whose worked moves between “narrative and paused moments of self-awareness.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler, Paul</td>
<td>Paul Fowler has been practicing architecture for 20+ years, currently located in York, Maine. He has an avid interest in the environment and touching the earth as gently as possible in the work he is involved with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabranski, Tobias</td>
<td>Licensed architect in ME and NY, his firm provides integrated planning, landscape, architectural, and interior design services. Interested in collaboration, and the use of place, urban form and precedent in the creation of contemporary design solutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAAB Matrix for Faculty Credentials</th>
<th>NY2015-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKG 201: Water &amp; Materials</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKG 203: Architectural Design II</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKG 204: Architectural Design III</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKG 205: Architectural Design IV</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKG 207: Architectural Design VI</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKG 211: Architectural Design X</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKG 221: Architectural Design XX</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKG 223: Architectural Design XXII</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKG 225: Architectural Design XXIV</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKG 228: Architectural Design XXVII</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Name</td>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinkley, Amy</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbrook, Andrew</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klingelhofer, William</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasure, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needham-Curtis, Rosie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precourt, Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Roger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray, Sanjit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark, Eric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace, Adam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** coursework approved but not yet taught is shown in gray.
I.2.2 Physical Resources

Please see our response under Section 2: Program Response to Conditions Not Met in this document.

I.2.3 Financial Resources

Please see our response under Section 2: Program Response to Conditions Not Met in this document.

I.2.4 Information Resources


I.2.5 Administrative Structure & Governance


II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria

Please see Section 2: Program Responses to SPCs Not Met in regards to pedagogy and methodology used to address Realm C.

Student work is assessed through demonstration of knowledge via presentation, quiz, exam, and/or written assignment. Students are evaluated on a grading system of A (high pass) through F (no pass).

The following chart has been updated to meet the 2014 Conditions.
### NAAB Student Performance Criteria Matrix - 2017

- **Primary demonstration**
- **Secondary demonstration**

#### Realm A: Critical Thinking & Representation

- A1. Professional Communication Skills
- A2. Design Thinking Skills
- A3. Investigative Skills
- A4. Architectural Design Skills
- A5. Designing Systems
- A6. Use of Procedures
- A7. History & Global Culture
- A8. Cultural Diversity & Social Equity

#### Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills & Knowledge

- B1. Pre-Design
- B2. Site Design
- B3. Codes & Regulations
- B4. Technical Documentation
- B5. Structural Systems
- B6. Environmental Systems
- B7. Building Envelope Systems & Assemblies
- B8. Materials & Assemblies
- B9. Building Service Systems
- B10. Financial Considerations

#### Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions

- C1. Research
- C2. Integrated Evaluation & Decision-Making Design Process
- C3. Integrated Design

#### Realm D: Professional Practice

- D1. Stakeholder Roles in Architecture
- D2. Project Management
- D4. Legal Responsibilities
- D5. Professional Conduct

Note: courses are grouped by pedagogical category.
II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation

Please see Appendix B for a copy of the University of Maine at Augusta’s most recent accreditation documentation from the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC).

II.2.2 Professional Degrees & Curriculum

The University of Maine at Augusta offers the Bachelor of Architecture Degree (150 semester credits). Charts showing the 2017-18 suggested semester-by-semester course schedule, and the professional vs. general credits breakdown can be found below.


Other than our **ARC 441, Architectural Travel Experience** course, UMA Architecture does not offer any off-campus coursework.

### UMA Bachelor of Architecture Curriculum by Semester – AY 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ARC 101 INTRO TO ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ARC 102 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARC 110 INTRO TO ARCHITECTURAL REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARC 120 INTRO TO DIGITAL TOOLS FOR ARCHITECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ART 115 DRAWING I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARC 241 ARCHITECTURAL RESEARCH &amp; ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAT 112 (or MAT 124, 125 or 126) COLLEGE ALGEBRA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CIS 100 INTRODUCTION TO COMPUTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARC 111/ARH 105 HISTORY OF ART &amp; ARC 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARH 106 HISTORY OF ART &amp; ARC II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong>: 16</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong>: 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ARC 203 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ARC 204 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARC 123 PHILOSOPHY OF ARCHITECTURE &amp; DESIGN THEORY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARC 212 GLOBAL THEMES IN ARCHITECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARC 261 COMPUTER AIDED DESIGN &amp; DRAFTING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARC 251 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN CONCEPTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM 101 (or any 100 level Communications) PUBLIC SPEAKING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARC 350 MECHANICAL SYSTEMS IN ARCHITECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 101 COLLEGE WRITING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENG 102W – INTRO TO LITERATURE or ENG 317W – PROFESSIONAL WRITING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong>: 16</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Credits</strong>: 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following list has been updated for 2017, and identifies the courses and their credit hours required for professional content, and the courses and their credit hours required for general education for the UMA B.Arch degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. &amp; Title – Professional Content</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC 101 Introduction to Architectural Design</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 102 Architectural Design I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 110 Introduction to Architectural Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 120 Introduction to Digital Tools for Architecture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 123 Philosophy of Architecture and Design Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 203 Architectural Design II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 204 Architectural Design III</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 212 Global Theme in Architecture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 221 Concepts of Structure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 231 Architectural Materials and Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 241 Architectural Research &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 251 Sustainable Design Concepts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. &amp; Title – General Education</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHY 115 GENERAL PHYSICS + LAB</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART XXX ART ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3rd Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. &amp; Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC 305 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN IV</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 311 INTRODUCTION TO ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 321 ARCHITECTURAL MATERIALS &amp; METHODS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHY 115 GENERAL PHYSICS + LAB</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART XXX ART ELECTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4th Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. &amp; Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC 407 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN VI</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 417 INTEGRATED BUILDING SYSTEMS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 421 PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 431 ARCHITECTURAL THEORY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 441 PORTFOLIO DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5th Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. &amp; Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC 509 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN VIII – PRE-THESIS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 510 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN IX – THESIS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 521 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 531 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN XI</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 541 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN XII</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 551 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN XIII</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 561 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN XIV</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 571 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN XV</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 581 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN XVI</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 591 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN XVII</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 601 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN XVIII</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 611 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN XIX</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 621 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN XX</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Credits: 150
ARC 261 Computer Design & Drafting 3
ARC 262 Building Information Modeling 3
ARC 305 Architectural Design IV 4
ARC 306 Architectural Design V 4
ARC 322 Concepts of Structure II 3
ARC 332 Construction Techniques 3
ARC 350 Mechanical Systems in Architecture 3
ARC 361 Portfolio Development 1
ARC 406 Architectural Apprenticeship 1
ARC 407 Architectural Design VI 4
ARC 408 Architectural Design VII 4
ARC 417 Integrated Building Systems 3
ARC 421 Professional Practice 3
ARC 431 Architectural Theory 3
ARC 441 Architectural Travel Experience 3
ARC 489 Architecture Electives (6 credit hours) 6
ARC 509 Architectural Design VIII - Pre Thesis 4
ARC 510 Architectural Design IX - Architectural Design Senior Thesis 6

Total Credits – Professional Content 101

Course No. & Title – General Education | Credits
--- | ---
ARH 105 History of Art and Architecture I | 3
ARH 106 History of Art and Architecture II | 3
ARH/ARC 312 History of Modern Architecture | 3
ART 115 Drawing I | 3
ART XXX Electives (6 credit hours) | 6
COM 1xx Communication Elective | 3
CIS 100 Introduction to Computing or CIS 101 Introduction to Computer Science | 3
ENG 101 College Writing | 3
ENG 102W Introduction to Literature or ENG 317W Professional Writing | 3
MAT XXX, one of the following math courses: | 3
MAT 112 College Algebra
MAT 124 Pre-Calculus
MAT 125 Analytical Geometry and Intro to Calculus I
MAT 126 Analytical Geometry and Calculus II
PHY 115 General Physics I + lab | 4
Social Science Electives (6 credit hours) | 6
General Electives (6 credit hours) | 6

Total Credits – General Education Content 49

Total Credits B.Arch Degree 150
II.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education

Please see our response under Section 2: Program Response to Conditions Not Met for information on this area.

II.4 Public Information

All information as required by NAAB can be found here:
http://www.uma.edu/academics/programs/architecture/naab-information/.

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

For information on this area please follow this link
http://www.uma.edu/academics/programs/architecture/naab-information/

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

For information on this area please follow this link
http://www.uma.edu/academics/programs/architecture/naab-information/

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

Students are aided and made aware of career requirements and opportunities through:
- The UMA AIAS chapter
- Work done by our NCARB Architect Licensing Advisor
- In our ARC 421, Professional Practice course
- Programs created and run by the University, an outline of which can be found here: http://www.uma.edu/academics/advising/career-connections/ and here http://www.uma.edu/academics/advising/career-connections/career-development-process/

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

For information on this area please follow this link
http://www.uma.edu/academics/programs/architecture/naab-information/

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

This section is not currently applicable to our program, as our first full cohort will graduate in spring 2018.
II.4.6. Admissions and Advising

Policies and procedures for application to the UMA BArch degree can be found here: http://www.uma.edu/academics/programs/architecture/apply/.

Financial aid information can be found here: http://www.uma.edu/financial/.

Statements on diversity can be found here: http://www.uma.edu/compliance/handbook/statements.

II.4.7 Student Financial Information

Student financial aid information can be found here: http://www.uma.edu/financial/.

Information for estimated costs for tuition, fees, books, general supplies, technology, and specialized materials that may be found on our website here: http://www.uma.edu/academics/programs/architecture/. Note: this is a newly created spreadsheet for AY2017-18.

III.1.1 Annual Statistical Reports

Statistical reports submitted by the program to NAAB can be found here: http://www.uma.edu/academics/programs/architecture/naab-information/.

A letter from the UMA Office of Institutional Research and Planning, certifying that all statistical data submitted to NAAB has been verified by the institution, can be found in Appendix C.

III.1.2 Interim Progress Reports

The NAAB will provide the following directly to the team at the same time as the VTR template and other materials:

- All narrative annual or interim reports submitted since the last visit
- All NAAB responses to annual reports submitted between 2008 and 2012
- In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda
Section 4. Supplemental Material

Course Descriptions

Descriptions of all courses offered within the curriculum of the NAAB-accredited degree program can be viewed in folder “01-Course Descriptions” found here: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/4jrirl91raqjfcj/AADqzide7XVw5jjaZyStNhUGa?dl=0

Studio Culture Policy

Materials related to this topic can be found in folder “02-Stuido Culture Policy” found here: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/4jrirl91raqjfcj/AADqzide7XVw5jjaZyStNhUGa?dl=0

Self-Assessment Policies and Objectives

Materials related to this topic can be found in folder “03-Self Assessment Policies” found here: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/4jrirl91raqjfcj/AADqzide7XVw5jjaZyStNhUGa?dl=0

Academic Integrity

Policies on academic integrity for students (e.g., cheating and plagiarism) can be found in The UMA Student Handbook. Please see the UMA Academic Integrity Code, including process for appeal, at http://www.uma.edu/compliance/handbook/academic-integrity/.

Information Resources policies including collection development

UMA Library’s collection development policy can be found here: http://www.uma.edu/library/policies/.

EEO/AA Policies

UMaine Systems policies and procedures relative to EEO/AA for faculty, staff, and students can be found online at: http://www.maine.edu/about-the-system/board-of-trustees/policy-manual/section401/. The UMaine System Affirmative Action plan can be found online at http://www.maine.edu/pdf/aaplan.pdf.

Human Resource Development


Materials on sabbatical leave can be found in folder “04-Sabbatical Info” found here: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/4jrirl91raqjfcj/AADqzide7XVw5jjaZyStNhUGa?dl=0

Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

This information can be downloaded at http://www.maine.edu/about-the-system/system-office/academic-affairs/tenure-and-promotion/. This section and its documents are based on agreements found in the AFUM Contract 2013-2015 found here: http://www.maine.edu/about-the-system/system-office/human-resources/labor-relations/.
Response to the Offsite Program Questionnaire

The University of Maine at Augusta’s B.Arch degree does not currently use any offsite teaching locations. All architecture coursework, other than travel courses, are taught at Handley Hall.
APPENDICES

Appendix A
Assessment Processing Documents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course SPCs</th>
<th>Charter or Syllabus</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course SPCs</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 1000</td>
<td>Studio 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>ARC 101</td>
<td>Introduction to Architectural Design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Transferred</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credits Transferred</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**UMA BArch Transfer Evaluation - FINAL REPORT**

**Student:** John Johnson  
**AY:** 2017-2018

**Transfer School:** Maine Community College  
**UMA Equivalencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course SPCs</th>
<th>Charter or Syllabus</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course SPCs</th>
<th>Credits Transferred</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 1000</td>
<td>Studio 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>ARC 101</td>
<td>Introduction to Architectural Design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Credits Transferred:** 4

**Student Signature**

**Faculty Advisor Signature**

**Program Coordinator Signature**
Appendix B
NEASC University Letter of Accreditation
February 9, 2016

Dr. James F. Conneely
President
University of Maine at Augusta
46 University Drive
Augusta, ME 04330-9410

Dear President Conneely:

I am pleased to inform you that at its meeting on November 19, 2015, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education took the following action with respect to University of Maine at Augusta:

that University of Maine at Augusta be continued in accreditation;

that the University submit a report for consideration in Spring 2018 that gives emphasis to the institution’s progress in:

1. improving the success rates of both its associate and baccalaureate students as measured by traditional retention and graduation rates and other institutional measures of success;

2. decreasing the institution’s student loan default rate;

that submission of the report be followed by a visit to validate its contents;

that the University submit an interim (fifth-year) report for consideration in Spring 2020;

that, in addition to the information included in all interim reports, the University give emphasis to its success in:

1. continuing to address the two areas specified for attention in the Spring 2018 report;

2. ensuring sufficient student support services are provided to meet the needs of the institution’s part-time and distance education students;

3. using the goals of the 2016-2020 strategic plan to guide resource allocation and the planning efforts of individual units;
that the next comprehensive evaluation be scheduled for Spring 2025.

The Commission gives the following reasons for its action.

University of Maine at Augusta is continued in accreditation because the Commission finds the institution to be substantially in compliance with the Standards for Accreditation.

The Commission commends University of Maine at Augusta (UMA) for its preparation of a thoughtful, “data-rich” self-study that demonstrates the institution’s success in using a wide range of teaching and learning modalities to accomplish its mission of serving “students of every age and background” on its campuses in Augusta and Bangor, in its robust online programs, and through its administration of eight Outreach Centers and twenty-three learning sites across the state. We note with favor that over the past five years the institution has developed a culture of assessment as evidenced by a “highly functioning” Office of Institutional Research and Planning, and by faculty who value and are actively engaged in the measurement of student achievement. As indicated on the E-series forms, program reviews are conducted on a regular cycle, and we understand from the visiting team that the recently implemented General Education curriculum “characterized by explicit and measurable outcomes” is widely supported by faculty. Particularly as distance education is an integral part of UMA’s future, we commend the investments made to aid its expansion, and more generally to encourage the use of technology in courses, that include dedicated funding to support faculty development and improvement of online offerings and the availability of instructional designers. We recognize the institution’s fiscally conservative approach has allowed it to maintain its internal reserves and fully fund depreciation even in light of enrollment declines, and we acknowledge the success of its 50th anniversary capital campaign — reaching $3.2 million of the $5 million goal — to support, among other things, student scholarships and the enhancement of veterans’ services. Along with the visiting team, we are impressed by the understanding and respect University of Maine at Augusta faculty and staff have for their students, and find that the institution’s entrepreneurial spirit and willingness to develop innovative and responsive programs position it well to continue to be a “transformation institution” that provides accessible and affordable education for Mainers.

The items the institution is asked to report on in Spring 2018 are related to our standard on Students.

IPEDS data indicate that University of Maine at Augusta retained 49% of its first-time, full-time bachelor’s degree students from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013; its six-year graduation rate was 13%. (For associate degree students, UMA retained 46%, and its three-year graduation rate was 3%.) As these IPEDS rates are regarded as low and therefore of concern, we note with approval that the University has incorporated “improving retention by strengthening student success” into its strategic plan and has set a goal to increase its IPEDS retention rate for baccalaureate students to 61% and its graduation rate to 18% over a five-year period. In support of this initiative, a Student Success Coordinator position has been established and an additional faculty member hired to explore new pathways for developmental math. UMA has also joined the Educational Advisory Board’s Student Success Collaborative to further its use of data to identify at-risk students. At the same time, because IPEDS data track just first-time, full-time students, these metrics only capture 6% of the institution’s primarily adult, part-time student population. We therefore concur with the visiting team that use of traditional IPEDS retention and graduation rates “represents a challenge” to UMA, and we find commendable the University’s 2013 adoption of an alternative approach – the Student Learning Progress Model (SLPM) – that better measures the ten-year progress of all UMA students. We note, for example, in AY2014 SLPM measures found that 85% of students earning a UMA bachelor’s degree did so within six years, and 62% of students earning a UMA associate’s degree did so within three years. The Spring 2018 report will provide an opportunity for the institution to update the Commission on its progress to improve student persistence and degree completion as measured both by traditional
retention and graduation rates and also by other institutional measures of student success. This request is in keeping with our standard on Students:

The institution measures student success, including rates of retention and graduation and other measures of success appropriate to institutional mission (6.6).

The institution’s goals for retention and graduation reflect institutional purposes, and the results are used to inform recruitment and the review of programs and services (6.8).

Data on retention, graduation, and other measures of student success are regularly reviewed within the institution, with the results being used for planning, resource allocation, and improvement (6.9).

While we appreciate the University’s commitment to affordability and note that tuition has not increased over the past four years, we remain concerned that University of Maine at Augusta’s three-year student loan cohort default rate continues to be around 20%: 19.8% in 2010, 22.7% in 2011, and 19.1% in 2012. We understand that the decrease experienced from 2011 to 2012 could reflect the initial success of measures UMA implemented to decrease its cohort default rate, including the SALT financial literacy program and increased communication with its student borrowers, and note that the University has set a goal over the next five years to further decrease and to then sustain its cohort default rate at 18%. We seek assurance, through the Spring 2018 report, of UMA’s continued success to decrease its three-year student loan cohort default rate. Our concern here is informed by our standard on Students:

Student financial aid is provided through a well-organized program. Awards are based on the equitable application of clear and publicized criteria. Students are provided with clear and timely information about debt before borrowing (6.14).

The submission of the report in Spring 2018 will be followed by an evaluation visit by Commission representatives to validate its contents.

Commission policy requires an interim (fifth-year) report of all institutions on a decennial evaluation cycle. Its purpose is to provide the Commission an opportunity to appraise the institution’s current status in keeping with the Policy on Periodic Review. In addition to the information included in all fifth-year reports, the University is asked, in Spring 2020, to give emphasis to its continued success in addressing the two areas of attention specified above for the Spring 2018 progress report. The Commission understands that these issues do not lend themselves to rapid resolution and will require the institution’s continued attention over time; hence, we ask that evidence of continued progress be provided in the report submitted for consideration in Spring 2020. The University is also asked, in Spring 2020, to report on two additional matters related to our standards on Faculty, Students, Library and Other Information Resources, and Planning and Evaluation.

Particularly given University of Maine at Augusta’s strategic goal to promote academic innovation, we support the visiting team’s observation that the institution should continue to explore “promising practices” to serve its part-time and distance education students. In addition to extending advising hours, notable examples of improvements made by the University to enhance its student support services include increased use of social media to build communities as part of the online student orientation, embedded services in courses to provide library and writing support as well as access to online tutors, development of an information literacy website, and embedded Class Stewards to help identify struggling students. In keeping with our standards on Faculty, Students, and Library and Other Information Resources, we ask that the Spring 2020 interim report provide evidence that UMA’s student support services are appropriate and sufficient to meet the needs of its part-time and distance education students:
The institution has in place an effective system of academic advising that meets student needs for information and advice and is compatible with its educational objectives. ... Resources are adequate to ensure the quality of advising for students regardless of the location of instruction or the mode of delivery (5.19).

The institution offers an array of student services appropriate to its mission and the needs and goals of its students, recognizing the variations in services that are appropriate at the main campus, at off-campus locations, and for programs delivered electronically as well as the differences in circumstances and goals of students pursuing degrees. In all cases, the institution provides academic support services appropriate to the student body. The institution's faculty and professional staff collectively have sufficient interaction with students outside of class to promote students' academic achievement and provide academic and career guidance (6.11).

The institution ensures appropriate access to library and information resources and services for all students regardless of program location or mode of delivery (7.7).

Finally, we understand that University of Maine at Augusta's strategic plan for 2016-2020 was approved by the Board in May 2015 and has since been shared in multiple venues including the faculty retreat and campus-wide open forums. To provide for enrollment growth and financial stability, $1.6 million of reserves has been earmarked over the next two years to support strategic investments in the areas of student success, academic innovation, and marketing/promotion. We look forward to learning in the Spring 2020 interim report of the institution's use of its 2016-2020 strategic plan goals to guide resource allocation and the planning efforts of individual units to ensure that the "institution has a demonstrable record of success in implementing the results of its planning" (2.4). Our standard on Planning and Evaluation provides this additional guidance:

Planning and evaluation are systematic, comprehensive, broad-based, integrated, and appropriate to the institution. They involve the participation of individuals and groups responsible for the achievement of institutional purposes. Results of planning and evaluation are regularly communicated to appropriate institutional constituencies. The institution allocates sufficient resources for its planning and evaluation efforts (2.1).

... Institutional decision-making, particularly the allocation of resources, is consistent with planning priorities (2.3).

The scheduling of a comprehensive evaluation in Spring 2025 is consistent with Commission policy requiring each accredited institution to undergo a comprehensive evaluation at least once every ten years.

You will note that the Commission has specified no length or term of accreditation. Accreditation is a continuing relationship that is reconsidered when necessary. Thus, while the Commission has indicated the timing of the next comprehensive evaluation, the schedule should not be unduly emphasized because it is subject to change.

The Commission expressed appreciation for the self-study prepared by University of Maine at Augusta and for the report submitted by the visiting team. The Commission also welcomed the opportunity to meet with you, Joseph Szakas, Provost and Executive Vice President, Gregory LaPointe, Executive Director of Institutional Research and Planning, Thomas Abbot, Former Dean of Libraries and Distance Education, and Barbara Murphy, team chair, during its deliberations.

You are encouraged to share this letter with all of the institution's constituencies. It is Commission policy to inform the chairperson of the institution's governing board of action on its
accreditation status. In a few days we will be sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Samuel W. Collins. The institution is free to release information about the evaluation and the Commission’s action to others, in accordance with the enclosed policy on Public Disclosure of Information about Affiliated Institutions.

The Commission hopes that the evaluation process has contributed to institutional improvement. It appreciates your cooperation with the effort to provide public assurance of the quality of higher education in New England.

If you have any questions about the Commission’s action, please contact Barbara Brittingham, President of the Commission.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Patricia Maguire Meservey

PMM/jm

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Samuel W. Collins
Visiting Team
Appendix C
Office of Institutional Research Letter of Certification
May 15, 2017

Ms. Andrea Rutledge, CAE  
Executive Director  
National Architectural Accrediting Board  
1735 New York Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Ms. Rutledge:

With this letter I certify that UMA’s Office of Institutional Research and Planning has reviewed all student statistical data submitted to NAAB for accuracy.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Claire Good, Ph.D.  
Vice President for Student Engagement and Enrollment Management  
University of Maine at Augusta
Appendix D
Finance and Budget
### Current Fiscal Year Report & Forecast Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Hour Enrollments</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>382.00</td>
<td>369.00</td>
<td>201.00</td>
<td>320.75</td>
<td>408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>455.00</td>
<td>324.00</td>
<td>455.00</td>
<td>427.50</td>
<td>372.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>837.00</td>
<td>693.00</td>
<td>656.00</td>
<td>748.25</td>
<td>825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Tuition</td>
<td>195,041.00</td>
<td>156,177.00</td>
<td>146,636.00</td>
<td>171,610.25</td>
<td>188,053.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified &amp; Online Fees</td>
<td>24,273.00</td>
<td>20,133.00</td>
<td>19,912.00</td>
<td>21,240.25</td>
<td>23,925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less prorated Waivers &amp; Scholarships</td>
<td>(19,468.00)</td>
<td>(19,050.00)</td>
<td>(14,034.00)</td>
<td>(18,831.00)</td>
<td>(21,737.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>199,846.00</td>
<td>157,260.00</td>
<td>152,514.00</td>
<td>174,019.50</td>
<td>190,241.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation Dist’d by CH</td>
<td>47,660.00</td>
<td>41,368.00</td>
<td>41,590.00</td>
<td>50,184.00</td>
<td>58,997.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Fees</td>
<td>15,127.80</td>
<td>13,215.00</td>
<td>11,934.95</td>
<td>15,268.19</td>
<td>15,936.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Student Billing Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,250.00</td>
<td>16,775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>262,633.80</td>
<td>211,841.00</td>
<td>206,038.95</td>
<td>255,721.69</td>
<td>283,449.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Direct Costs</td>
<td>260,521.00</td>
<td>296,319.00</td>
<td>287,559.00</td>
<td>324,332.09</td>
<td>347,324.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Functional Expenses costs per CH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>(3.16)</td>
<td>(2.06)</td>
<td>(1.31)</td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
<td>(2.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>43.09</td>
<td>42.65</td>
<td>42.17</td>
<td>40.99</td>
<td>40.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>29.48</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>27.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>24.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>31.47</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>32.19</td>
<td>32.11</td>
<td>30.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>(2,645.73)</td>
<td>(1,428.81)</td>
<td>(862.01)</td>
<td>(1,498.74)</td>
<td>(1,829.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>36,069.42</td>
<td>29,556.04</td>
<td>27,666.17</td>
<td>30,670.11</td>
<td>33,024.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>23,540.20</td>
<td>19,188.41</td>
<td>19,341.75</td>
<td>21,510.41</td>
<td>22,785.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support Physical Plan</td>
<td>14,313.53</td>
<td>12,498.09</td>
<td>13,296.07</td>
<td>13,923.29</td>
<td>20,038.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>26,338.66</td>
<td>22,362.09</td>
<td>21,117.00</td>
<td>24,027.03</td>
<td>25,224.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>429.04</td>
<td>62.37</td>
<td>(5.54)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(124.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td>358,566.12</td>
<td>378,557.19</td>
<td>368,113.06</td>
<td>412,963.69</td>
<td>408,901.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional E&amp;G Transfers</td>
<td>8,656.00</td>
<td>(5,954.85)</td>
<td>6,488.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,864.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trf to/from Misc Campus Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,704.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Transfers</td>
<td>8,656.00</td>
<td>(5,954.85)</td>
<td>6,488.00</td>
<td>1,704.50</td>
<td>3,864.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain/(Loss)</strong></td>
<td>(87,276.32)</td>
<td>(172,669.04)</td>
<td>(155,586.11)</td>
<td>(155,537.50)</td>
<td>(121,586.84)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### College of Arts & Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY16 Cr Hrs</th>
<th>Stdt FTE’s</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Direct Costs</th>
<th>Contribution Margin</th>
<th>Direct Cost CM per FTE</th>
<th>Indirect Costs &amp; Trfs</th>
<th>Program Gain/(Loss)</th>
<th>Total Cost per FTE</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1485570 Soc &amp; Behavioral Sci</td>
<td>13,603.25</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>4,063,382</td>
<td>1,297,234</td>
<td>2,766,148</td>
<td>6,106</td>
<td>1,681,731</td>
<td>1,179,179</td>
<td>6,576</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1465520 English &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>14,196.50</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>3,951,978</td>
<td>2,191,167</td>
<td>1,760,811</td>
<td>3,723</td>
<td>1,751,079</td>
<td>100,640</td>
<td>8,335</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262000 Jazz &amp; Contemporary Music</td>
<td>2,451.50</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>779,765</td>
<td>412,669</td>
<td>367,096</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>297,681</td>
<td>75,710</td>
<td>8,663</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485540 Natural Lab &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>7,009.50</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2,032,674</td>
<td>1,208,094</td>
<td>824,580</td>
<td>3,524</td>
<td>862,366</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>8,848</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1465510 Architecture</td>
<td>825.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>283,450</td>
<td>309,782</td>
<td>(26,333)</td>
<td>(940)</td>
<td>102,984</td>
<td>(121,587)</td>
<td>14,742</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251000 Art Program</td>
<td>2,221.00</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>728,537</td>
<td>784,057</td>
<td>(55,521)</td>
<td>(750)</td>
<td>270,252</td>
<td>(318,949)</td>
<td>14,247</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY16 Cr Hrs</th>
<th>Stdt FTE’s</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Direct Costs</th>
<th>Contribution Margin</th>
<th>Direct Cost CM per FTE</th>
<th>Indirect Costs &amp; Trfs</th>
<th>Program Gain/(Loss)</th>
<th>Total Cost per FTE</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40,306.75</td>
<td>1,344.00</td>
<td>11,839,785</td>
<td>6,203,003</td>
<td>5,636,781</td>
<td>16,140</td>
<td>4,966,093</td>
<td>917,640</td>
<td>61,411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Professional Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485520 Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200004 Computer Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475510 Business Financial Services &amp; PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485530 Library Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485510 Justic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261000 Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475560 Medical Lab Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475550 Licensed Vet Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475540 Aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475570 Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475530 Dental Health Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY16 Cr Hrs</th>
<th>Stdt FTE’s</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Direct Costs</th>
<th>Contribution Margin</th>
<th>Direct Cost CM per FTE</th>
<th>Indirect Costs &amp; Trfs</th>
<th>Program Gain/(Loss)</th>
<th>Total Cost per FTE</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48,479.00</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>14,620,283</td>
<td>8,232,645</td>
<td>6,387,638</td>
<td>22,048</td>
<td>5,935,941</td>
<td>674,650</td>
<td>120,447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

| N/A No Dept/Misc adj | 22.50 | 1 | (176,308) | 88,068 | (264,375) | (264,375) | (229,092) | (498,873) | (141,024) | 19 |

**Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY16 Cr Hrs</th>
<th>Stdt FTE’s</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Direct Costs</th>
<th>Contribution Margin</th>
<th>Direct Cost CM per FTE</th>
<th>Indirect Costs &amp; Trfs</th>
<th>Program Gain/(Loss)</th>
<th>Total Cost per FTE</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88,808.25</td>
<td>2,962.00</td>
<td>26,283,760</td>
<td>14,523,716</td>
<td>11,760,044</td>
<td>(226,187)</td>
<td>10,672,942</td>
<td>1,093,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. FTE’s are calculated by dividing the total credit hours generated by a given department over the course of the year by 3.
2. FY16 revenues include the summer 2015, fall 2015, and spring 2016 semesters. Revenues include reallocated tuition and fees, state appropriation, less waivers & scholarships.
3. Direct costs represent those instructional costs charged directly to the academic program.
4. Indirect costs presents the total of all other functional expense categories, reduced by prorated State appropriation revenues and associated revenues, at a cost per credit hour as presented.