

2009 NAAB ANNUAL REPORT

Tuskegee University

Conditions not met

3.3, Public Information

Criteria 13.14, Accessibility

Causes for Concern

Causes of Concern

The 2008 Visiting Team has the following concerns:

h h n n **maintain its momentum** r d h h

That the program will be able to maintain its current operating funding level;

h h n n d h f f d

h h h n h h d C , d

That the campus is able to find a creative solution for providing a conveniently located architectural supply store locally.

NAAB Annual Report 2009 Information

Alabama Board of Architects (BOA) Grant

The Alabama Board of Architects (BOA) has received a grant of \$13,500.00 from the National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB) for the purpose of providing continuing education for architects in Alabama for the years 2009 & 2010. The grant will be used to fund the development and delivery of continuing education programs for architects in Alabama. The BOA is currently reviewing the grant and will be submitting a plan of action to the NAAB.

The grant will be used to fund the development and delivery of continuing education programs for architects in Alabama. The BOA is currently reviewing the grant and will be submitting a plan of action to the NAAB. The grant will be used to fund the development and delivery of continuing education programs for architects in Alabama. The BOA is currently reviewing the grant and will be submitting a plan of action to the NAAB.

The grant will be used to fund the development and delivery of continuing education programs for architects in Alabama. The BOA is currently reviewing the grant and will be submitting a plan of action to the NAAB. The grant will be used to fund the development and delivery of continuing education programs for architects in Alabama. The BOA is currently reviewing the grant and will be submitting a plan of action to the NAAB.

The grant will be used to fund the development and delivery of continuing education programs for architects in Alabama. The BOA is currently reviewing the grant and will be submitting a plan of action to the NAAB.

1) L 1111.

1. *(sustainability)*

1. *(diversity)*

1.

Memo Re: Site Conditions and Accessibility SPC's
November 1, 2009

Architecture, School of Architecture

Since the NAAB accreditation process in 2008, I have been focusing on the learning outcomes in these areas in my students' studio work. Here is a summary of the findings:

Spring 2009, Architecture 302 studio Africatown Museum project

Students were given a site plan for the Africatown Museum project. The site plan shows a large open area with a building footprint and a parking lot. The students were asked to design an accessible route from the parking lot to the building. The route was designed to be a straight line, which is not the best solution for accessibility. The students were also asked to design a ramp for the building entrance. The ramp was designed to be a straight line, which is not the best solution for accessibility.

Outcome: This was the students' second exposure to accessibility and contour. In Architecture 301, they learned about accessibility and contour. In this project, they were asked to design an accessible route and a ramp. The students were given a site plan and a set of instructions. They were asked to design an accessible route from the parking lot to the building. The route was designed to be a straight line, which is not the best solution for accessibility. The students were also asked to design a ramp for the building entrance. The ramp was designed to be a straight line, which is not the best solution for accessibility.

Spring 2009, Architecture 201 studio Outdoor Pavilion project

Students were given a site plan for the Outdoor Pavilion project. The site plan shows a large open area with a building footprint and a parking lot. The students were asked to design an accessible route from the parking lot to the building. The route was designed to be a straight line, which is not the best solution for accessibility. The students were also asked to design a ramp for the building entrance. The ramp was designed to be a straight line, which is not the best solution for accessibility.

Outcome: This was the students' first exposure to accessibility and contour. In this project, they were asked to design an accessible route and a ramp. The students were given a site plan and a set of instructions. They were asked to design an accessible route from the parking lot to the building. The route was designed to be a straight line, which is not the best solution for accessibility. The students were also asked to design a ramp for the building entrance. The ramp was designed to be a straight line, which is not the best solution for accessibility.

h h d d . S d h A A
r d d d d r d
r d .

Name: [REDACTED]

Courses Taught:

ARCH 301 ARCH [REDACTED]

ARCH/CSTM 331 MATH [REDACTED]

Educational Credentials:

MA in Statistics 1999

B.S. in [REDACTED] 1996

Teaching Experience:

ARCH 301 2009 - [REDACTED]

VEHICLE DESIGN 2008 -2009

STATISTICS 2008

ARCH 301 2006 -2007

ARCH 301 2005 -2006

Professional Experience:

DESIGNER [REDACTED] 2007

CHER DESIGN 2007

WATER DESIGN, [REDACTED] 2006 -2007

DESIGNER, [REDACTED] 2004 -2005

DESIGNER [REDACTED] MD, [REDACTED] 02 7-20

Name:

Jose Luis Colmenares R.

Courses Taught:

ARC 501 Fifth Year Architectural Studio.

ARC 343 Structures I

CSM 343 Structures I

Educational Credentials

B. Arch., The University of Texas at Austin, 1976

B. A. in Art. St. Edward's University (Austin-Texas), 1976

B. S. in Architectural Studies. The University of Texas at Austin. 1977

M. Arch. The University of Texas at Austin. 1978

Teaching Experience:

Assistant professor. - Tuskegee University- Alabama. 1983- 1984.

Associate Professor. •Jose Maria Vargas University. 1985- 1996.

Head of the •History of Architecture Department- Faculty of Architecture and Fine Arts. 1986-1991.

Dean of the Faculty of Architecture and

For 2009 NAAB Annual Report: Progress since Last Team Visit

Answer:

Thesis Project

Answer: The following is the 2009 thesis project description:

The project didn't show a significant advancement from the 4th year.

The project description is as follows: The project is a research project that will focus on the development of a new software application for the management of a business. The project will be completed over a period of 12 months. The project will be completed in 4 phases. The first phase will be the development of the software application. The second phase will be the testing of the software application. The third phase will be the implementation of the software application. The fourth phase will be the evaluation of the software application.

The project will be completed in 4 phases. The first phase will be the development of the software application. The second phase will be the testing of the software application. The third phase will be the implementation of the software application. The fourth phase will be the evaluation of the software application.

The project description is as follows: The project is a research project that will focus on the development of a new software application for the management of a business. The project will be completed over a period of 12 months. The project will be completed in 4 phases. The first phase will be the development of the software application. The second phase will be the testing of the software application. The third phase will be the implementation of the software application. The fourth phase will be the evaluation of the software application.

The project will be completed in 4 phases. The first phase will be the development of the software application. The second phase will be the testing of the software application. The third phase will be the implementation of the software application. The fourth phase will be the evaluation of the software application.

The project will be completed in 4 phases. The first phase will be the development of the software application. The second phase will be the testing of the software application. The third phase will be the implementation of the software application. The fourth phase will be the evaluation of the software application.

The project will be completed in 4 phases. The first phase will be the development of the software application. The second phase will be the testing of the software application. The third phase will be the implementation of the software application. The fourth phase will be the evaluation of the software application.

The project will be completed in 4 phases. The first phase will be the development of the software application. The second phase will be the testing of the software application. The third phase will be the implementation of the software application. The fourth phase will be the evaluation of the software application.

h f r h A CH 503. e.□□ e. , A d□
r , f 2009. h r :
B d□ , A
Aff d□ - H B d□ , A
O h hf , A
B f r , A

2008 NAAB VISITING TEAM REPORT Responses to Issues

1.0 Identity, Self-Assessment, Resources and Institutional/Program Characteristics

Self-Assessment

ITEM 01/TR: Need more student/alumni involvement in assessments

Page 11
ARCH 501 (2009)
PINA

ITEM 02/TR: Increase IDP awareness

Page 9
ARCH 501 (D. H.)

ITEM 03/TR: No urban studio

Page 11
ARCH 501 (2009)
PINA

ITEM 04/TR: Current student participation in Studio Culture policy

Page 11
ARCH 501 (2010)
PINA

ITEM 05/TR: Commitment to hire two new faculty

Page 11
ARCH 501 (2009)
PINA

ITEM 06/TR: Faculty workloads don't allow for research, practice, etc.

Page 9
PINA

ITEM 07/TR: Need more involvement of staff in governance

Page 11
PINA (L. J.)

ITEM 08/TR: Follow-up on library expansion

Page 11
ARCH 501 (2010)
PINA

ITEM 09 VTR: Need to improve woodshop

Pg 16 P. 15
2010
Pa

ITEM 10 VTR: Maintain current 2008-2009 operating budget

Pg 12
2009 - 2010
Pa

ITEM 11 VTR: No policy for allocating development funds

Pg
Pa

ITEM 11 VTR: follow-up on Taylor center as fundraiser

Pg 12
2009
2009 - 2010
Pa

ITEM 12 VTR: Follow-up on library expansion

Pg
Pa

ITEM 13:

Pg
Pd

ITEM 18 VTR: Structural Systems Need to address non-trad structures

Pg
Pd

ITEM 19 VTR: Ethics ... need more in Prof Practice

Pg
Pd

3.0 Public Information

ITEM 20 VTR: Unmet

Pg
Pd

6. z :
 L , H ,
 L h , f f
 O h , f f
 d d
 Ch h h
 hf

B :
 A /
 C (d h)
 (f h)
 h h

7. :
 d h f r f rh
 B d h h f
 f r z h f
 f h r d rh f
 rh r 3 d f
 L r f
 A r B d d
 d r h
 d

“Grasshopper” in Bino play with paradigm

8. :
 L , ,
 S (r h)
 S
 B d d
 “Band” of Tuskegee



Dialogue: Department Challenges

Q. Answer the following questions:

A. (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10)

5^h ...
... f ...
... h ...

Group Discussion of needed Department policies:

A ... & ...
...
S ... C ...
...

Afternoon Session:

Group assessment of spring 2009 design projects:

S ... C ... - "not seeing it"
... z ...
C ... A CH 101 & CS 101?
N ... CS ...
O ... - A ... h ...
... h ...

Group assessment of Physical Resources:

L ...
... : h ... f A-h 250 ... 15f
A,B,&C ... f ... h ...
h ... ?
h ... ?
h ... ?

Group discussion: Opportunities

On ...
... A,B,C, ... f ... h ...
... h ...
N ... f ...
O ... ? A ... B ...
A ... ?
... z ... (...)
IDP coordinator rec'd
...

Group assessment of Computer Resources:

"User, on consumer"
... f ... h ...
Workshop module: "intro to computer in arch"
C ... h ...

r. sh :

h f ()
C f f

r. z r :

h
H ?
H ?
N
H h ? H r f ?
A - h r
W ()
C

f r &f
L r-
N h ?
h f r r
N f r r f r
f (f) h r (ff)
r f r r (h r)
Ch r f r h
h r r h r f
r r , r f r

h 21, 2009

Attendees:

- r. Ar
- r. Sh
- r. Z
- r. Br
- r.
- r. A
- r.
- r.

Morning Session

Group Discussion: 2020 Vision

Vision: What do we want to be?

N
 Afr -A
 f Arh CS h 250
 z ABC
 f HBC
 A O S : N h
 C A S
 H h ? h
 r h NAAB (h)
 NAAB)

r. Br :
 C h (Sh f N)
 h h
 C h
 Could be a "school" within CEAPS as a step toward "college" status

Sr :
 H (A)
 S ff
 C f CS -
 - h ?
 -h h ?
 - r AA

Mission: How do we achieve our vision?

... , ... d ... f ... d ...

