

# ***2023 Visiting Team Report***

Catholic University of America  
School of Architecture and  
Planning

M.Arch.

Continuing Accreditation Visit  
April 12-14, 2023



National  
Architectural  
Accrediting  
Board, Inc.

## Contents

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>I. Summary of Visit</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. Program Changes</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation</b>	<b>9</b>
1. Context and Mission	
2. Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession	
3. Program and Student Criteria	
4. Curricular Framework	
5. Resources	
6. Public Information	
<b>V. Appendices</b>	<b>29</b>
1. Conditions Met with Distinction	
2. Team SPC Matrix	
3. The Visiting Team	
<b>VI. Report Signatures</b>	<b>33</b>

## I. Summary of Visit

### a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The team extends its most profound appreciation to the School of Architecture and Planning's administration, faculty, students, and staff for organizing the visit and their responses to the visiting team's material requests. Their commitment to hard work made the visit much more manageable. We especially appreciate how well they responded to the 2020 Conditions and Procedures and remote process.

The provost's support and appreciation of the school were clear, and the program reflects the institution's mission.

The team must acknowledge the work of the students, faculty, staff, and administration during the pandemic to deal with increased unknowns.

The team appreciated the honesty in the information meetings and the respectful answers to the team's questions. The team was also impressed with the many students in the student meeting, especially given the remote process.

### b. Conditions with a Team Recommendation to the Board as Not Achieved (list number and title)

- 5.2 Planning and Assessment
- 5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development
- 5.5 Social, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- 6.5 Admissions and Advising
- 6.6. Student Financial Information

## II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

### 2009 Conditions Not Met

#### I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

##### ***Faculty and 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.*
- *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.*

**Previous Team Report (2015):** This condition is still **Not Met** and continues to be a concern of this visiting team.

The support staff work hard (and they appear to enjoy what they are doing), but the staff are minimal in number for the size of the program. This team is concerned that, because the total number of support staff has been reduced, the school has limited to no support in running the program. The total number of support staff positions was 12 at the time of the last visit. Currently, there are only 4 positions: the assistant dean, shop supervisor, computer technician, and assistant to the dean.

The total number of students in the School of Architecture and Planning during the last visit in 2009 was 504, which was peak enrollment (376 undergraduates and 128 graduates). At this visit, the actual numbers are 233 undergraduates and 111 graduates. With a 75% reduction in staff in the 6-year period between visits, the team has a concern that the school and, subsequently, the program are not adequately staffed. The focus of our evaluation is on the professional component of the program—the graduate enrollment—and this number has only been reduced by 7 students since the 2008-2009 academic year.

The faculty have concerns regarding course scheduling. Some faculty report that they are not always sure how many students they will have for a course—sometimes during the first few days of class, enrollment doubles from the number initially projected. University faculty recently voted to shorten the student drop/add period so that there would be more certainty with regard to class enrollment numbers at the start of each semester.

**2023 Team Analysis:** As of the Board of Director's 2021 review of the program's 5-year Interim report, the program demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies previously identified.

The program balances the workload with an appointment of 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service (5.4.1). In coordination with the University and the Provost's March 2022 Task Force on Faculty Workload Apportionment, they concluded that the schools are too diverse for a single, uniform workload apportionment. The School of Architecture's representative on the provost task force is currently working with the dean to define the school's specific policy within the context of the university. The team verified the evidence in meetings with the dean, associate dean, and faculty.

### **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:*

- o *Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.*
- o *Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.*
- o *Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.*

**Previous Team Report (2015):** The Crough Center is a converted gymnasium with many inefficient spaces, but, as a whole, it is adequate in size for the current needs. The addition of an elevator has made most of the building accessible.

Nevertheless, the building infrastructure is antiquated and inefficient. Industrial bay lighting fixtures are the primary source of studio illumination. They emit a very loud, very distracting noise, and are expensive to operate. Students conducted an energy audit and recommended turning off the lights during daylight hours and using only the natural light. The first year's savings were reported to be about \$10,000. Studies

indicate that better illumination and greater savings could be achieved by replacing the lighting, wiring, and controls.

Likewise, the uneven, uncontrollable HVAC system is not conducive to teaching or learning. The plumbing is also problematic; a ruptured water line recently caused catastrophic damage to the basement. The woodworking, print, and fabrication laboratories have been recently renovated and reconfigured. New equipment, ventilation, and lighting were installed following the flood mentioned above.

**2023 Team Analysis:** As of the Board of Director's 2021 review of the program's 5-year Interim report, the program demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies previously identified.

The program's APR and a virtual tour link provided evidence that the program has appropriate space to support and encourage studio-based learning (5.6.1). As a supplement, additional evidence was provided by a detailed summary of existing rooms in the school and the associated improvements to facilities with the recent \$1.25 Million renovation that includes new A.V. and computer equipment. A live tour conducted by the dean and associate dean of facilities during studio hours provided real-time observation and discussions with faculty and students, reinforcing the positive role of the facility in supporting student learning. The team verified the evidence in meetings with the school administration, students, and faculty.

**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.*

**Previous Team Report (2015):** The financial challenges of the school are directly related to declining student enrollment and the disproportionate number of faculty.

The program reached a high point of enrollment in 2008-2009 at 504 total students (376 undergraduates and 128 graduates). This visiting team evaluated the professional portion of the program: the graduate programs. As mentioned in Section I 2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development, there is concern about the inability to fund an adequate number of staff positions to support the program. In 2008-2009, the number of graduate students was one-third of the total enrollment, with 12 total staff members to support the program. At this visit, the staff count is down to 4. The number of staff is inadequate to support the program.

Signs of an enrollment increase are good. The enrollment numbers have increased since last year to 344 total students (233 undergraduates and 111 graduates). The school felt confident that these numbers would continue to go up since the number of applicants has been increasing. The school's goal is a total enrollment cap of 430 students (232 undergraduates and 133 graduates). At the time of the team visit, a university budget had not yet been approved for next year, which also concerns the team.

**2023 Team Analysis:** As of the Board of Director's 2021 review of the program's 5-year Interim report, the program demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies previously identified.

The program has demonstrated that it has the appropriate institutional Support and financial resources to support student learning and achievement during the next term of Accreditation ensures student as evidenced by the Architectural Program Report and Budget committee reports. The program provided the following materials for review, meeting minutes, overall revenue review, and current/future budget reports. The program's assessment plan describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. The program last assessed this criterion in the 2022-2023 academic year. The program did meet its revenue baselines, as evidenced in its reports. Upcoming changes/improvements include increased fund-raising campaigns, enrollment, and donations contributions. The team verified the evidence in meetings with the school administration.

**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 and 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 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 and 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.

**Previous Team Report (2015):** Statistical Reports are provided. However, not all of the required information is available or easily accessible.

Extensive demographic information is provided. However, no comparative data is provided to gauge the changes in demographics during the period since the last team visit. While it is possible to obtain information regarding the changes by comparing the reports from 2009 and from this year, the changes are too complex to allow a useful, comparative reading. More data needs to be provided to allow better analysis of trends that gauge the effectiveness of the social equity policy.

The team did not find data on the percentage of matriculating students who complete their degree program within the normal time to completion or within 150% of the normal time to completion.

While extensive data was provided on the demographics of the faculty, comparative data between this visit and the 2009 visit was not provided.

**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.*

**2015 Team Assessment:** The school's 2015 APR describes the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process, and the involvement of adjunct faculty assures that students are exposed to current issues in practice. While the process is defined, it does not appear to be uniformly implemented. The failure seems to be a lack of coordination of core content in non-studio classes. Anecdotal evidence of course content being repeated in successive classes concerned the team, as did reports of syllabi not being shared among faculty resulting in often redundant course content. The program strengths are in the range of unique concentration options in Tracks I and II. These concentrations include: Urban Practice, Real Estate Development, Emerging Technologies and Media, and Cultural Studies and Sacred Space. However, students reported a lack of coordination among the concentrations and the lack of a holistic vision.

**2023 Team Analysis:** The APR describes and documents a significantly improved and consistent curriculum evaluation, modification, and implementation process. The process is uniformly documented as one-page assessment forms. The forms are used for studio and non-studio classes. Meetings with administration, and faculty confirmed the information and the positive role of licensed architects in the curriculum review and development process.

The program implemented significant improvements in the spring 2022 semester by identifying and focusing on required courses for graduating seniors and continuing graduate students. The changes were judged as the most appropriate way of correcting these deficiencies in the concentrations (Urban Practice, Real Estate Development, Emerging Technologies and Media, and Cultural Studies and Sacred Space). Specifically, these courses are ARPL 402/602 - Integrated Building Design Studio (IBDS), its supplemental lecture ARPL- 432/632 Integrated Studio Supplemental (ISS), and ARPL 221 Pre-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.

**Previous Team Report (2015):** Student work and supporting material in ARPL 602 and ARPL 632 (an elective) reflect an understanding of this criterion, but not an ability to perform the requirements of the criterion.

**2021 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by The Catholic University of America, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.7 Financial Considerations.

**2023 Team Analysis:** The program's APR and course materials provided evidence that students can synthesize user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design in an architectural project through ARPL 402 and ARPL 602 Integrated Building Design Studio, and ARPL 432 and ARPL 632 Integrated Studio Supplement. The process is documented as a one-page quantitative course assessment summary that identifies specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year.

**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.

**Previous Team Report (2015):** This criterion is **Not Met**. Projects in ARPL 402/602: Comprehensive Building Design Studio (CBDS) and throughout the program do not provide evidence of student ability with regard to the accessibility requirements of this criterion.

**2021 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by The Catholic University of America, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.7 Financial Considerations.

**2023 Team Analysis:** The program's APR and course materials provided evidence that students can design sites, facilities, and systems for diverse users. An understanding of the regulatory context is met through ARPL 101 Introduction to Architecture, ARPL 383 Ethics + Stewardship, ARPL 402 IBDS Studio + ARPL 432 Integrated Studio Supplement, and ARPL 722 Professional Practice. Students learn to include people of different backgrounds, resources, and abilities (in support of social equity) through several courses, including ARPL302/501 Architectural Design II (Studio), ARPL311 History of Architecture 3, and ARPL401/601 Architectural Design 4 Concentration Studio. The learning goals are documented in one-page quantitative Course Assessment summaries that identifies specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion.

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

**Previous Team Report (2015):** This criterion is Not Met. While selected projects in ARPL 402/602: Comprehensive Building Design Studio (CBDS) illustrate this ability, the team found little evi

**2021 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by The Catholic University of America, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.7 Financial Considerations.

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program's APR and course materials provided evidence that students understand the basic principles of life-safety systems. An understanding of health, and welfare in the built environment are addressed in ARPL221 Predesign, ARPL232/532 Environmental Design 1, ARPL331/731 Environmental Design 2, and several structures courses ARPL441/541, ARPL442/542, and ARPL742 Advanced Structures. Students also address life safety in ARPL 383 Ethics + Stewardship, ARPL 402 IBDS Studio + ARPL 432 Integrated Studio Supplement, and ARPL 722 Professional Practice. The learning goals are documented in one-page quantitative Course Assessment summaries that identifies specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion.

**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.

**Previous Team Report (2015):** This criterion is Not Met. The program needs to address understanding financial considerations as they relate to 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, instead of focusing on the financial considerations of an architectural firm's practice. In the course binders for Track I and Track II, ARPL 722: Practice Management, there is not enough evidence to illustrate an understanding of this criterion.

**2021 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by The Catholic University of America, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most

recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.7 Financial Considerations.

**2023 Team Analysis:** The program's APR and course materials provided evidence that students understand the fundamentals of building costs and financing. The understanding acquisition and feasibility is met through APRL 221 Predesign, APRL 383 Ethics and Stewardship, APRL 722 Professional Practice, APRL 402 IBDS Studio, and ARPL 432 Integrated Studio Supplement. For example, the course exercises focus on basic building systems, structural steel and concrete systems, HVAC components, and cost estimating. The learning goals are documented in one-page quantitative Course Assessment summaries that identifies specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion.

### III. Program Changes

If the Accreditation Conditions have changed since the previous visit, a brief description of changes made to the program because of changes in the Conditions is required.

The program had three (3) significant changes because of changes in the Conditions. The first is the increased attention to assessment. The program has also changed as the accreditation process has shifted from reviewing student work. The program instituted a regular, year-end review of all studios.

The second significant change is the increased coordination of the syllabus content. The two academic associate deans (undergraduate and graduate) emphasized general issues of syllabus conformance. The deans also gave increased attention to grading rubrics and other areas that enhance assessment.

The third significant change is the addition of two required classes. In response to PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility, the program added an entirely new, required course: APRL 383 Ethics + Stewardship. The second new, required course was ARPL 241 Theory of the Orders.

### IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

#### 1—Context and Mission (*Guidelines, p. 5*)

To help the NAAB and the visiting team understand the specific circumstances of the school, the program must describe the following:

- The institutional context and geographic setting (public or private, urban or rural, size, etc.), and how the program's mission and culture influence its architecture pedagogy and impact its development. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the mission of the college or university and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program's role in and relationship to its academic context and university community, including how the program benefits—and benefits from—its institutional setting and how the program as a unit and/or its individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. Also describe how the program, as a unit, develops multidisciplinary relationships and leverages unique opportunities in the institution and the community.
- The ways in which the program encourages students and faculty to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective opportunities (e.g., field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities).

☒ Described

### 2023 Team Analysis:

The School of Architecture and Planning at The Catholic University of America (CUA) has a particular mission on a distinctive private university campus. As the national university of the Catholic Church in the United States, the mission specifically references the dialectic of faith and reason—recognizing the university's effort to interface with that reality. The geographic setting of the campus is also distinctive and has a direct impact on the school. The context of Washington DC, both architecturally and in terms of urbanism, is genuinely distinct.

The campus's location has made it easy to connect with architectural professionals from downtown or those who wish to teach at a NAAB-accredited design school. It has allowed CUA students to secure internships quickly. The program's primary multidisciplinary relationship with the university is a joint Bachelor of Science in Architecture and Bachelor's in Civil Engineering (B.S. Arch./B.C.E.) initiative.

Learning inside and outside the classroom is addressed through the curriculum and faculty pro bono work in Washington, D.C. The curriculum's role is three classes - ARPL 221 Predesign, ARPL 383 Ethics and Stewardship, and ARPL 402 Integrated Building Design Studio. The administration, faculty, and student interviews confirmed that students work in teams, consult with local architects, and practice community engagement.

## 2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession (Guidelines, p. 6)

The program must report on how it responds to the following values, all of which affect the education and development of architects. The response to each value must also identify how the program will continue to address these values as part of its long-range planning. These values are foundational, not exhaustive.

**Design:** Architects design better, safer, more equitable, resilient, and sustainable built environments. Design thinking and integrated design solutions are hallmarks of architecture education, the discipline, and the profession. (p.7)

**Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility:** Architects are responsible for the impact of their work on the natural world and on public health, safety, and welfare. As professionals and designers of the built environment, we embrace these responsibilities and act ethically to accomplish them. (p.7)

**Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion:** Architects commit to equity and inclusion in the environments we design, the policies we adopt, the words we speak, the actions we take, and the respectful learning, teaching, and working environments we create. Architects seek fairness, diversity, and social justice in the profession and in society and support a range of pathways for students seeking access to an architecture education. (p.7)

**Knowledge and Innovation:** Architects create and disseminate knowledge focused on design and the built environment in response to ever-changing conditions. New knowledge advances architecture as a cultural force, drives innovation, and prompts the continuous improvement of the discipline. (p.8)

**Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement:** Architects practice design as a collaborative, inclusive, creative, and empathetic enterprise with other disciplines, the communities we serve, and the clients for whom we work. (p.8)

**Lifelong Learning:** Architects value educational breadth and depth, including a thorough understanding of the discipline's body of knowledge, histories and theories, and architecture's role in cultural, social, environmental, economic, and built contexts. The practice of architecture demands lifelong learning, which is a shared responsibility between academic and practice settings.

☒ Described

## 2023 Team Analysis:

**Design:** Design is understood by integrating history, theory, ethics, construction, and building systems. The broad course curriculum provides an understanding of architects' diverse roles, and the design studios encourage an understanding of critical thinking. The faculty and student interviews confirmed the integration and effectiveness of the curriculum. In addition, third parties assess course outcomes every semester. For a long-range change, faculty review the integration of the design studio course sequence with other courses annually to identify areas of improvement.

**Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility:** The program uses five classes to ensure an understanding of Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility. Students and faculty confirmed that two classes, ARPL 101 Intro to Architecture lectures and ARPL 232 Environmental Design 1, introduce the calculation of passive building systems' performance and use of material and energy resources. They also confirmed that ARPL 331 Env Design 2, and ARPL 383 Ethics + Stewardship, support the ARPL 402 studio. In the studio, students integrate their knowledge of building design while collaborating with external architectural firms, consulting engineers, and actual clients. For a long-range change, the program measured student learning through quizzes, assignments, exams, and final projects. The program last assessed this criterion in the 2022-2023 academic year.

**Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion:** Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion are addressed by the program's mission statement and its support for its student organizations. The mission highlights a "duty to God to preserve His creation – to preserve human dignity, the environment, and society." The APR emphasized a studio culture where "faculty, staff, and students of CUA enhance and maintain the quality of life for all members of the CUA community." Meetings with students, staff, and faculty verified the APR statements. The discussions also highlighted that AIAS and NOMA play essential roles in "fostering a culture of diversity through academic events, competitions, and other festivals." The program will continue to address this through continued recognition of its mission and support for its student organizations.

**Knowledge and Innovation:** Knowledge and Innovation are addressed along four themes (scholarly, technical, methodological, and design) through a palette of more than seven classes (ARPL211/511, ARPL21/512, ARPL241/641, ARPL311/611, ARPL314/514, ARPL333/633, ARPL434/634, ARPL402/432, ARPL401/601/701/603, and ARPL696AZ/696BD). The effectiveness of the classes was confirmed with faculty and student interviews. The program last assessed this criterion in the 2022-2023 academic year and met the class benchmarks. Upcoming changes/improvements include increased cross-pollination of class work and different courses.

### Leadership, Collaboration, And Community Engagement

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement are addressed through the curriculum and faculty pro bono work in Washington, D.C. The curriculum's role is three classes - ARPL 221 Predesign, ARPL 383 Ethics and Stewardship, and ARPL 402 Integrated Building Design Studio. The administration, faculty, and student interviews confirmed that students work in teams, consult with local architects, and practice community engagement. For a long-range change, the outcomes are reviewed annually.

### Lifelong Learning

Lifelong Learning is addressed through seven classes- ARPL 211 History of Architecture 1, ARPL 212 History of Architecture 2, ARPL 311 History of Architecture 3, ARPL 401 Architectural Design Studio 4, ARPL 402 Integrated Building Design Studio, ARPL 636 Design Process and Methods, and ARP 696 Thesis. The effectiveness of the classes was confirmed with faculty and student interviews. The program last assessed this criterion in the 2022-2023 academic year and met the benchmarks for the seven classes. Upcoming changes/improvements include increased cross-pollination of class work and different courses.

### **3—Program and Student Criteria** *(Guidelines, p. 9)*

These criteria seek to evaluate the outcomes of architecture programs and student work within their unique institutional, regional, national, international, and professional contexts, while encouraging innovative approaches to architecture education and professional preparation.

#### **3.1 Program Criteria (PC)** *(Guidelines, p. 9)*

A program must demonstrate how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address the following criteria.

**PC.1 Career Paths**—How the program ensures that students understand the paths to becoming licensed as an architect in the United States and the range of available career opportunities that utilize the discipline's skills and knowledge. *(p.9)*

☒ **Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

The program ensures an understanding of PC.1 Career Paths through ARPL 101 Architecture Foundations 1, ARPL 432 Integrated Studio Supplement (ISS), and ARPL 722 Practice Management. Supplemental experiences include lectures and events that had students and faculty from outside the architecture program. The program provided the syllabus, lecture materials, and student work for review.

The program's assessment plan describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. The process will be reoccurring and documented as a one-page quantitative course assessment summary that identifies six (6) - eight (8) specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The date on the forms indicates that the program's last assessments were in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmarks (grades and NCARB data) were listed for each class as a percentage and met.

**PC.2 Design**—How the program instills in students the role of the design process in shaping the built environment and conveys the methods by which design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities. *(p.9)*

☒ **Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

The program ensures an understanding of PC.2 Design through a series of design studios- ARPL202 Arch Design 1, ARPL301 Arch Design 2, ARPL302 Arch Design 3, ARPL401 Arch Design 4, ARPL402 Integrated Building Design Studio, and ARPL601/603/701 Concentration Studios I, II, III. The program provided syllabi, assignments, student work, and faculty class evaluations.

The assessment process focused on evaluating design studio projects. The assessment plan describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The process will be reoccurring and documented as a one-page quantitative course assessment summary that identifies six (6) - eight (8) specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The benchmark for each class was listed as a percent, based on the class grade, and was met.

**PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility**—How the program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities. *(p.9)*

☒ Met

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program ensures an understanding of PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility through APRL 383 Ethics and Stewardship, APRL 221 Predesign, APRL 232 Environmental Design I, and APRL 402 IBDS Studio. Supplemental experiences include lectures and events that had students and faculty from outside the architecture program. The program provided the syllabus, lecture materials, and student work for review.

The assessment process uses quizzes, assignments, and final exams. Student evaluations are shared with the school's Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. This feedback, along with the A.E. partner firm's comments, is shared with the Faculty Advisory Committee, which guides recommended improvements to the course. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The process will be reoccurring and documented as a one-page quantitative course assessment summary that identifies six (6) - eight (8) specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmark for each class was listed as a percent and was met.

**PC.4 History and Theory**—How the program ensures that students understand the histories and theories of architecture and urbanism, framed by diverse social, cultural, economic, and political forces, nationally and globally. (p.9)

☒ Met

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program ensures an understanding of PC.4 History and Theory through APRL 101 Arch Foundations 1, Introduction to Arch, APRL 211 History of Arch 1, APRL 212 History of Arch 2, APRL 241 Theory of the Orders, ARPL 311 History of Arch 3, ARPL 314 Intro to Arch Theory, ARPL 636 Design Process and Methods, and ARPL 696 Thesis 1. experiences include guest lectures and a hands-on project focused on understanding joinery and craft by constructing a full-scale replica of truss #6 from Notre Dame de Paris, destroyed in the fire of 2019. The diversity of lectures and student project assignments provide a broad understanding of architectural and urban history and theory from national to global and across diverse social and cultural contexts.

The program provided the syllabus, lecture materials, and student work for review. The assessment plan includes outlining the P.C. 4 learning outcomes and documenting benchmarks and actions for improvement based on tests, quizzes, visual presentations, and written papers. The plan also includes continuous feedback from students through course evaluations and architecture and engineering consulting firms engaged juries of the work. Student evaluations are shared with the school's Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. This feedback and the A.E. partner firm's comments are shared with the Faculty Advisory Committee. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The process will be reoccurring and documented as a one-page quantitative course assessment summary that identifies six (6) - eight (8) specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmark for each class was listed as a percent and was met.

**PC.5 Research and Innovation**—How the program prepares students to engage and participate in architectural research to test and evaluate innovations in the field. (p.9)

☒ Met

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program ensures an understanding of PC.5 Research and Innovation through APRL 241/741 Theory of Orders, APRL 402 Integrated Building Design Studio (IBDS), APRL 432 Integrated Building Design

Studio, APRL 636 Design Process and Methods, ARPL 696 A-C Thesis I, and ARPL 696 B-D Thesis II. The Supplemental experiences include a university-wide Research Day each April. Students devote the day to consideration of the role and impact of research on society, the profession, and their individual lives. In addition, guest lectures and the Walton Critic Program bring prominent practitioners to campus to share with students some perspectives on how research and innovation are deployed in practice to serve society.

The program provided the syllabus, lecture materials, and student work for review. The assessment plan for this criterion includes documenting benchmarks and actions for improvement based on an annual pin-up review of low and high-pass student work in the IDBS and Thesis I and II studios each year. Reviewing and teaching faculty convene to determine if the work constitutes research and evaluate the depth and breadth of the resulting analysis. External practitioners and academic guests also provide assessment and award decisions through review juries. The assessment results are shared with the Faculty Advisory Committee, which guides recommended improvements to the course. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The process will be reoccurring and documented as a one-page quantitative course assessment summary that identifies six (6) - eight (8) specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmark for each class was listed as a percent and was met.

**PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration**—How the program ensures that students understand approaches to leadership in multidisciplinary teams, diverse stakeholder constituents, and dynamic physical and social contexts, and learn how to apply effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems. (p.9)

☑ Met

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

The program ensures an understanding of PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration through ARPL221, ARPL483, ARPL523, ARPL615, ARPL402, and ARPL602. Supplemental experiences include lectures and events that had students and faculty from outside the architecture program. The program provided the syllabus, lecture materials, and student work for review.

The program's assessment plan describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. The process will be reoccurring and documented as a one-page quantitative course assessment summary that identifies six (6) - eight (8) specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmarks (grades and NCARB data) were listed for each class as a percentage and met.

**PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture**—How the program fosters and ensures a positive and respectful environment that encourages optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation among its faculty, students, administration, and staff. (p.9)

☑ Met

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

The program ensures an understanding of PC.8 Learning and Teaching Culture through a studio policy and courses. The program provided a copy of a policy on studio culture that lists core principles, including engagement of faculty, staff, and students in the architectural program, university community, and surrounding community; maintaining a quality of life for all members of the CUA community; understanding the consequences of behaviors and actions; and upholding ethical and professional environment. These principles are reinforced in town hall forums and by instructors in their studios.

The APR listed several courses that instilled the values. Assessments in each class are recorded, and the faculty and administration work to improve communication and address the concerns of faculty and

students. A team of faculty and students reviews the studio culture policy to ensure implementation and assess its effectiveness and pertinence. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The process will be reoccurring and documented as a one-page quantitative course assessment summary that identifies six (6) - eight (8) specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmark for each class was listed as a percent and was met.

**PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion**—How the program furthers and deepens students' understanding of diverse cultural and social contexts and helps them translate that understanding into built environments that equitably support and include people of different backgrounds, resources, and abilities. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program ensures an understanding of P.C.8 Social Equity and Inclusion in several courses, including ARPL302/501 Architectural Design II (Studio), ARPL311 History of Architecture 3, and ARPL401/601 Architectural Design 4 Concentration Studio. The program provided the following materials for review, class Syllabus, Student assignments, Student studio projects, and faculty course evaluations. The assessment plan for this criterion includes measures of student learning through a quiz, assignments, exams, and Studio Projects (as applicable). The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process.

The program's assessment plan describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. The process is documented as a one-page quantitative Course Assessment summary that identifies 6-8 specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. Upcoming changes/ improvements include increased overlaps of coursework and shared learning opportunities. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmark for each class was listed as a percent and was met.

**3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes** (Guidelines, p. 10)

A program must demonstrate how it addresses the following criteria through program curricula and other experiences, with an emphasis on the articulation of learning objectives and assessment.

**SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment**—How the program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities. (p.10)

☒ **Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program ensures an understanding of SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment in the following classes, ARPL221 Predesign, ARPL232/532 Environmental Design 1, ARPL331/731 Environmental Design 2, and several structures courses ARPL441/541, ARPL442/542, and ARPL742 Advanced Structures. Supplemental experiences include guest lectures. The assessment plan for this criterion measured student learning through quizzes, assignments, exams, and final drawing deliverables (when applicable).

The assessment plan includes collecting data, analyzing results, and identifying actionable insights for continuous improvement. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The process is documented as a one-page quantitative Course Assessment summary that identifies 6-8 specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The program did not meet its

benchmarks in ARPL221, ARPL232, ARPL331, ARPL441, and ARPL742. Upcoming changes/improvements include course transitions from the old curriculum to the new.

**SC.2 Professional Practice**—How the program ensures that students understand professional ethics, the regulatory requirements, the fundamental business processes relevant to architecture practice in the United States, and the forces influencing change in these subjects. (p.10)

☒ **Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program ensures an understanding of SC.2 Professional Practice through APRL 221 Predesign, APRL 383 Ethics and Stewardship, APRL 722 Professional Practice, APRL 402 IBDS Studio, and ARPL 432 Integrated Studio Supplement. Supplemental experiences include engagement by the School of Architecture with firms in professional practice in the D.C. area, providing students with contacts, and engaging alums and practitioners in round table discussions on practice, course assignments, and guest lectures connected to the learning objectives of SC 2 Professional Practice. The program provided syllabi, lecture materials, and student work for review. The assessment plan for this criterion includes measures of student learning through a quiz, assignments, and final exams.

The program's assessment plan includes collecting data, analyzing results, and identifying actionable insights for continuous improvement. The plan consists of a framework outlining the SC.2 learning outcomes and documentation of benchmarks and actions for progress based on continuous feedback from students through course evaluations and architecture and engineering consulting firms engaged in the IBDS Studio. Student evaluations are shared with the school's Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. This feedback, along with the A.E. partner firm's comments, is shared with the Faculty Advisory Committee, which guides recommended improvements to the course. Recommendations for improvements to APRL 722, Professional Practice include considering alternative assessment strategies and early intervention with students falling below benchmarks and offering additional tutoring. These recommendations for improvements are made to the Faculty Advisory Committee, which considers them for future adoption. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The process will be reoccurring and documented as a one-page quantitative course assessment summary that identifies six (6) - eight (8) specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmark for each class was listed as a percent and was met.

**SC.3 Regulatory Context**—How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project. (p.10)

☒ **Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program ensures an understanding of SC.3 Regulatory Context through the following classes, ARPL 101 Introduction to Architecture, ARPL 383 Ethics + Stewardship, ARPL 402 IBDS Studio + ARPL 432 Integrated Studio Supplement, ARPL 722 Professional Practice. The assessment plan for this criterion measured student learning through quizzes, assignments, exams, and final drawing deliverables (when applicable).

The program's assessment process includes gathering student feedback through course evaluations and professional input from the architecture and engineering firms engaged in the IBDS Studio. Recommendations for improvements are made to the Faculty Advisory Committee. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The process will be reoccurring and documented as a one-page quantitative course assessment summary that identifies six (6) - eight (8) specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that

the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmark for each class was listed as a percent and was met.

**SC.4 Technical Knowledge**—How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects. (p.10)

☑ Met

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

The program ensures student understanding of SC.4 Technical Knowledge through courses that address established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies and how they are evaluated. The sequence includes multiple classes in building construction, structural design, and environment design and culminates in two Integrated Building Design Studios. The exercises focus on basic building systems, structural steel and concrete systems, HVAC components, and cost estimating. For supplemental instruction, students take field trips to construction sites and build models of different structural approaches to help illustrate the design and construction process. The program provided syllabi, lecture materials, and student work for review. The assessment plan for this criterion includes measures of student learning through a quiz, assignments, and final exams.

The Integrated Building Design Studio is assessed at the end of each semester during a meeting of all faculty and associate deans and separate evaluations by students. Successes and challenges are identified and corrected for the upcoming year. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The process is documented as a one-page quantitative Course Assessment summary that identifies specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmark for each class was listed as a percent and was met.

**SC.5 Design Synthesis**—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions. (p. 12)

☑ Met

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

The program ensures student ability of SC.3 Design Synthesis to synthesize user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design in an architectural project through APRL 402 and ARPL 602 Integrated Building Design Studio, and APRL 432 and APRL 632 Integrated Studio Supplement. Supplemental experiences include lectures and events that unite students and faculty with practitioners outside the School of Architecture. As noted earlier, the strong relationships between the School of Architecture at CUA and firms in professional practice in the D.C. area provide students with regular engagement sponsor firms that host students in their offices. The direct experience of working with practicing architects and engineers aligns with the learning objectives of SC 5, as students gain insight through the lens of individual team members and how diverse expertise is synthesized to address the multiple considerations and associated environmental impacts of design decisions. The program provided the syllabus, assignments, and final studio projects. The assessment for this criterion includes measures of student learning through a review of student work at progress intervals of 60%, 90%, and 100% Design Development Set presentations.

The program's assessment process includes gathering student feedback through course evaluations, professional input from the architecture and engineering firms engaged in the IBDS Studio and ARE scores for the preceding 5-year window following graduation for Programming & Analysis, Project Planning & Design, and Project Development & Documentation. Student evaluations are shared with the

school's Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. This feedback, along with the A.E. partner firm's comments, is shared with the Faculty Advisory Committee, which guides recommended improvements to the course. Recommendations for improving these courses include integrating some of the "facets" of course content into other prerequisites to increase familiarity and ability leading up to these courses. These recommendations for improvements are made to the Faculty Advisory Committee, which will consider them for future adoption. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The process is documented as a one-page quantitative Course Assessment summary that identifies specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmark for each class was listed as a percent and was met.

**SC.6 Building Integration**—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance. (p. 12)

☒ **Met**

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

The program ensures student ability of SC.6 Building Integration in ARPL 402 Integrated Building Design and the accompanying lecture class ARPL432 Integrated Studio Supplement. As stated earlier, the supplemental experiences include lectures and events that unite students and faculty with practitioners outside the School of Architecture. The direct experience of working with practicing architects and engineers aligns with the learning objectives of SC 6. The program provided the syllabus, assignments, and final studio projects.

The program's assessment process includes gathering student feedback through course evaluations and professional input from the architecture and engineering firms engaged in the IBDS Studio. Recommendations for improvements are made to the Faculty Advisory Committee. The administration and faculty interviews confirmed the evidence and process. The process will be reoccurring and documented as a one-page quantitative course assessment summary that identifies six (6) - eight (8) specific learning criteria and provides recommendations for each unmet criterion. The forms indicate that the last assessments were done in the 2021-2022 academic year. The benchmark for each class was listed as a percent and was met.

#### 4—Curricular Framework (Guidelines, p. 13)

This condition addresses the institution's regional accreditation and the program's degree nomenclature, credit-hour and curricular requirements, and the process used to evaluate student preparatory work.

##### 4.1 Institutional Accreditation (Guidelines, p. 13)

For the NAAB to accredit a professional degree program in architecture, the program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education:

- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
- Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)
- New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE)
- Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)
- WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC)

☒ **Met**

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

The APR included a copy of the most recent letter from the regional accrediting commission/agency as evidence.

#### 4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum *(Guidelines, p. 13)*

The NAAB accredits professional degree programs with the following titles: 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 optional studies.

- 4.2.1 **Professional Studies.** Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program are the core of a professional degree program that leads to licensure. Knowledge from these courses is used to satisfy Condition 3—Program and Student Criteria. The degree program has the flexibility to add additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. In its documentation, the program must clearly indicate which professional courses are required for all students. *(p.13)*
- 4.2.2 **General Studies.** An important component of architecture education, general studies provide basic knowledge and methodologies of the humanities, fine arts, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences. Programs must document how students earning an accredited degree achieve a broad, interdisciplinary understanding of human knowledge. In most cases, the general studies requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution's baccalaureate degree. Graduate programs must describe and document the criteria and process used to evaluate applicants' prior academic experience relative to this requirement. Programs accepting transfers from other institutions must document the criteria and process used to ensure that the general education requirement was covered at another institution. *(p.14)*
- 4.2.3 **Optional Studies.** All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum to allow students to develop additional expertise, either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking courses offered within the department offering the accredited program but outside the required professional studies curriculum. These courses may be configured in a variety of curricular structures, including elective offerings, concentrations, certificate programs, and minors. *(p.14)*

NAAB-accredited professional degree programs have the exclusive right to use the B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. titles, which are recognized by the public as accredited degrees and therefore may not be used by non-accredited programs.

The number of credit hours for each degree is outlined below. All accredited programs must conform to minimum credit-hour requirements established by the institution's regional accreditor.

- 4.2.4 **Bachelor of Architecture.** The B. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 150 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in general studies, professional studies, and optional studies, all of which are delivered or accounted for (either by transfer or articulation) by the institution that will grant the degree. Programs must document the required professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.
- 4.2.5 **Master of Architecture.** The M. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate coursework and a minimum of 30 semester credits of graduate coursework. Programs must document the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for both the undergraduate and graduate degrees.
- 4.2.6 **Doctor of Architecture.** The D. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 210 credits, or the

quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate and graduate coursework. The D. Arch. requires a minimum of 90 graduate-level semester credit hours, or the graduate-level 135 quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in professional studies and optional studies. Programs must document, for both undergraduate and graduate degrees, the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.

☒ **Met**

### 2022 Team Analysis:

The program provides a specific curriculum of required courses for a Master of Architecture degree. The degree courses are listed on the school's website (4.2.1) and in the APR. The administration interviews and website confirmed the APR credit hour evidence. The program's English, Math, Philosophy, Sociology, and Religion courses address the requirements of General Studies (4.2.2) and Optional Studies (4.2.3). In addition, the curriculum allows a particular number of hours for elective courses. To graduate with a professional degree, a student must accumulate 84 hours of professional practice, 30 hours of general studies, and 12 hours of elective courses. Many students achieve collaborative engineering and pre-professional architecture degrees. Students at CUA can obtain a master's degree in two or three years, depending on their undergraduate degree. Each degree requires 60 credit hours; therefore, the total hours required substantially exceed 168 (4.2.5). A few students are admitted to the master's program with advanced standing and can graduate with 45 hours. CUA does not offer a Doctor of Architecture degree.

### 4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education *(Guidelines, p. 16)*

The NAAB recognizes that students transferring to an undergraduate accredited program or entering a graduate accredited program come from different types of programs and have different needs, aptitudes, and knowledge bases. In this condition, a program must demonstrate that it utilizes a thorough and equitable process to evaluate incoming students and that it documents the accreditation criteria it expects students to have met in their education experiences in non-accredited programs.

- 4.3.1 A program must document its process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria when it admits a student to the professional degree program.
- 4.3.2 In the event a program relies on the preparatory education experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain accreditation criteria, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these accreditation criteria are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- 4.3.3 A program must demonstrate that it has clearly articulated the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content in the admissions process, and that a candidate understands the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program before accepting an offer of admission.

☒ **Met**

### 2023 Team Analysis:

CUA accepts applications from transfer students in the fall and spring semesters, and the application process is explained on the school's website (4.3.3). They documented specific criteria for reviewing credits applied toward a Master of Architecture degree (4.3.1). Applications are accepted from other 4-year architecture programs and community colleges. Transfer students are admitted if studio space is available and if they have maintained at least a 2.80-grade point average. Transfer credits are evaluated based on established standards (4.3.2). The associate dean meets with students to communicate their placement in the program. The team verified the evidence in meetings with the dean and associate dean, and a website review confirmed the APR narrative.

## 5—Resources

### 5.1 Structure and Governance *(Guidelines, p. 18)*

The program must describe the administrative and governance processes that provide for organizational continuity, clarity, and fairness and allow for improvement and change.

- 5.1.1 **Administrative Structure:** Describe the administrative structure and identify key personnel in the program and school, college, and institution.
- 5.1.2 **Governance:** Describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures and how these structures relate to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

#### ☒ Described

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

The program describes administrative and governance processes that provide continuity, clarity, and fairness, allowing for improvement and change. The Structure and Governance of the program are evidenced by the Architectural Program Report, referenced documentation, and website links and through subsequent visiting team interviews. The assessment plan for this criterion includes several measures of checks and balances as documented in the school's structure and available documents.

The program provided the Architectural Program Report, Organization of the University, University Bylaws, Current Governing Documents, Historical Documents, Academic Senate webpages, and Current Organizational Chart. The program's assessment plan describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. The program last assessed this criterion in the 2022-2023 academic year. The team verified the evidence in meetings with the dean and associate dean, and a website review confirmed the APR narrative.

### 5.2 Planning and Assessment *(Guidelines, p. 18)*

The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies:

- 5.2.1 The program's multiyear strategic objectives, including the requirement to meet the NAAB Conditions, as part of the larger institutional strategic planning and assessment efforts.
- 5.2.2 Key performance indicators used by the unit and the institution.
- 5.2.3 How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated multiyear objectives.
- 5.2.4 Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program as it strives to continuously improve learning outcomes and opportunities.
- 5.2.5 Ongoing outside input from others, including practitioners.

The program must also demonstrate that it regularly uses the results of self-assessments to advise and encourage changes and adjustments that promote student and faculty success.

#### ☒ Not Demonstrated

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

While the APR begins with a section labeled "multiyear strategic objectives," the objectives are not listed (5.2.1). Instead, the writer indicates problems due to the "changeover in administration" and "NAAB advancing the visit by one year." While six items are identified as an "emphasis," six items are listed as how the program will "advance the mission." In addition, none of them are measurable, so it is unclear how the program will measure success.

The APR lists multiple Key Performance Indicators the unit uses (5.2.2). This list includes statistical profiles, course evaluations, Common Data Sets (CDS), surveys, juror feedback, ARE Exam scores, and other forms of statistical data. The Team confirmed the evidence in meetings with the administration.

While the program identified six strategic objectives on page 103 of the APR, it does not evaluate how well it is progressing toward its mission. For example, the "Progress Toward the Mission" section on page 109 has six headings that are not on page 103 Strategic Objectives. While pages 112 and page 113 reference the original six strategic objectives, none of the objectives or their updates are quantitative. For example, objective #3 is "increase enrollment," and objective #4 is "Increase alumni and philanthropic support." The APR never sets a quantitative goal or describes how much either objective has increased. While the APR lists several attempted actions, the document does not list multi-year objectives (5.2.3).

The APR lists the program's strengths, challenges, and opportunities (5.2.4). It also clarifies the program's relationship with the local architecture community. While professionals can provide valuable input, it is too early to see if the comments significantly impact (5.2.5).

### **5.3 Curricular Development** *(Guidelines, p. 19)*

The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for assessing its curriculum and making adjustments based on the outcome of the assessment. The program must identify:

- 5.3.1 The relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including NAAB program and student criteria.
- 5.3.2 The roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

#### **☒ Demonstrated**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

The APR presented a well-reasoned process for assessing its curriculum. Currently, the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) is responsible for assessments and adjustments to the curriculum. The FAC develops, adopts, and maintains the curricular goals and oversees their implementation by instructors and design studio coordinators. After the academic year, the FAC reviews and comments on student design work examples. It meets regularly (5.3.1).

The Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) is responsible for setting curricular initiatives. The small number of faculty and the need for close coordination called for consolidating the responsibility for assessing and amending the curriculum in one entity. The FAC is led by a chair who reports to the Executive Committee. The FAC will oversee a regular procedure and timetable for course assessments and improvements.

### **5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development** *(Guidelines, p. 19)*

The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate and adequately funded human resources to support student learning and achievement. Human resources include full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. The program must:

- 5.4.1 Demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty in a way that promotes student and faculty achievement.
- 5.4.2 Demonstrate that it has an Architect Licensing Advisor who is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. These duties include attending the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay up-to-date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.
- 5.4.3 Demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- 5.4.4 Describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, mental well-being, career guidance, internship, and job placement.

#### **☒ Not Demonstrated**

### 2023 Team Analysis:

The program balances the workload with an appointment of 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service (5.4.1). In coordination with the university and the provost's March 2022 Task Force on Faculty Workload Apportionment, they concluded that the schools are too diverse for a single, uniform workload apportionment. The School of Architecture's representative on the provost task force is currently working with the dean to define the school's specific policy within the context of the university. The team verified the evidence in meetings with the dean, associate dean, and faculty.

The APR identifies a faculty member as the architect licensing advisor and lists his qualifications and responsibilities. As the guidelines require, the APR does not "clarify his professional development in support of his/r responsibilities." The more significant issues were raised in the meetings with students. The students could not identify who currently serves as the advisor (5.4.2) and were unaware of the training. In the faculty meeting, the individual confirmed his involvement but did not provide evidence that he attends the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and other training opportunities to stay current on the licensure requirements. In the faculty meeting, the advisor said he offered Saturday meetings to communicate IPAL information, but they were not well attended.

The APR describes the faculty and staff opportunities for professional development (5.4.3). Faculty and staff can apply for a \$2,000/year professional development and conference attendance stipend. The school is also formulating an annual peer-reviewed compensation of \$5,000 to \$15,000 to advance the dialogue between the classical and modern design realms. The team verified the statements in meetings with the school administration and faculty.

The APR describes the students' support services (5.4.4) and links to the CUA Center for Academic and Career Success. Several courses in the School of Architecture provide students with opportunities for direct engagement with professionals in practice, providing valuable insights into careers, potential internships, and job placement. The dean of students described the support services available to students at the university, including academic and personal advising, student wellness, emotional and physical health, and career guidance. The team verified the statements in meetings with the faculty and staff.

### 5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion *(Guidelines, p. 20)*

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

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

☒ Not Demonstrated

### 2023 Team Analysis:

The APR describes the program's attempt to improve diversity and inclusion among current faculty, staff, and students. While the APR describes anti-racism actions and providing opportunities for immigrants, it does not clarify how diversity is reflected in human, physical, and financial resource distribution (5.5.1). The document does identify a series of steps to increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff (5.5.2 and students (5.5.3). In addition, Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) policies are in place (5.5.4), and resources are in place to support faculty, staff, and students with different physical or mental abilities (5.5.5). The team verified the statements in meetings with the administration.

### 5.6 Physical Resources *(Guidelines, p. 21)*

The program must describe its physical resources and demonstrate how they safely and equitably support the program's pedagogical approach and student and faculty achievement. Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

- 5.6.1 Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- 5.6.2 Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including lecture halls, seminar spaces, small group study rooms, labs, shops, and equipment.
- 5.6.3 Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- 5.6.4 Resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program's pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, off-site, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

#### ☒ Demonstrated

### 2023 Team Analysis:

The program's APR and a virtual tour link provided evidence that the program has appropriate space to support and encourage studio-based learning (5.6.1). As a supplement, additional evidence was provided by a detailed summary of existing rooms in the school and the associated improvements to facilities with the recent \$1.25 Million renovation that includes new A.V. and computer equipment. A live tour conducted by the dean and associate dean of facilities during studio hours provided real-time observation and discussions with faculty and students, reinforcing the positive role of the facility in supporting student learning. The team verified the evidence in meetings with the school administration, students, and faculty.

The program's APR provided evidence that spaces support and encourage didactic and interactive learning (5.6.2). The virtual tour and interviews with faculty and students showed a lecture hall, seminar space, small group study rooms, labs, shops, equipment, and other areas. The full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising, was provided in the virtual tour and confirmed in discussions with faculty. The team verified the evidence in meetings with the school administration and faculty.

The program's APR and virtual tour provided evidence that the program's spaces support and promote a full range of faculty roles and responsibilities (5.6.3). The space needed to prepare for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising, was provided and confirmed in discussions with faculty. The team also verified the evidence in meetings with the school administration.

The program's demonstration of sub-condition 5.6.4, Support for all learning formats and pedagogies, is based on the APR. Evidence that resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in the program were seen in the virtual tour video and live stream in a walk-through with the dean and associate dean. The team verified the evidence in meetings with the school administration.

### 5.7 Financial Resources *(Guidelines, p. 21)*

The program must demonstrate that it has the appropriate institutional support and financial resources to support student learning and achievement during the next term of accreditation.

**☒ Demonstrated**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program has demonstrated that it has the appropriate institutional Support and financial resources to support student learning and achievement during the next term of Accreditation ensures student as evidenced by the Architectural Program Report and Budget committee reports. The program provided the following materials for review, meeting minutes, overall revenue review, and current/future budget reports. The program's assessment plan describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. The program last assessed this criterion in the 2022-2023 academic year. The program did meet its revenue baselines, as evidenced in its reports. Upcoming changes/improvements include increased fund-raising campaigns, enrollment, and donations contributions. The team verified the evidence in meetings with the school administration.

**5.8 Information Resources** *(Guidelines, p. 22)*

The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient and equitable access to architecture literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in architecture.

Further, the program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resource professionals who provide discipline-relevant information services that support teaching and research.

**☒ Demonstrated**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program's APR and weblinks provided evidence of convenient and equitable access for all students, faculty, and staff to resources like the Mullen Library. The collection includes access to Washington Research Libraries Consortium, which provides access to approximately 12 million titles that are accessible within 24 hours. Additional resources include architecture-specific databases such as the Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals, ARTstor, GreenFILE, Sustainability, and Building Green. Mullen provides an online Architecture Planning Guide with an overview of these resources and others. CUA University Libraries Organization chart illustrates a staff of over 30 team members, including providing services in University Archives and Special Collections, Research and Instruction, and Resource Management and Digital Services. Each service area leader reports to the University Librarian. The team verified the evidence in meetings with the school administration, students, and the school faculty, as well as a review of associated website links.

## **6—Public Information**

The NAAB expects accredited degree programs to provide information to the public about accreditation activities and the relationship between the program and the NAAB, admissions and advising, and career information, as well as accurate public information about accredited and non-accredited architecture programs. The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the public. As a result, all NAAB-accredited programs are required to ensure that the following information is posted online and is easily available to the public.

**6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees** *(Guidelines, p. 23)*

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*, Appendix 2, in catalogs and promotional media, including the program's website.

**☒ Met**

### 2023 Team Analysis:

The program's website includes a section on Accreditation with the exact language from the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Students can access it through this link: <https://architecture.catholic.edu/about-us/accreditation/index.html>. The team verified the evidence by visiting the school website during the visit.

### 6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures (Guidelines, p. 23)

The program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program's website:

- a) *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*
- b) *Conditions for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2014, depending on the date of the last visit)
- c) *Procedures for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*
- d) *Procedures for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2012 or 2015, depending on the date of the last visit)

☒ Met

### 2023 Team Analysis:

The school includes all required documents on its website (<https://architecture.catholic.edu/about-us/accreditation/index.html>). The needed documents included the Requirements for Accreditation, Conditions for Accreditation, Procedures for Accreditation, the last Visiting Team Report, the 2017 and 2020 Interim Progress Reports, and the 2021 NAAB response. Interested parties and the public can access all documentation about the program's accreditation status. The team verified the evidence by visiting the school website during the visit.

### 6.3 Access to Career Development Information (Guidelines, p. 23)

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that help them develop, evaluate, and implement career, education, and employment plans.

☒ Met

### 2023 Team Analysis:

The School of Architecture and Planning established the Center for Academic and Career Success to advise students throughout their academic careers as stipulated in condition 6.3. Each student is assigned to a career advisor who assists them with their curriculum, training opportunities and connecting with potential employers. They receive help in long-term career planning, preparing resumes, and finding summer internships. Each year the school hosts a career fair with the participation of several local firms. Local firms also act as consultants in studio design projects, and this process offers a good networking opportunity. Several students interviewed by the visiting team have taken advantage of the advisor's services. However, many have not. Many attended the last career fair and were enthusiastic about the opportunities it provided.

### 6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents (Guidelines, p. 23)

To promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program's website:

- a) All Interim Progress Reports and narratives of Program Annual Reports submitted since the last team visit
- b) All NAAB responses to any Plan to Correct and any NAAB responses to the Program Annual Reports since the last team visit
- c) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB
- d) The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit

- e) The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda
- f) The program's optional response to the Visiting Team Report
- g) Plan to Correct (if applicable)
- h) NCARB ARE pass rates
- i) Statements and/or policies on learning and teaching culture
- j) Statements and/or policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion

☒ **Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program's APR and administration meetings indicated that the required documents were available via the website. The team reviewed the program website and found them to be available. Specifically, this included.

- a) All Interim Progress Reports and narratives of Program Annual Reports
- b) All NAAB responses to any Plan to Correct and any NAAB responses to the Program Annual Reports since the last team visit
- c) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB
- d) The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit
- e) The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda
- f) The program's optional response to the Visiting Team Report
- g) Plan to Correct (if applicable)
- h) NCARB ARE pass rates
- i) Statements and policies on learning and teaching culture
- j) Statements and policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion

**6.5 Admissions and Advising** (*Guidelines, p. 24*)

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern the evaluation of applicants for admission to the accredited program. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers from within and outside the institution. This documentation must include the following:

- a) Application forms and instructions
- b) Admissions requirements; admissions-decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (when required); and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing
- c) Forms and a description of the process for evaluating the content of a non-accredited degrees
- d) Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships
- e) Explanation of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures

☒ **Not Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program has publicly documented the policies and procedures that govern the evaluation of applicants for admission to the accredited program. The procedures include first-time, first-year students, transfers from within and outside the institution, and program-provided application forms and instructions. But, the program did not provide evidence for the "Evaluation of Transcripts."

The program evaluated transcripts and student portfolios during the summer. Through visiting team interviews, different parties expressed and communicated that students of varying levels of learning were co-mixed. Still, the requirements for learning and assignments were standardized for all students regardless of class. But the program did not provide evidence for decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing.

Forms and Descriptions of the process for evaluating the content of non-accredited degrees were provided. A team member confirmed that the program website had financial aid information and links to the forms for applying for financial aid. The program's assessment plan describes a regular mechanism to

collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. The program last assessed this criterion in the 2022-2023 academic year.

A visiting team member was able to find information on "Anti-Discrimination" and "Anti-Harassment" policies but was not able to understand "how diversity goals affect admissions procedures. Therefore, the team determined this condition is not met.

**6.6 Student Financial Information** (*Guidelines, p. 24*)

- 6.6.1 The program must demonstrate that students have access to current resources and advice for making decisions about financial aid.
- 6.6.2 The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

**☒ Not Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program's demonstration of sub-condition 6.6.1, financial aid decisions, is based on the CUA website. The School of Architecture website identifies several forms of financial assistance offered to qualified students, including research and student-teaching scholarships. Information is also provided for various financing options, contact information, and office hours for the Office of Student Financial Assistance. Website links provide financial literacy on financial aid basics, how to apply, and an overview of financial aid programs. The team verified the evidence during the visit by visiting the website.

The program's demonstration of sub-condition 6.6.2, Student access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required, is based on the CUA website. CUA's website includes a summary of tuition, mandatory fees, and room and board with a total direct cost for graduate-level programs. Website links provide access to more detailed information on affordability, including a "Full Cost of Attendance for Graduate Students."

While the summary identifies slightly higher tuition for engineering and architecture students and an interactive financial aid planner is available, the team did not find estimates for specialized materials required for architecture students. The students described the specialized materials as a significant cost that often exceeds the allowance included in student fees for the program. The team verified the evidence during the visit by visiting the website and reviewing embedded links. Therefore, the team determined this condition is not met.

## **V. Appendices**

### **Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction**

N/A

## Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

Master of Architecture 2

Master of Architecture 2		BS.Arch COURSES																								M.Arch COURSES			
																										Year 1		Year 2	
																										Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Preparatory Education		ARPL101	ARPL211	ARPL 221	ARPL241	ARPL301	ARPL311	ARPL331	ARPL333	ARPL383	ARPL401	ARPL441	ARPL202	ARPL212	ARPL232	ARPL302	ARPL314	ARPL402/602	ARPL432/632	ARPL434	ARPL442	ARPL601	ARPL636	ARPL603	ARPL742	ARPL696A.C	ARPL701	ARPL696B.D	ARPL 722
		Architectural Foundations I: Intro to Architecture																								Concentration Studio		Thesis 1	
		History of Architecture 1																								Design Process and Methods		Concentration Studio III	
		Pre-Design																								Concentration Studio		Thesis 2	
		Theory of the Orders																								Advanced Structures		Professional Practice	
		Architectural Design 2																											
		History of Architecture 3																											
		Environmental Design 2																											
		Construction 1																											
		Ethics + Stewardship***																											
		Architectural Design 4																											
		Structures 1																											
		Architectural Design 1																											
		History of Architecture 2																											
		Environmental Design 1																											
		Architectural Design 3																											
		Introduction to Architectural Theory																											
		Integrated Bldg. Design Studio (IBDS)																											
		Integrated Studio Supplement (ISS)																											
		Construction 2																											
		Structures 2																											
Shared Values																													
Design																													
Env. Stewardship & Professional Respon.																													
Equity, Diversity & Inclusion																													
Knowledge & Innovation																													
Leadership, Collab. & Community Engmt.																													
Lifelong Learning																													
Program Criteria																													
PC.1 Career Paths																													
PC.2 Design																													
PC.3 Ecological Know. & Respon.																													
PC.4 History & Theory																													
PC.5 Research & Innovation																													
PC.6 Leadership & Collaboration																													
PC.7 Learning & Teaching Culture																													
PC.8 Social Equity & Inclusion																													
Student Criteria																													
SC.1 HSW in the Built Environ.																													
SC.2 Professional Practice																													
SC.3 Regulatory Context																													
SC.4 Technical Knowledge																													
SC.5 Design Synthesis																													
SC.6 Building Integration																													

Master of Architecture 3

[illegible]

### Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

**Team Chair**

Andrew Chin

Interim Dean

School of Architecture + Engineering Technology Florida A&M University

Tallahassee, FL

850-339-8168

[andrew.chin@famu.edu](mailto:andrew.chin@famu.edu)

Garett "Gary" Warner, AIA

President, Founding Partner

Warner-Nease-Bost Architects

Kansas City, MO

[gwarner@wnbarchitects.com](mailto:gwarner@wnbarchitects.com)

James Wesala, AIA, NCARB

Project Architect

Richard Kennedy Architects

Phoenix, AZ

[dbj.architecture@gmail.com](mailto:dbj.architecture@gmail.com)

Chris Brasier, FAIA, NCARB, LEED AP

AE Certificate Program Director

Duke University

Durham, NC

[cb21@duke.edu](mailto:cb21@duke.edu)

## VI. Report Signatures


Respectfully Submitted,



Andrew Chin, NOMA  
Team Chair



Chris Brasier, FAIA, LEED AP  
Team Member



Gary Warner, AIA, LEED AP  
Team Member



James Wesala, AIA  
Team Member