As stated in the University of Hawai'i at Manoa 2009/2010 catalogue (p. 79):

Students enrolled in the first four-year segment of the program must meet UH Manoa General Education Core requirements, and maintain UH Manoa academic standards. Enrolled students wishing to enter the second three-year segment of the program must maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA and successfully complete a portfolio review process.

Students transferring into the second three-year segment of the program must also submit and pass a portfolio review.

Once the portfolio has been approved the student may advance. If the portfolio is determined to be marginal, the faculty will require additional coursework.

Details of the review procedure follow:

1 Purpose

Each student in the School of Architecture is required to submit the portfolio typically after completion of three years and ARCH 341, ARCH 342 and before advancement to any 400 or 500 level studio in the program.

The portfolio review intends to:

A Provide a process for faculty to assess each student’s competency in architectural and urban design, as well as aptitude for:
   1 advanced comprehensive design work at the 400 and 500 level
   2 responsible participation in the practicum experience of the Doctorate in Architecture program

B Provide a structured opportunity for each student to:
   1 evaluate individual development within architectural education
   2 produce a convincing representation of design work for future use in job procurement and as necessary skill in professional practice

C Provide a forum for faculty and administration to collectively evaluate:
   1 student progress
   2 effectiveness of design curriculum and teaching methods
II Submission procedure

A Eligibility requirements
1 Completion of or current enrollment in ARCH 342
2 Transfer students before entry into 415 or the final year of the four year program
3 Resubmittals are accepted by the recommended date given in writing by the Portfolio Review Committee
4 A maximum of three submittals is permitted for the portfolio review

B Submission requirements
1 Examples of projects from four semesters of design studio work
   a design studio projects will be evaluated by the criteria stated in Article III of this document
   b each design studio project must include written descriptive data
   c all submittals (design studio projects and other documents) must clearly indicate within the descriptive data:
      i topic + name of instructor
      ii semester date + time length of the project
      iii team members + specific responsibility of the student submitting the portfolio (if a group project)
2 Statement that both evaluates personal development and analyzes the school’s approach to architectural education (1 page)
3 Example of work that shows writing ability or research skill from a course other than design studio (2 to 4 pages)
4 Examples of creative or service work outside of design studio (2 to 4 pages)
5 The portfolio shall be submitted in two formats. The content and layout of both formats must be identical:
   a bound hard copy (11” x 17” maximum size)
   b digital copy (to be retained in the archives of the School)
      i CD or DVD format
      ii save as PDF files

C Submission deadline
1 Regular submittal (Monday at beginning of spring exam week):
   10 May 2010 @ 4:00 p.m. to the school office
2 Resubmittals and submittals by transfer (Monday after January 1):
   04 January 2010 @ 4:00 p.m. to the school office
3 Late submissions will not be accepted
III Criteria for evaluation *

Since most do not fully build when in architecture school, evaluation of progress within the education must rely on documents that reflect capacity for thought that could lead to building. Key to architectural design are these types of thinking:

A Creative thinking
1 Ability to generate ideas/concepts that have breadth and diversity, revealing imagination towards shaping the built environment
2 Most often evident in:
   a process drawings/sketches, concept models
   b textual commentary

B Critical thinking
1 Ability to identify and analyze issues in a project and make choices based on rational deployment of research efforts
2 Most often evident in:
   a diagrams
   b textual commentary

C Synthetic thinking
1 Ability to find correspondence or consilience of issues in design leading to a comprehensible three-dimensional outcome, examples:
   a spatial order reflects a social order or
   b form bears a relation to function
   c building responds to a context, including culture, site, climate
   d building systems, including structural, constructional and environmental, correspond to a spatial and functional order
2 Most often evident in:
   a site plans, plans, sections, elevations, system diagrams, projection views (axonometric, isometric, perspective), construction details
   b models, both real and virtual

D Representational thinking
1 Ability to present work with clear documentation and with articulate credible language
2 Most often evident in:
   a organization (view, sequence and juxtaposition) and clarity of multiple documents
   b textual commentary and annotation (keys, dimensions, etc.)

*See also the Student Performance Criteria (SPC) published by NAAB (National Architectural Accrediting Board), in the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation (PART TWO (II): Section I-Student Performance-Educational Realms & Student Performance).

In particular note the criteria designated by the more demanding term ability: Proficiency in using specific information to accomplish a task, correctly selecting the appropriate information, and accurately applying it to the solution of a specific problem, while also distinguishing the effects of its implementation. This information can be viewed at: www.naab.org/documents/home
IV Review procedure

A All full-time faculty read a selection of portfolios assigned through lottery by the Chair of the Portfolio Review Committee.

B Faculty teaching Arch 342 are not assigned to students currently enrolled in that instructor’s studio section.

C Faculty read and evaluate the portfolios independently by the attached form.

D Chair of the Portfolio Review Committee tabulates the independent assessments and places the portfolios in three categories:
   1 Pass (if all first readings clearly indicate satisfactory work)
   2 Borderline (if any first reading indicates borderline or unsatisfactory work)
   3 Fail (if all first readings clearly indicate unsatisfactory work)

E Portfolio Review Committee (faculty appointed by the Dean) meets and
   1 Reviews all portfolios to establish as a group benchmarks for the evaluation
   2 Confers on the portfolios of all borderline and fail submissions
   3 Meets with each student of all borderline and fail portfolios to discuss a course of action for improvement in the work if the committee requires such a meeting
   4 Notifies each student and the administration in writing the results of the review and recommendations for those not passing the portfolio review
      a Previous recommendations have included a resubmittal of the portfolio plus additional required course work, such as:
         i Arch 341 and/or 342 studio as a repeated studio
         ii three-dimensional/representational coursework
         iii other coursework to address shortcomings in the portfolio
      b Students must pass the Portfolio Review before enrolling in any studio at the 400 or 500 level.

F Appeals on the results of the review and recommendation of the Portfolio Review Committee can be made directly to the Dean of the School.