The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1940, is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture. Because most state registration boards in the United States require any applicant for licensure to have graduated from an NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.
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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

A. Thanks to Carnegie Mellon and its School of Architecture for facilitating such a meaningful visit for the NAAB team. We are the beneficiaries of a lot of hard, caring work. Every constituency was very open with us. We found that the stream of communication was vibrant, especially between students and faculty. Everyone cares about the history and traditions of the school and is excited about its future.

B. The team feels that the school is on the cusp of a new era. The head of the program deserves credit for shaping a discussion about its future and engaging all parties, and now these parties believe it is time to bring that process to a conclusion that will define the school’s sense of itself for the next generation. The students clearly demonstrated to the team that they have a vital, even leading, voice in this discussion.

C. Carnegie Mellon is unique among architecture schools by virtue of its strong building design program united with an exemplary high-level research endeavor. Other leading architecture schools today are trying to create this kind of foundation, which already exists here. The opportunity now is to closely link these different yet complementary areas in a unified manner toward this effort.

D. All parties, including the college and university administrations, should recognize the School of Architecture’s role as a scout: there is a history at the school of trendsetting research and work around emerging issues in architecture: sustainability, community engagement, digital media, etc. Recognition of this ongoing role in shaping contemporary discourse in architecture and design can be a significant lens through which to envision a new strategic plan.

E. Within the school there exists an ethical attitude about the role of architects in designing buildings and places that are socially responsible components of the built environment; this important legacy can also shape a strategic idea of the future.

F. The faculty demonstrates a very strong commitment to the program. They represent diverse talents, from research to design to practice, and the extent of that diversity is unusual for most architecture schools. Yet within this diversity there is a need to find a balance between different points of view. In particular, the team finds a need for senior faculty to acknowledge that developing human capital is equally important as securing project-based funding. The corollary to this is that junior faculty can learn from their senior colleagues about the means of raising external support for their own initiatives.

G. Students want a greater challenge, even exceeding the rigorous academic program already in place: make room for visitors, for new faces, new ideas, and more exploration of the world outside architecture so that it can be integrated into their architectural studies. Students also want a new level of interdisciplinary engagement with their peers in other College of Fine Arts programs, and internationally as well.

H. Regarding facilities and equipment: substantial incremental improvements have been made through support from the provost and the dean, and this ongoing process is perceived as positive by students. Yet there remains a significant need for a symbolic “front door” for the school, and an actual “gathering, celebratory space” where all the diverse populations of the school can come together around exhibitions, lectures, reviews, etc.

I. Finally, the question the team wants to leave for the school is this: how can the school continue to develop confidence in a new future vision? There are many distinct and interesting components to this school, each operating in its own orbit. The opportunity to link these components together into a larger whole is tantalizingly close. Addressing this challenge will allow the school to rise to greater heights, and
provide its constituents with new challenges that will expand both their professional and personal lives.

2. **Conditions Not Met**
   
   I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development
   
   A. 7. Use of Precedents

3. **Causes of Concern**

   A. **The tradition of autonomy** in both the school and the college is a double-edged sword. While it has allowed the school to create its own identity, it has promoted a lack of academic engagement with other CFA programs that is negative, and a culture of tentative connections between faculty from different areas within the school.

   B. **There is a need to address emerging issues in contemporary architecture, such as global engagement, new practice models, and interdisciplinary study.**

   C. Faculty appointment and promotion mechanisms need significant improvement. Despite much conversation, clear expectations for faculty success are not evident. That difficulty is compounded by the fact that faculty mentoring is nonexistent. Instead of a culture where all faculty have a stake in the anticipated success of junior faculty colleagues, nearly the opposite occurs: there is a process by which those faculty find their own “bottom up” path to academic success.

   D. There is a **continuing over-reliance on adjunct faculty**, and especially of a single type (i.e., local practitioners). Individually, these adjuncts bring commitment and talent to the program. But despite their numbers, the team finds that they do not have the same voice as regular faculty on significant issues, especially for the strategic direction and governance of the school.

   E. **While multiple methods of communication exist within the school**, both individual faculty members and different interest groups within the faculty have not yet found the means to affect a meaningful conversation that can enhance the professional program.

   F. The new pedagogical models for Comprehensive Studio and the History and Theory stream need to be carefully and continually examined; criteria are spread across several courses and semesters.

   G. Given the school’s aspirations to be a “top five” school in the DesignIntelligence rankings, a question must be asked: **are students being underserved** in present and future employment circumstances by awarding a B. Arch. degree for 486 units, when other programs, considered to be peers by Carnegie Mellon, are awarding M. Arch. degrees for 504 units?

   H. **Regarding facilities**: While the MMX addition is not anticipated to be built in the near term, the possibility to enhance the entire CFA, both academically and culturally, with this future project should remain a priority.

   I. Despite the substantial recent improvements, **there are important facilities concerns in the short term** that need to be addressed. These include continual monitoring of safety and overcrowding in the shop, increasing utilization of the digital fabrication lab, and improvements to studio spaces for pinups, group projects, and larger project assembly areas.

4. **Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2005)**

   **1998 Condition 5, Human Resources:** The program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, administrative and technical support staff, and faculty support staff.
Previous Team Report (2005): This Visiting team, as did the last, found the School to be overly dependent on adjunct faculty with little evidence that substantial improvement has been made since the previous visit. This concern is exacerbated by the fact that the tenured faculty is involved in the pursuit of valuable but highly specialized areas of research which require them to expend from 30 to 50% of their time with graduate programs. The team felt that the correlation between the excellent courses taught by the tenured faculty, and the lack of evidence that such knowledge was applied in the studio, was at least partly due to the tenured faculty’s reliance on the adjunct faculty. The team believes that if the School is to maintain its position as a leader in the field of architecture, it must increase the number of full-time faculty that teaches in the design studios.

The team also found a weak design aesthetic in the upper level studios and believes that the search for new faculty should focus on persons able to improve that aspect of the program. The School does not yet have a full-time, endowed Chair to be occupied by someone to provide creative leadership for the design faculty and inspiration to the students.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: This deficiency remains unmet. The team notes that some positive steps have been made with the hiring of several new tenure-track faculty, planned hires for two more in the coming year, and an increased focus on design quality by the new head. However, other issues noted by the 2005 team remain. Chief among these is the heavy reliance on adjunct faculty, the narrow understanding of adjunct faculty as professionals in local employment only, limited mechanisms to support junior faculty, and the ongoing uncertainty around pedagogy and design expectations in the upper years of the curriculum. In addition, a new issue is emerging, which is the succession plan for the retirement of senior research faculty in the near future, and how these high-level programs will continue to engage with the professional program. There is uncertainty about both the composition of existing faculty search committees, and about the strategic process to address future faculty hires.

1998 Condition 7, Physical Resources: The program must provide physical resources that are appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each full-time student; lecture and seminar spaces that accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space.

Previous Team Report (2005): Again, following comments found in the 2000 Visiting Team Report, the Team found a shop that is still too small and is limited to wood-working, providing no access to metal, plastic, a paint booth, physical modeling, or the other elements associated with a well-equipped shop.

Also, the program would profit from consolidating the studio spaces into one building, with neighboring adjacencies to enhance peer-to-peer learning and the new mentoring system of the “I AM” program, in which upper-level students support younger students’ acclimation and degree progress. This team felt this consolidation to be more compelling than the cachet of having certain studios in the CFA Hall, since other classes and advising needs will still bring students there for interaction with the other Fine Arts disciplines.

Equipment resources need to expand to provide digital 3-D modeling capability. Remedies are planned by the School, however wider institutional commitment is pending.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is now met. There have been multiple, incremental improvements to the facilities since the previous visit. Walls were removed in
multiple smaller spaces to create a series of open studios, storage space, and pin-up space. These improvements have had a positive impact on the program, and the work environments for the faculty and students. Notable improvements include the creation of the digital fabrication lab, a paint booth, and a metal-working area. An expansion is planned for Margaret Morrison Hall, but lack of adequate funding has delayed this project for the foreseeable future. At present, the school is being creative and adapting its facilities to accommodate its needs. The team identified a few areas that still have some room for improvement; however, the team notes that at this time, many constituents of the school feel that there is not a strong need to consolidate the studios into one building prior to the expansion project.

1998 Condition 11, Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB only accredits professional programs offering the Bachelor of Architecture and the Master of Architecture degrees. The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include three components—general studies, professional studies, and electives—which respond to the needs of the institution, the architecture profession, and the students respectively.

Previous Team Report (2005): The professional degree does not require a sufficient number of courses in the liberal arts and sciences, in favor of extensive requirements in architecture studies. The School has a plan to reverse this imbalance, however the stated plan may not be quite aggressive enough to meet either NAAB’s old requirement of a 40/60% distribution ratio between non-architecture and architecture courses, or the up-coming requirement (in the 2004 Conditions) of 45 credit hours of general studies (or 135 units, in CMU’s course-credit system.)

The Team also recommends finding “room” in the early years of study for students to take their University Elective and general education courses. In the current situation, these electives are taken in the last 3 years of study, meaning that the student is inclined to take the upper-level courses that the Majors in other disciplines might take, yet they cannot qualify for the courses, not being Majors and not having taken the introductory survey courses. Room for University Electives in the early years allows them to take the introductory courses and establish interests in other disciplines to set up a Minor or other specialty in other programs of study.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: This deficiency has been satisfied.

1998 Criterion 12.14, Accessibility: Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities

Previous Team Report (2005): Although the appropriate subject matter is covered in classroom work, its application in studio work is either weak or non-existent. Very similar comments were seen in the previous VTR and the continued failure to address this issue was of concern to this Team.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: The team believes that there has been enough improvement in this area to state that this criterion has been met.
1998 Criterion 12.29, Comprehensive Building Design: Ability to produce an architecture project informed by a comprehensive program, from schematic design through the detailed development of programmatic spaces, structural and environmental systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections, and building assemblies, as may be appropriate; and to assess the completed project with respect to the program’s design criteria.

Previous Team Report (2005): The Team could not find sufficient evidence that students were able to use the technical and environmental knowledge gained in their first three years of education to inform the design process in the projects produced in their fourth and fifth year studios. This Team, as did the previous team, found little evidence that students were retaining the knowledge gained in various “technical” courses and making it a part of what should become their growing design vocabulary. This observation was reinforced in discussions with both students and faculty and was characterized by student comment that there is not much continuity between the classroom and the studio.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. The school has a unique approach to comprehensive design. This approach is to look at a project holistically from early on in a student's studio work (i.e., 3rd year), and as one progresses through the program, systems integration is expected to become more sophisticated (in 4th and 5th years). This approach does not anticipate that a student will complete all elements of the Comprehensive Design criteria in a single semester, and in a single project. Once the school clarified this approach to the team as a specific strategy during the visit, the team determined that students have met most of the categories within comprehensive design exceptionally well. There are two categories that are met, but not to the same high standard of the other criteria; these are life-safety and accessibility.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation
(Note, every assessment should be accompanied by a brief narrative. In the case of SPCs being Met, the team is encouraged to identify the course or courses where evidence of student accomplishment was found. Likewise, if the assessment of the condition or SPC is negative, please include a narrative that indicates the reasoning behind the team’s assessment.)

Part One (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Part One (I): Section 1. Identity and Self-Assessment

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission, and culture and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context.

The accredited degree program must describe and then provide evidence of the relationship between the program, the administrative unit that supports it (e.g., school or college) and the institution. This includes an explanation of the program’s benefits to the institutional setting, how the institution benefits from the program, any unique synergies, events, or activities occurring as a result, etc.

Finally, the program must describe and then demonstrate how the course of study and learning experiences encourage the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects.

[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2012 Team Assessment: As one of five programs within the College of Fine Arts, the School of Architecture has a distinct and prominent presence in the areas of art and culture within the institution.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

• Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff in all learning environments both traditional and non-traditional.

Further, the program must demonstrate that it encourages students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers, and it addresses health-related issues, such as time management.

Finally, the program must document, through narrative and artifacts, its efforts to ensure that all members of the learning community: faculty, staff, and students are aware of these objectives and are advised as to the expectations for ensuring they are met in all elements of the learning culture.

• Social Equity: The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equivalently able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.
[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which in each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

NOTE: In the event a team cannot assess both elements in the affirmative, please document this in the comments below.

2012 Team Assessment: Meetings with faculty and reinforced by students indicate a very collegial environment for communication in both directions. Both groups look forward to working with the other through formal as well as informal contexts.

I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives: Programs must demonstrate through narrative and artifacts, how they respond to the following perspectives on architecture education. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently within the context of its history, mission, and culture and to further identify as part of its long-range planning activities how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community. That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching. In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: As one of five programs in the College of Fine Arts, the School of Architecture has a substantial history in representing the arts ideal across the university. While the autonomy of the program within the college is noteworthy, there are ample opportunities for collaboration with the other programs, and further afield at Carnegie Mellon. The PhD research programs in the school contribute to the B.Arch. program, and a cross-disciplinary course at the college level is intended to examine critical discourse across the arts. There are selected cross-college appointments with the business, theater, and engineering schools.

B. Architectural Education and Students. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to live and work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured and respected; to emerge as leaders in the academic setting and the profession; to understand the breadth of professional opportunities; to make thoughtful, deliberate, informed choices and; to develop the habit of lifelong learning.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The team found that there was a very strong student-faculty interaction that led to positive results in regard to student learning, leadership development, and career development. Several studio projects engaged students on a more practical level, preparing students for the more common building/project types they will see in architecture practice. The school is moving to amend the curriculum to allow for greater flexibility and integrate other areas of learning into their architectural education in an interdisciplinary fashion.

C. **Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located, and; prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The students are introduced to the profession as early as the application process. The recruiter for the architecture program interacts with the students and ensures that they understand what an architecture education entails and what it means to be an architect. The school has a dedicated staff person for advising students regarding the profession, and working with the university's career office to help place the students. She is also the school’s IDP Educator/Coordinator and has attended NCARB’s conference. The students are all familiar with and are required to enroll in IDP. Students had attended presentations with representatives from NCARB and the Pennsylvania State Architects Licensing Board.

D. **Architectural Education and the Profession.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to practice in a global economy; to recognize the impact of design on the environment; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to the multiple needs of a diversity of clients and diverse populations, as well as the needs of communities and; to contribute to the growth and development of the profession.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The array of courses selected to introduce the students to issues involved in practice incorporate many of the concerns for practitioners in architecture and provide a very broad perspective from observation and data gathering with community engagement to feasibility studies; design and project execution. Practicing architects on the faculty introduce students to a broad array of professional issues, including budget and design from a developer’s perspective. This interesting dynamic helps to prepare students for an evolving profession.

E. **Architectural Education and the Public Good.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to be active, engaged citizens; to be responsive to the needs of a changing world; to acquire the knowledge needed to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges through design, conservation and responsible professional practice; to understand the ethical implications of their decisions; to reconcile differences between the architect’s obligation to his/her client and the public; and to nurture a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service and leadership.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The program has a long history of socially conscious projects and engagement opportunities for the students in Pittsburgh and the surrounding region. Of particular note are the Urban Design/Build Studio and the Urban Lab, and the engagement of both students and faculty with public constituents for these projects.
I.1.4 Long-Range Planning: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and, where appropriate, the five perspectives. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform its future planning and strategic decision making.

[X] The program’s processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: The school is in the midst of a strategic planning process. This process, begun in 2010 by the new head of the school, has been paused for the accreditation review. To date, a series of meetings have taken place with various cohorts of the faculty. Student input has also been gathered through a series of town hall meetings. A draft of the strategic plan has been circulated to the faculty and needs refinement. The process appears to have initiated a healthy dialog regarding the future of the program, and the faculty members are passionate about their visions. The challenge will be to mesh these diverse opinions into one cohesive plan.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How the program is progressing towards its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.
- Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:
  - Solicitation of faculty, students’, and graduates’ views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
  - Individual course evaluations.
  - Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.
  - Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.

The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.

[X] The program’s processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: The school utilizes a wide variety of methods to ensure self-assessment procedures are adequate. These include regular oversight from a Presidential Advisory group as well as other areas of central administration; a full panoply of meeting types, including retreats, regular faculty meetings, social interaction, committees, and town meetings; and regular solicitation of student opinions through meetings, surveys, course evaluations, Student Advisory Council meetings, and all-school meetings.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

- Faculty & Staff:
  - An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to
document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position
descriptions\(^2\).

- Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment
  Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.
- An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and
  staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student
  achievement.
- An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been
  appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular
  communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education
  Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development
  programs.
- An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty
  and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment,
  tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.

\[X\] Human Resources (Faculty & Staff) are inadequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The team notes that some positive steps have been made with the hiring
of several new tenure-track faculty, planned hires for two more in the coming year, and an increased
focus on design quality by the new head. However, other issues noted by the 2005 team remain.
Chief among these is the heavy reliance on adjunct faculty, the narrow understanding of adjunct
faculty as almost exclusively professionals in local employment, severely limited mechanisms to
support and evaluate junior faculty, and the ongoing uncertainty around pedagogy and design
expectations in the upper years of the curriculum. In addition, a new issue is emerging, which is the
succession plan for the retirement of senior research faculty in the near future, and how these high-
level programs will continue to engage with the professional program. There is uncertainty about both
the composition of existing faculty search committees, and about the strategic process to address
future faculty hires.

- Students:
  - An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This
documentation may include, but is not limited to application forms and instructions, admissions
requirements, admissions decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and
student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshman, as well as
transfers within and outside of the university.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both
inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.

\[X\] Human Resources (Students) are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: Meetings with the administrative staff and the Student Advisory Council
noted that the admission process has evolved to better identify students who have the best potential
to succeed in the architecture program. In addition, the head of the school has worked to identify
leadership opportunities for the students.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

- Administrative Structure: An accredited degree program must demonstrate it has a measure of
administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm the program’s ability to conform to the conditions
for accreditation. Accredited programs are required to maintain an organizational chart describing the

---

\(^2\) A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
administrative structure of the program and position descriptions describing the responsibilities of the administrative staff.

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The program has sufficient autonomy within the college and support by the administration of the university to carry out the professional program.

- Governance: The program must demonstrate that all faculty, staff, and students have equitable opportunities to participate in program and institutional governance.

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: A conscious effort by the head of the school has created more opportunities that ensure students, faculty, and staff are participating in governance procedures.

I.2.3 Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:
- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: There have been multiple improvements to the facilities since the previous visit. Walls were removed in multiple smaller spaces to create a series of open studios, storage space, and pin-up space. These improvements have had a positive impact on the program and on the work environments for faculty and students. Notable improvements include the creation of the digital fabrication lab, a paint booth, and a metal-working area. An expansion is planned for Margaret Morrison Hall, but lack of adequate funding has delayed this project for the foreseeable future. At present, the school is being creative and adapting its facilities to accommodate its needs. The team identified a few areas that still have some room for improvement; however, all constituents feel that there is not a strong need to consolidate the studios into one building prior to the expansion project.

I.2.4 Financial Resources: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The program is supported on par with other schools in the College of Fine Arts.

I.2.5 Information Resources: The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

Further, the accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resources professionals who provide information services that teach and develop research and evaluative skills, and critical thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.
[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

**2012 Team Assessment:** Information resources are varied and the staff is knowledgeable, including senior library staff with discipline-specific knowledge. The library includes traditional stacks and online resources as well as a general use computer lab. The facility, while not a dedicated architecture library, is open late enough to accommodate student access outside of class time. Additional resources are available at the nearby Carnegie Library and through interlibrary loans. This access allows for more specialized research.
PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports. Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

- Program student characteristics.
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.
  - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
    - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
  - Time to graduation.
    - Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.
    - Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.

- Program faculty characteristics
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.
  - Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.

[X] Statistical reports were provided and provide the appropriate information

2012 Team Assessment: Conversations with the head during the visit confirmed that the information presented in the APR conforms to this condition.

I.3.2. Annual Reports: The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2009 NAAB Procedures. Beginning in 2008, these reports are submitted electronically to the NAAB. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the NAAB will provide to the visiting team all annual reports submitted since 2008. The NAAB will also provide the NAAB Responses to the annual reports.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused

---

3 In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

[X] Annual Reports and NAAB responses were provided and provide the appropriate information.

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials: The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty is adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history and context of the institution. In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit\(^4\) that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

[X] Faculty credentials were provided and demonstrate the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement.

2012 Team Assessment: The range of expertise of the faculty was evident in both the faculty exhibit and the teaching matrix. The team noted that there were a number of adjunct faculty without a terminal degree; however, this circumstance was offset by the breadth of professional experience for a program emphasizing professional capabilities.

\(^4\) The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

[X] The policy documents in the team room met the requirements of Appendix 3

2012 Team Assessment: All required documents were available for review by the team. The documents set forth reasonable expectations for professional programs.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE – EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the criteria set out below. The knowledge and skills are the minimum for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice.

The school must provide evidence that its graduates have satisfied each criterion through required coursework. If credits are granted for courses taken at other institutions or online, evidence must be provided that the courses are comparable to those offered in the accredited degree program.

The criteria encompass two levels of accomplishment:

**Understanding**—The capacity to classify, compare, summarize, explain, and/or interpret information.

**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.

The NAAB establishes performance criteria to help accredited degree programs prepare students for the profession while encouraging educational practices suited to the individual degree program. In addition to assessing whether student performance meets the professional criteria, the visiting team will assess performance in relation to the school’s stated curricular goals and content. While the NAAB stipulates the student performance criteria that must be met, it specifies neither the educational format nor the form of student work that may serve as evidence of having met these criteria. Programs are encouraged to develop unique learning and teaching strategies, methods, and materials to satisfy these criteria. The NAAB encourages innovative methods for satisfying the criteria, provided the school has a formal evaluation process for assessing student achievement of these criteria and documenting the results.

For the purpose of accreditation, graduating students must demonstrate understanding or ability as defined below for each of the Student Performance Criteria (SPC):

Finally, in addition to assessing each SPC as met or not-met, the team must assess whether the realm overall is met or not-met.

II.1.1 **Student Performance Criteria:** The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.

**Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:**

Architects must have the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This ability includes facility with the wider range of media used to think about architecture including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making. Students’ learning aspirations include:

- Being broadly educated.
- Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.
- Communicating graphically in a range of media.
- Recognizing the assessment of evidence.

• Comprehending people, place, and context.
• Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.

A.1. Communication Skills: Ability to read, write, speak and listen effectively.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of the ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively was found in course work and course syllabi. Reading and writing skills were evident in course papers with citations. Evidence of the use and development of speaking and listening skills were present in the syllabi of courses that had oral presentations and seminar discussions as a large percentage of the course grade.

Verbal presentation skill development was a component of studio courses, and proficiency in this area was evident in studio pin-ups that the team observed.

A. 2. Design Thinking Skills: Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of design thinking skills are present in program diagrams and parti diagrams from studio course work. Critical questions (such as “What role do libraries play in society?”) were raised in project descriptions and graphic work. Furthermore, a good portion of studio work showed evidence of the analysis of design alternatives.

A. 3. Visual Communication Skills: Ability to use appropriate representational media, such as traditional graphic and digital technology skills, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of visual communication skills was present in the digital media and drawing courses. Furthermore, the concepts learned in the courses were clearly and appropriately applied in studio course work. Although the quality of low-pass work from the digital media and drawing courses was only marginal, the low-pass studio course work still showed evidence that students were able to use the appropriate representational media to convey ideas in varying design phases from concept to final renderings.

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.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Technical Documentation was present in multiple courses. Annotated technical drawings of component and material assemblies were present in work from the 48-305: Advanced Construction studio. Drawings as well as physical and digital models displayed an understanding of structural systems and component assemblies in most of the high-pass work and in some of the low-pass work. Outline specifications were not present in the 48-305 studio (which was
designated as a class meeting the A.4 requirement), but evidence of outline specifications was found in 4th year studio course work.

A.5. Investigative Skills: Ability to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The use of investigative skills was present in the designated courses in addition to various studio courses. Research and interpretation of data was evident in these courses.

A. 6. Fundamental Design Skills: Ability to effectively use basic architectural and environmental principles in design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The ability to effectively use basic architectural skills was present in the 48-205 studio course work, but environmental principles were only marginally present at best. However, the incorporation of environmental principles into design was present in other required studios such as 48-405.

A. 7. Use of Precedents: Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: Very basic examples of precedents are used for exercises for 48-453; these are largely 20th-century vernacular urban conditions, but no earlier examples are evidenced in student work. None of the work presented in 48-100 provides evidence of the use of precedent.

A. 8. Ordering Systems Skills: Understanding of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence is provided in both first year and second year studios.

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.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The 48-240 survey is very broad for one semester, and the 48-3XX courses (of which all students are required to select two) are quite specific.
A. 10. Cultural Diversity: Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: 48-351 Human Factors in Architecture addresses this criterion in a broad and meaningful manner.


[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: For 48-351, an ambitious course outline is supported by an interesting variety of student exercises. Although the digital information was incomplete (first pages only of paper assignments, exams missing drawings, etc), the group project was comprehensive and meaningful.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The professional program demonstrates a deep and engaged learning environment that promotes a variety of educational methods and outcomes.
Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Incorporating life safety systems.
- Integrating accessibility.
- Applying principles of sustainable design.

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.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Ability in this area was evident in the 48-400 Architecture Design Studio: Occupancy, as well as 48-452 Real Estate Design and Development.

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.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Ability for this criterion was met in both 48-400 Architecture Design Studio: Occupancy and 48-405 Architecture Design Studio: Systems Integration. It was noted that there was not the consistency of ability for this criterion among the student work that was present for other building systems.

B. 3. Sustainability: Ability to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction and operations on future generations through means such as carbon-neutral design, bioclimatic design, and energy efficiency.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Ability in this area was evident in many courses. The notion and importance of sustainability permeates the entire program. Particular attention to this SPC is evident in 48-405 Architecture Design Studio: Systems Integration as well as 48-415 Advanced Building Systems.

B. 4. Site Design: Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.

[X] Met
2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was shown in course 48-312 Site Engineering and Foundations and the 3rd-year studio, 48-300 Architectural Design Studio: Site

B. 5. **Life Safety:** *Ability* to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Ability for this criterion was met in both 48-400 Architecture Design Studio: Occupancy and 48-405 Architecture Design Studio: Systems Integration. It was noted that there was not the consistency of ability for this criterion among the student work that was present for other building systems.

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:

- A.2. Design Thinking Skills
- A.4. Technical Documentation
- A.5. Investigative Skills
- A.8. Ordering Systems
- A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture
- B.2. Accessibility
- B.3. Sustainability
- B.4. Site Design
- B.7. Environmental Systems
- B.9. Structural Systems
- B.5. Life Safety

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Exhibit material illustrates that Comprehensive Design was adequately addressed in 48-305 and addressed with increasing sophistication through 48-405 and beyond. Where design projects included diagrams to illustrate individual systems these lessons seemed most clearly understood. Many of the subcategories are met exceptionally well, but the components of life-safety and accessibility were not as strongly addressed: in a culture where so many of the standards are handled exceptionally well, strong design responses to these systems are not to the same standard.

B. 7 **Financial Considerations:** *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in both the identified courses of the matrix and 48-415 that this criterion is an integral part of the design thought process.

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.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The work presented for this criterion demonstrates why “systems thinking” is a core value of the school. It is both broadly presented and specifically applied throughout the curriculum.

B. 9. Structural Systems: Understanding of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is evident to the required degree in the course work reviewed.

B. 10. Building Envelope Systems: Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: It is evident that the work in the professional degree program is positively affected by the high level of advanced research conducted by the graduate faculty of the school in this area.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The course work exhibits the necessary understanding to satisfy this criterion.

B. 12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration: Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The highly valued concept of “making” in the overall thought process of the school allows a framework for this criterion to be apparent both in the required course work and projects across the curriculum.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The School of Architecture exhibits great strengths in the broad array of technical skills required to produce a building as a work of architecture.
Realm C: Leadership and Practice:
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

- Knowing societal and professional responsibilities
- Comprehending the business of building.
- Collaborating and negotiating with clients and consultants in the design process.
- Discerning the diverse roles of architects and those in related disciplines.
- Integrating community service into the practice of architecture.

C. 1. Collaboration: Ability to work in collaboration with others and in multidisciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The 48-500 course successfully allows students to engage and interact with the community. In course 48-105 students seem to be using work provided from other disciplines (i.e., art, dance or their previous work) in their interpretive design. Though they do collaborate among themselves, they are not actively engaged in a multidisciplinary collaborative process.

The Urban Laboratory is commendable for its ability to allow the students to design in a true context, engaging the general community, potential developers etc, while applying a comprehensive approach to architectural documentation. The project investigates everything from concept to strategies addressing infrastructure, land use, and ecology. It addresses current problems and potential future problems and attempts to offer solutions for them.

C. 2. Human Behavior: Understanding of the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment and the design of the built environment.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Student work demonstrates an understanding of human interaction with nature and the built environment by its experiential space design. Students are able to apply user programming to the space and also within the contextual environment. They are also able to synthesize the language of the context and apply to their design.

C. 3 Client Role in Architecture: Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and reconcile the needs of the client, owner, user groups, and the public and community domains.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Students are able to understand the needs and role of the client by project type as demonstrated in their design project (for example, a theatre design project catered to a particular client) and also through their case studies in the Ethics and Decision Making in Architecture course, where they identified problems and discussed the resolutions for the architect, contractor, and client in some case studies.

C. 4. Project Management: Understanding of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The document produced in the Issues of Practice Management was very detailed and encompassed a lot of detail—from identifying a problem and coming up with a resolution that included all members of the design and construction team to the logistics and resolution of a built design.

C. 5. Practice Management: **Understanding** of the basic principles of architectural practice management such as financial management and business planning, time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Through several case studies in the Ethics and Decision Making in Architecture and the Issues of Practice courses, students are able to understand the basics of practice management. They have been able to present a case, identify a problem, and come up with a resolution through various methods. The courses expose them to dilemmas in practice and prepare them to make a decision as a result.

C. 6. Leadership: **Understanding** of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Leadership was clearly evidenced in the Issues of Practice course. Several examples of effective collaboration were illustrated in the work of the community project books. These impressive publications evidence lessons of collaboration between the student teams and community stakeholders as well as the effective collaboration of the student teams among themselves. The varied illustrations and explanations regarding the client, contractor, architect, and attorney relationships are an innovative way of reinforcing these lessons and the architect’s role in a community design process.

C. 7. Legal Responsibilities: **Understanding** of the architect’s responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Student projects from 48-550 Issues of Practice include explanations to community clients regarding the legal responsibilities of the various parties in an AEC project. By encouraging students to explain these concepts to others, their own understanding of these concepts is clear. Other course projects, illustrating small design interventions, effectively evidence understanding of the regulatory conditions governing an architecture project.

C. 8. Ethics and Professional Judgment: **Understanding** of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues, and responsibility in architectural design and practice.

[X] Met
2012 Team Assessment: Projects in 48-500, 48-550 and 48-551 provide clear evidence that students are being taught a process of conscious decision-making that includes a broad consideration of values and consequences for the client, community, and ecology. This was particularly clear through student engagement with real communities and community-based problems in the Urban Laboratory, reinforcing the school’s focus on systems thinking.

C. 9. Community and Social Responsibility: Understanding of the architect’s responsibility to work in the public interest, to respect historic resources, and to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Both 48-500 The Urban Laboratory and 48-551 Issues of Practice include design projects for communities in the region. Project documentation, primarily through final reports and publications, shows thoughtful problem solving that includes data gathering and community interaction. Illustrated design interventions include clear explanations of deficiencies, needs, and challenges along with proposed design solutions.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The professional dimension of the program is evident in many aspects of the curriculum, from the strong participation of licensed professionals as adjunct faculty, the commitment to understanding the details of an engaged professional practice, and the regular community outreach of a number of upper-level studios.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Regional Accreditation: The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Carnegie Mellon University is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE).

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The B. Arch. program is the only professional degree program in the School of Architecture.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development
The program must describe the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications (e.g., changes or additions) are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Further, the NAAB expects that programs are evaluating curricula with a view toward the advancement of the discipline and toward ensuring that students are exposed to current issues in practice. Therefore, the program must demonstrate that licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: There are regular curriculum committee meetings and monthly meetings with the studio coordinators. The faculty includes licensed architects among both the regular and adjunct components.
PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

In the event a program relies on the preparatory/pre-professional educational experience to ensure that students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist. Likewise, the program must demonstrate it has determined how any gaps will be addressed during each student’s progress through the accredited degree program. This assessment should be documented in a student’s admission and advising files.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: All entering students, including internal and external transfer students, are required to enter the required architecture curriculum from the first year of the sequence.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

Il.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Exact statement is listed on the school’s web site for public viewing.

Il.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:

- The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
- The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Documents are available on the school’s web site under Academics – Undergraduate – Accreditation, located with the clickable links to the right side of the page.

Il.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:

- www.ARCHCareers.org
- The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
- Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
- The Emerging Professional’s Companion
- www.NCARB.org
- www.aia.org
- www.aias.org
- www.acsa-arch.org
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: School of Architecture students have a dedicated career center consultant available to them as well as the university job search career and development center called TartanTrak, all listed on the school’s web site. There are other helpful job search site links posted. The career center consultant is working with the university TartanTrak administrators to update the system to include the option for architecture students to post their portfolios online as well.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:

- All Annual Reports, including the narrative
- All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
- The final decision letter from the NAAB
- The most recent APR
- The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

These documents must be housed together and accessible to all. Programs are encouraged to make these documents available electronically from their websites.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The most recent APR is available on the school’s web site and includes the Annual Reports and NAAB response to the Annual Reports.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Documents are available on the school’s web site under Academics – Undergraduate – Accreditation, located with the clickable links to the right side of the page.
III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

[Taken from the Architecture Program Report, responses to Part One: Section 1 Identity and Self-Assessment]

A. History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)


B. History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)

Reference Carnegie Mellon University, APR, p. 4.

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)


D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

2. Conditions Met with Distinction

A. 10. Cultural Diversity
B. 3. Sustainability
B.8. Environmental Systems
B. 10. Building Envelope Systems
B.12 Building Materials and Assemblies
C. 3 Client Role in Architecture
C. 8. Ethics and Professional Judgment
C. 9. Community and Social Responsibility
3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
David Mohney, Dean Emeritus
School of Architecture
College of Design
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506
(859) 257-7619
(859) 323-1990 fax
dmohney@gmail.com

Non-voting member
David Biagi, Director
School of Architecture
College of Design
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506
(859) 257-7617
dbiagi@uky.edu

Representing the AIA
Shelly-Anne Tulia Scott, AIA, NCARB, NOMA, LEED®AP BC+C
Leo A. Daly
10 Tenth Street, Suite 200
Atlanta GA, 30309
(850) 212-1845
tuliascott@gmail.com

Representing the AIAS
Jason G. Wong
16309 N. Chronicle Lane
Colbert, WA 99005
(509) 294-0362
jasonwong.architecture@gmail.com

Representing the NCARB
Susan Schaefer Kliman, Ph.D., AIA
Klimatic Architecture
6022 N. Paseo Ventoso
Tucson, AZ 85750
(520) 405-3978
skliman@klimatic.com

Non-voting member
Aron Temkin, AIA, Dean
Norwich University
School of Architecture and Art
Chaplin Hall #407
158 Harmon Drive
Northfield, VT 05663
(802) 485-2620
(802) 485-2956 direct
(802) 485-2623 (fax)
atemkin@norwich.edu
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Representing the ACSA
Anne Tuila Scott, AIA, NCARB, NOMA, LEED®AP BC+C

Representing the AIA
Shelly Team

Representing the AIAS
Jason G. Wong

David Mohney
Team Chair

Team member