2024 Visiting Team Report

University of Cincinnati
The School of Architecture and
Interior Design

M.Arch.
Track: M1 99 credit hours
Track: M2 64 credit hours

Continuing Accreditation Visit
March 3-6, 2024

Contents

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The team would like to extend its thanks to the school community for their extensive preparation for the visit. We benefited immeasurably from our engagement with students, faculty, and staff and our review was enhanced by our ability to visit the college and the school's impressive learning environments. We want to acknowledge Edward Mitchell and Vincent Sansalone for their commitment to the advancement of the program and their tireless attention and responsiveness in advance of and during the visit. We also wish to extend our thanks to Kimberly Lawson and Julie Crowe for their efforts.

During meetings with stakeholders throughout the visit, the team noted the distinctive strengths of the institution and the program. The co-op program at the University of Cincinnati continues to be integral to the program and is clearly valued by students and the professional community. The recent restructuring of the Master of Architecture (M1 and M2) curricula has been a significant development for the school. Research themes tied to critical issues for our discipline have been articulated and are clearly reflected in the core curriculum and elective offerings. The program enjoys a vibrant and committed group of students, thoughtful leadership, an impressive faculty, and terrific staff.

The team would like to commend the program on the following criteria:

PC.1   Career Paths
PC.4   History and Theory
SC.2   Professional Practice

Conditions with a Team Recommendation to the Board as Not Achieved:

PC.2   Design
PC.5   Research and Innovation
PC.7   Learning and Teaching Culture
PC.8   Social Equity and Inclusion
SC.1   Health Safety and Welfare
SC.5   Design Synthesis
SC.6   Building Integration
5.2   Planning and Assessment
5.3   Curricular Development
5.4   Human Resource and Human Resource Development
5.6   Physical Resources
5.7   Financial Resources

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2009 Condition: I.1.4 Long-Range Planning*:* An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and, where appropriate, the five perspectives. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform its future planning and strategic decision-making.

Previous Team Report (2015): A commentary on long-range planning is in the 2014 APR on pp.16-20. The program's faculty was in the process of validating the director's vision for the M.Arch. program (which they considered the beginning of a long-range planning process), but they did not complete the process when it became clear that the leadership would be changing. The program has opted to await new leadership before proceeding with developing a Long-Range Plan. There was no information in the APR

on data collection, future planning, or strategic decision-making for the program, nor were any multi-year objectives identified. The university's Long-Range Plan, as described in the 2014 APR, does not adequately meet the NAAB requirements.

2021 IPR Board Review: After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Cincinnati the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the 2-Year Interim Progress Report. No further information is required at this time.

2024 Team Analysis: This 2014 condition was noted as satisfied in the NAAB response to the 2-year IPR. The team's response to the 2020 condition regarding long range planning is addressed in the team findings for condition 5.2.

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.

2024 Team Analysis: Significant changes to the curricular structure of the M1 and M2 programs have been implemented since the last visit. The duration of these programs has been reduced by one to three semesters-shortening the M1 track from nine to six semesters and the M2 track from five to four semesters. This was done to make them competitive with peer institutions and increase enrollment. Non-curricular changes suggested by the Conditions have impacted the admissions process, including a more comprehensive set of admissions standards for pre-enrollment review. Research themes have been strengthened throughout the curriculum. Though these revisions were not motivated by changes to the criteria for accreditation, they support and affirm the shared values articulated in the 2020 Conditions.

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).

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

Program Summary Statement of 1 – Context and Mission
The School of Architecture and Interior Design (SAID) at the University of Cincinnati prepares students for critical practice. Our students engage with the principles, traditions, and requirements of building in all its

4

aspects, interior and exterior. Our goal is to advance the professions of Architecture and Interior Design by combining ethical judgment, creative research and technical proficiency in pursuit of excellence. We seek to nurture a life-long worldview that recognizes the designer's responsibility to the environment, society, and the profession. Students are encouraged to take risks with their design ideas and develop the skills to communicate them.

The faculty and students of SAID strive to advance the discourse of environmental design, to respond effectively to change, and to integrate research with technical expertise.

2024 Team Analysis:
The architecture program at the University of Cincinnati is nested within the School of Architecture and Interior Design (SAID) in the College of Design, Architecture, Art and Planning (DAAP). The college is one of nine colleges on the UC Uptown campus. The University of Cincinnati is one of the largest state universities in Ohio with more than 60,000 students. It is one of three Ohio universities to be classified as a Research 1 institution. The university's setting in the heart of a revitalizing post-industrial city offers both opportunities and challenges; every program at the university remains mindful of the institution's commitment to social justice and community engagement, but programs must also operate in the contemporary competitive environment, in which declining resources and demographic changes are forcing many programs to prioritize their research and service initiatives.

DAAP focuses on interdisciplinary collaboration and is committed to advancing the visual and design environment. There are 4 schools within the college: School of Architecture and Interior Design, School of Design, School of Art, and the School of Planning.

The foundations of architectural education at UC are:

'•   A liberal arts education provides a broad basis for understanding the role of architecture and locating the profession in a cultural and historical context.
•   The school presents core professional knowledge and develops design ability through a prescribed curriculum.
•   The professional curriculum is enriched with professional options, delivered through elective seminars, lectures, and design studios, as well as opportunities to engage in travel-study programs; experimental projects; and collaborative, interdisciplinary projects for communities, organizations, and for-profit entities.
•   Unique among schools of architecture and interior design, SAID students alternate these more traditional academic experiences with periods of professional experience, through our landmark cooperative education program.

The students in the M.Arch. program benefit tremendously from being part of the university. Although students take the vast majority of their courses within the school, the program makes room for a number of elective courses, several of which are required to be taken outside of the college. This allows students to develop an area of expertise, perhaps related to their thesis, or to pursue an interest that they discovered in their undergraduate program. Students can pursue a joint-master's degree program, such as the M.Arch./MBA program, while others take a certificate program or courses in a foreign language to prepare for an international co-op. Others simply take advantage of the resources within the college; many students take a studio art course in painting or sculpture, while others take courses in planning or industrial design in order to develop skills that they expect will help them in the workforce. The faculty and administration of the School of Architecture and Interior Design have crafted an educational experience that balances theory and practice and the liberal arts with a professional education. The program works to blend the benefits of the academy and the workplace with its cooperative education model.

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. (p.8)

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
Design: The APR thoroughly documents the program's responses to the design values. The program focuses on four major areas – Urban Futures, New Building Technology, Thinking Beyond Sustainability, or New Publics / New Audiences in their studio classes. According to the APR and confirmed during the visit, these principles are addressed in the studio courses through meetings and interviews. Design culture is central to the program's vision and identity and is referenced in the draft of the long-range plan.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: Thinking Beyond Sustainability is one of the pillars of the program's research agenda. The faculty emphasize the importance and necessity of innovative sustainable practice and design in course work and in studio practice. Sustainability is approached comprehensively throughout the curriculum from materials studies, to building assembly, to passive and active heating and cooling, to urban design. Sustainable strategies in landscape and urban environments are taught in second- and third-year courses. The draft of the long-range plan references searches related to amplifying the building science curriculum. This evidence was confirmed with the School Director and faculty in onsite interviews.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: This program describes its commitment to the values of equity, diversity, and inclusion at the university, college, and school levels in the APR. Each of these values are

clearly described throughout their university's guiding principles. They are further exhibited in the required History Theory sequence of courses which develops their understanding of diverse cultural and social contexts. The team confirmed the program's commitment to these values through the hire of an Inclusive Excellence director for the College at the staff level. In discussions with the provost, a concern was raised that this was not a faculty member in a leadership role on this issue. The program has lost current and potential faculty members to competing programs which has impacted the diversity of the program's faculty. The draft of the long-range plan does not directly reference equity, diversity, and inclusion issues in the curriculum or hiring process and the committee learned that legislation is in process in the state legislature (Ohio SB 83) would prohibit DEI initiatives and prohibit advantages to faculty, staff, or students on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, or sex in admissions, hiring, promotion, tenuring, or workplace conditions. The link below shares the guiding principles at the university level.
https://www.uc.edu/about/equity-inclusion/about/guiding-principles.html

Knowledge and Innovation: The APR describes how advancing knowledge and commitment to innovation permeates its program both within the curriculum and in co-curricular opportunities and initiatives. The four research areas (Urban Futures, Thinking Beyond Sustainability, New Materials and Building Assemblage, and New Publics/New Audiences) structure student's learning as they articulate questions and develop design responses in their thesis projects. The ARCH 8001 Research Studio provides opportunities for interdisciplinary, grant funded, design research. Public lectures and events advance these themes both for the School and the broader community. The draft of the long-range plan addresses specific goals of amplifying the research content in the program. The Simpson Fund Urban Futures funding is articulated as a key resource to develop this part of the program.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: The program describes its commitments to these shared values in its APR by describing elective courses with opportunities for student leadership and collaboration with other schools within the college and other colleges within the university. The APR also highlighted their student engagement with local ULI and AIA chapters, government officials, and property owners during the studio classes. In the studio project for ARCH7001, students engaged with the regional community and designed and built a sukkah for the Hillel Foundation. Additional engagement with community groups occurs through the historic building documentation portion of the Preservation courses.

Studio classes (except thesis) are mostly team projects, allowing students to learn and collaborate with each other. During the visit, the team confirmed that students have the opportunity of collaborating with other programs within the college in elective courses.

Although the draft of the long-range plan does not specifically address this, based on the meetings with the students, the program continues to heavily invest in the co-op program experience.

Lifelong Learning: SAID holds regular public lectures and works with the AIA to share events and calendars. Once a month the head of the AIA, the head of Cincinnati's ULI, representatives of the construction industry, and the School Director meet to share resources and opportunities. The faculty and the school director also work with the AIA Vision group, which supports mid-career architects through workshops and discussion groups. Faculty work regularly with other professional organizations including the AIA, NAAB, NOMA, the Cincinnati Preservation Society, and neighborhood planning associations.

The professional licensure and historic preservation classes that the school offers are open to the local professional community. This evidence was confirmed in meetings with the Associate School Director and Co-op Advisor.

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)

Team Findings:

☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:

The school's required Cooperative Education (co-op) program is led by faculty and ensures students fully understand the paths to licensure and are *aware of career opportunities* that they can pursue with their M.Arch. degree.

Students take a professional development course PD7001 where they learn the pedagogical goals of the Architectural Experience Program (AXP) and professional practice within the office environment. The Associate School Director serves with the AXP and Co-op advisor and meets with students to inform them of opportunities to complete criteria for licensure.

During co-op, the student begins by writing 2 learning objectives and meets with an advisor to discuss the objectives. At the mid-term, the student again meets with the advisor to assess progress made in the 2 learning objectives and how to adjust the learning experience to meet the objectives. In an exit interview, the employer's evaluation (form provided in the APR Appendix) is reviewed by the Co-op supervisor with the student, to assess the student's abilities in 8 areas of professional development which are listed in this section of the APR.

Improvement to its approach or curriculum, in response to the assessment, was not documented but found in interviews. The co-op program was reviewed thoroughly onsite in interviews with the Associate School Director, faculty Co-op advisor for AXP, and the students. The co-op program includes written assessments by employers and employees. The data is collected annually and is a basis for improvements to the program.

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)

Team Findings:

☒ **Not Met**

2024 Team Analysis:

The APR narrative articulates how the design process is introduced and developed in the required studio sequence. The studio curriculum is organized into a foundation year, a year with a professional development focus and culminates in a research year. M1 students are introduced to design themes through ARCH 7001 and ARCH 7002. In 2023 this included a group project involving the design and construction of a small outdoor pavilion, a Sukkah. This project builds skills in drawing and construction while ARCH 7002 introduces students to the digital design process. M1 students join with entering M2 students in the ARCH 7004 studio which focuses on the individual building scale. ARCH 7005 engages the design process at the urban scale. Research studio options and a required thesis allow students to focus on particular themes of design inquiry.

The APR describes assessment through course evaluations in ARCH 7004 and 7005. No cycle of assessment including learning outcomes, benchmarks, data collection and action is described.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The APR demonstrates how this program criterion is addressed in required courses and elective opportunities. Three of the program's focused research areas directly correspond to this program criterion. The coursework found in studio, building science, and history and theory classes shows a broad range of considerations for the built and natural environment. Review of syllabi, lectures, analyses, and student work illustrate the program's approach between the built and natural environments through ARCH7062 Integrated Technology, ARCH 7081 Environmental Technology 1, ARCH 7082 Environmental Technology 2, and ARCH7037 History and Theory.

The program described the assessment of the Building Science classes on a recurring basis by faculty and students and makes adjustments to their course work, assignments, and tests to enhance student learning. Faculty in this curricular area meet annually to review benchmarks related to student learning outcomes. In consultation with the program leadership, the assignments related to those benchmarks are revised for the following year. This assessment and course revisions occur annually. The team confirmed evidence with faculty and students during interviews where several different research projects regarding sustainable principles were noted.

Assessment was done over the past two years and three years for ARCH7082 and ARCH7062 respectively. Improvements were linked to the student learning outcomes and documented in an assessment report.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The program has a robust sequence of courses that introduce students to the multiple histories and theories of architecture in diverse settings. Evidence demonstrating how the program develops and assesses an understanding at the appropriate level was found in the APR narrative and the well-organized course materials. ARCH 7021 History of Architecture to 1600 and ARCH 7054 History of Cities introduce these themes and further development of understanding in ARCH 7022 History of Architecture 1600 to Present and ARCH7037 Contemporary Theory. The team found evidence that the students integrate these themes into their research and written work for their individual thesis projects.

Student learning outcomes are listed and assessed annually through evaluations by faculty and visitors. Course materials integrate new content to expand their references annually and the courses continue to explore innovative assignments to promote integration of historical themes with contemporary practice.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Not Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The team found a culture of research and innovation to be present in curricular and co-curricular offerings. The four primary areas of research (Urban Futures, Thinking Beyond Sustainability, New Materials and Building Assemblage, and New Publics/New Audiences) act as curricular guidelines and help to structure the students' the thesis research and design exploration. Elective and co-curricular opportunities are noted in the APR and confirmed in conversations with students and faculty. The uses of the Simpson articulated in the APR were not confirmed in meetings during the site visit. Faculty indicated this fund was being used for administrators' salaries.

Primary evidence of student preparation to test and evaluate innovations in the field was found in the syllabi and thesis documents:

ARCH8011 Thesis Research & Development
ARCH8009 Master of Architecture Thesis
ARCH8010 Master of Architecture Writing

Supplementary evidence was found in:

ARCH7004 Advanced Architectural Studio
ARCH7005 Advanced Urban Studio
ARCH7037 Contemporary Theory
ARCH8001 Research Studio

Student learning assessment in design studios is through semester grades on group and individual projects. Program level assessment is based on the percentage of students successfully completing the thesis. Outside reviewers for studio projects and thesis provide informal assessment. However, benchmarks are not articulated, and data collection and interpretation are not described. The APR describes curricular revisions in response to perceived deficiencies and opportunities for improvement. A formal process identifying learning outcomes, benchmarks, data collection and actions taken is not described.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis
Evidence of 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 in the presented classes was found in the APR and through interviews with students.

During the visits, students indicated that a large number of studio projects (except thesis projects) are team projects, allowing them the opportunity to learn and collaborate with each other. During the site visit, the students provided positive feedback to the co-op program. There are also opportunities for students to collaborate with other students outside of the SAID in elective courses.

During the visit, the team learned that there are various leadership development opportunities available to students. Students participated in the College Newsletter and managed the Instagram page. They also have various paid positions outside of the curriculum. Students were also invited to be involved in the faculty hiring process.

Firms and students complete required evaluations. Follow-up interviews are conducted with the co-op advisor. Based on the responses, the program advisor will work with the students to choose firms they will have the internship with for the next co-op cycle. These lead to an improved experience for the students in their next co-op.

The team reviewed examples of the required evaluations that both firms and students complete at the end of each co-op. Follow-up interviews with each student are conducted with the co-op advisor. Students confirmed that the program advisor works with them to choose firms that will enhance their experience regarding collaborative work in a practice setting during the next co-op cycle.

This evidence was confirmed in onsite interviews with the faculty, Co-op Director, School Director, and extensive interviews with the students.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Not Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The APR narrative indicates that learning outcomes associated with this criterion are demonstrated through program wide social activities, continuous and frequent faculty to student contact, graduate assistant opportunities for students, and a community studio project in ARCH7001's Sukkah Build. In meetings with the students and faculty, the team learned that the program enjoys positive and respectful relations between students, faculty, and staff. The level of engagement in the program was extremely high. Meetings with the students indicated that communications regarding deadlines and specific requirements for reviews were not always provided in a timely manner. They also indicated that faculty were not adequately respectful of maintaining a healthy work life balance. Although the school has initiated a survey of graduates regarding issues of studio culture, the results from this document were insufficient to provide useful data. Benchmarks need to be refined and data associated with this criterion will need to be collected and interpreted.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Not Met**

2024 Team Analysis
Students are introduced to and develop their understanding of diverse cultural and social contexts through the required History Theory sequence. ARCH 7021 History to 1600, ARCH 7054 History of Cities, ARCH 7072 History from 1600 and ARCH 7037 Contemporary Theories in Architecture have expanded their references beyond the western tradition. Elective research studios sometimes include projects supporting underserved communities and many thesis projects extend these themes in student directed research and design. Student organizations and all-school lectures extend and deepen these themes outside of the required curriculum.

The APR indicates assessment to be found in the thesis process, documents, and projects. A formal process identifying learning outcomes, benchmarks, data collection and actions taken is not described.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Not Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The APR describes its approach to health as a comprehensive set of values encompassing building code for life safety issues including egress and structural performance but also the performance of buildings and the ecology of the city. They cite the course work associated with issues of safety and health as occurring in ARCH7004 and ARCH7005. The team did not find specific learning outcomes in these classes mapped to this criterion. Although Student Course Evaluations have been provided as evidence of assessment, the questions on the evaluation did not map to the criterion. The APR indicates that they have made adjustment to the courses but no assessment process identifying specific learning outcomes related to the criteria, benchmarks, data collection and actions taken is not described or documented. The team noted that the required co-op sequence shows students are given opportunities to develop an understanding of the impact of the built environment on health safety and welfare. However, these themes were not included in the evaluation forms.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
Evidence of 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 was found in the course syllabi, quizzes, and assignments of the presented courses ARCH 8041 Professional Practice and Ethics, the, PD7001 co-op, and various elective ARE prep. courses.

Students are able to obtain valuable professional practice experience through the co-op program. Almost all of the students the team interviewed indicated that they have started their NCARB AXP process. Based on the interviews with the students, there are workshops and courses available to them for ARE preps, guest lectures, portfolio review workshops, etc. and they are readily available to students.

Faculty in this curricular area meet annually to review benchmarks related to student learning outcomes. In consultation with the program leadership, the assignments related to those benchmarks are revised for the following year. This assessment and course revision process occurs annually. This was confirmed in discussions with the faculty and students.

According to the APR and confirmed by the team in meetings, detailed assessments were conducted for ARCH 8041. Firms and students complete required evaluations. Follow-up interviews are conducted with the co-op advisor. Based on the responses, the program advisor will work with the students to choose firms they will have the internship with for the next co-op cycle. These lead to an improved experience for the students in their next co-op.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The APR indicates that these issues are addressed in ARCH7004 Building Design. The syllabus indicates under "Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge" that students are assessed in concepts for accessibility, sustainability, life safety (in terms of egress), and an understanding or development of skills in design codes as they pertain to the site issues in an historic district. The codes also impact choices on building materials and assemblies for their environmental impact and reuse.

ARE Prep courses ARCH 8045, 8046, 8047, and 8048 ARE Prep are one credit classes offered as electives to the graduate students in the IPAL Program and cover the content of the Licensing Exams.

Conversations with students and the co-op director supported their understanding at the required level.

Faculty in this curricular area meet annually to review benchmarks related to student learning outcomes from the required courses. In consultation with the program leadership, the assignments related to those benchmarks are revised for the following year. This assessment and course revisions process occurs annually.

According to the APR and confirmed by the team in meetings with the associate director and co-op advisor, firms and students complete required evaluations. Follow-up interviews are conducted with the co-op advisor. Based on the evaluations and interviews, the co-op advisor provides personal guidance for future firm placement.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
A narrative for the program's response to technical knowledge was found in the APR. ARCH 7004 addresses the ability to illustrate and identify material, systems, and component assembly for a building design. The course develops knowledge and skills in understanding environmental, structural, building envelope, and building service systems as well as building materials and assemblies. ARCH 7061 introduces students to assemblies of building construction and is still actively undergoing changes to adjust the course to go more in depth on basic construction technique. ARCH 7062 addresses building materials and envelopes assessing the understandings of environmental, structural, building envelope, and building service systems as well as building materials and assemblies. ARCH 7071 introduces students to building structure and assesses for basic knowledge. ARCH 7072 assesses more advanced knowledge of building structure by breaking students into groups to design a structural system based on varying load conditions. Students use that structural system to design a building with the primary focus being structural concerns in relevance of their thesis. ARCH7082 demonstrates an understanding of building cost and economics.

The team confirmed evidence described in the APR onsite in interviews with the students, faculty, and program director. Recurring assessment and improvements are documented in the APR.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Not Met**

Team Analysis:
Design synthesis is taught throughout the program and is built up through a number of singular design methodologies and ranges from introductory problems to higher levels of development where student's skills are assessed. Design Synthesis is assessed in the ARCH7004 Building Design and ARCH7005 Urban Design studios. These studio design problems seek to synthesize design at the building and urban scale. The team reviewed student work in the team room and materials provided online. Student projects demonstrated synthesis of user, regulatory, site conditions and environmental impacts on the design. The synthesis of *accessible design was not demonstrated in the studio problems.*

Evidence of student assessment in ARCH7004 included a written "Final Critical Reflection" prepared by the students as a response to the verbal studio crit received in the studio by faculty. The reflection included a description of the issues presented and a detailed outline of next steps the student would take to improve the design. The supplemental materials included an assessment chart, however this lacked specific learning outcomes relating to each component of the criteria. benchmarks and data collection and actions taken related to these learning outcomes was not described. Specifically, the program assessment chart indicates that ARCH7005 is still collecting data. Although the program makes improvements to the course each year, these were not documented relative to formal assessment process tied to specific learning outcomes.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Not Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The program cited the student course work of ARCH7004 Building Design, ARCH7005 Urban Studio, ARCH7062 Integrated Technologies, and ARCH7082 Environmental Technologies for criteria. During the site visit, the team reviewed the student work provided in the team room and online. was not Evidence of the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of structural systems and life safety systems at the required level was not found in the student work provided by the program. The projects for 7004, had detailed descriptions of learning outcomes in the syllabus, but we were unable to find evidence at the required level for structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems and the measurable outcomes of building performance. Building performance analysis and environmental control systems were shown to be integrated in work for ARCH 7082.

The supplemental materials included an assessment chart, however this lacked specific learning outcomes relating to each component of the criterion. Benchmarks, data collection, and actions taken related to these learning outcomes was not adequately described.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The APR includes the most recent letter confirming reaffirmation of accreditation (2018) from the Higher Learning Commission. The reaccreditation is based on a ten-year cycle.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The APR includes links to the M1 and M2 curriculum. The M1 curriculum includes 99 credit hours at the graduate level and the M2 degree includes 64-99 credit hours and an undergraduate degree in architecture. The program documents 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 on their website and in the APR.
The professional courses required for the M2 students are:

ARCH7004 Advanced Architectural Studio 6 Credits
ARCH7014 Design Visualization 3 Credits
ARCH7072 Structures 2 3 Credits
ARCH7054 History & Theory of Cities 3 Credits
PD7021 Introduction to Co-op 1 Credit
ARCH7005 Advanced Urban Studio 6 Credits
ARCH7037 Contemporary Theory 3 Credits
ARCH7062 Integrated Technologies 3 Credits ARCH7082 Environmental Technologies 3 Credits
ARCH8001 Building Design Research Studio 6 Credits
ARCH8011 Thesis Research & Development 3 Credits
ARCH8041 Professional Practice & Ethics 3 Credits
ARCH8009 Master of Architecture Thesis 6 Credits
ARCH8010 Master of Architecture Writing 3 Credits

The M1 student take the courses above, plus:
 ARCH7001   Order and Tectonics in Architecture (C min) 6 Credits
ARCH7012   Design Visualization 1 (C min) 4 Credits

ARCH7021   History of Architecture to 1600 (C min) 3 Credits
ARCH7061   Construction Technology (C min) 3 Credits
PD7021   Introduction to M Arch COOP (C min) 1 Credite
ARCH7002   Civic Realm and Public Context Studio (C min)
ARCH7013   Design Visualization 2 (C min)
ARCH7022   History of Architecture 1600 to Present (C min)
ARCH7081   Environmental Technologies 1 (C min)
ARCH7071   Structures 1 (C min)

This evidence was confirmed with the School Director and Assistant School Director in on-site interviews.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
4.3.1 In the APR, the program has provided a thorough review of the process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework. The Faculty, Graduate Coordinator, and School Director are directly involved in the decision-making process. Students do not apply specifically for M1 or M2 admission but are admitted based on prior degree, work experience, and quality of the work submitted.

4.3.2 Placement in the program options is done through a matrix of six criteria or lenses that evaluates grade point, complexity of studio assignments, hours of co-op or work experience, digital design skills and number of studio courses completed. Those without a B.S.Arch. degree are placed in the M1 track. The Associate School Director who also operates as the Programs NAAB representative also reviews the undergraduate transcripts to ensure admitted students meet the NAAB standards and no gaps exist.

Program placement evaluation forms are supplied in the Appendix of the APR along with a Rubric allowing evaluators to compare program requirements for graduate admission requirements with 7 others regional NAAB accredited programs.

4.3.3 Admitted students receive an official letter of acceptance but are also contacted by the School Director or Graduate Director by phone and/or email. UC students accepted into the programs have one on one interviews with the School or Graduate Director. All students are invited to a virtual or in person Open House and have short interviews at those visits. A typical Student Acceptance Letter has been included in the Appendix which outlines the offer to a Graduate Student. It includes a Scholarship Award which outlines what costs (such as tuition) are included and what fees not included in the offer. It also

outlines the satisfactory level of academic performance (3.0 GPA or better), to maintain the award. Students confirm their understanding of the evaluation process and the implications for the length of the professional program before accepting. This was confirmed in interviews with the students and the program director and admissions officer.

Students can appeal for waivers on courses in the M1 first year.

The team confirmed the narrative through discussions with school staff, leadership, and students. The team reviewed individual student records for both M1 and M2 students with the program director.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
5.1.1 The APR provides an organizational chart of the College of Design, Architecture, Art and Planning (DAAP) that identifies the leadership structure. The governance structure of the college and the school is described in the narrative. This was confirmed in discussions with the faculty, administration, and students.

5.1.2 The role of the faculty is described in the governance of the program. Students have some opportunities to participate in committees. This was confirmed in discussions with the faculty, administration, and students.

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.

Team Findings:

☒ **Not Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
5.2.1 The college (DAAP) has not had a long-range plan since 2000. This problem was identified in the previous NAAB Report. Because the school is nested with the college's administrative structure, this has

made long range planning challenging for the architecture programs. Changes in mission, explicit and implicit, have consequences for the goals of all four schools in the college. Plans for a college-wide Long-Range Plan were begun in August of 2023 with a target to complete this process by the close of the academic year. Because this is only in a preliminary stage, we cannot include any summary in this report.

Program (SAID) Long Range Plan: With no Long-Range Plan from the college, the school enacted a process to meet the concerns of the 2015 NAAB Report. In the Fall of 2017, Director Mitchell interviewed the faculty, wrote a draft of the Long-Range Plan that addressed those concerns identified in the previous report and those that were internal concerns for the future of the program. The Long-Range Plan was revised by the School Director with input from the SAID Academic Council and presented for faculty discussion in the Spring of 2018. In 2020 the College Director issued a draft including long range planning goals. These seemed to focus on reporting activities to date rather than projecting specific goals and metrics. Categories included: Fundraising and Alumni Outreach, Scholarships, Research, Publications, Student Travel and Lecture. A new series of long-range planning sessions with faculty was initiated in 2023 but information was not available. It is not clear whether this will directly address NAAB Conditions.

This subcondition is not met.

5.2.2 The college and university's KPIs for the architecture programs involve hitting enrollment targets. The APR indicates that goals associated with enrollment targets and increase in the number of scholarships have been tracked and are being met.

This subcondition is met.

5.2.3 Although the APR indicates that the school has done very well in meeting its goals, without a strategic planning process that affirms these goals it is difficult to track the program's status. Shortening the MArch program to more traditional lengths has appeared to add to the competitive nature of the program and the increase in scholarships has also benefited recruitment, but the program has not yet been fully assessed.

This subcondition is not met.

5.2.4 Faculty discussion at the School retreat at the start of the Fall 2023 semester included the following challenges:

> Faculty Workload
> Lack of Faculty for Electives and options in studio sequence
> Revenue Streams for Research
> Scholarship
> Leadership changes
> Review of the MS and PhD programs (including new focus areas in Urban Futures and Historic Preservation)
> Fiscal planning for the Simpson Fund

This subcondition is met.

5.2.5 The program receives ongoing outside input from practitioners and occurs regularly through the Co-op program. Academic and professional leaders are involved in the thesis process as well.

This subcondition is met.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ **Not Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
5.3.1 The APR describes the major curricular revisions that have occurred since the new director, Edward Mitchell, arrived in 2017. The rationale behind these revisions is described but an assessment and development process leading to those changes is not described. The changes did have to go through a College-wide process for approval. The relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including NAAB program and student criteria is not described.

5.3.2 The roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, were described in the APR and confirmed in discussions with the faculty.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ **Not Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
5.4.1 The workload of the faculty is described in the APR. The faculty operate under a faculty union contract, which follows the human resource protocols established for the entire university. For the M.Arch. program, 153 out of the required 176 graduate credits were taught by full-time faculty. The rest of the credits were taught by adjunct faculty. The typical instructional workload of a faculty member is equivalent to 18 credit hours per academic year. This limits the time available for research and scholarship. Although the college has set ambitious targets for increased enrollment, this has not been accompanied by an increase in funding for faculty positions. The Program has experienced retirements and departures that have not been filled. Low faculty salaries have led to failed searches for two open faculty positions.

This subcondition is not met.

5.4.2 There are currently two faculty members who serve as Architect Licensing Advisors. Associate Director Jeff Tilman has been serving in this role since 2015, and has attended the Licensing Summits in 2017, 2019, and 2021. Professor Alex Christoforidis also has attended the Licensing Summits.

This subcondition is met.

5.4.3 During the visit, the faculty expressed concerns regarding the student/ faculty ratio. With the planned growth of the program, the faculty appears to be negatively impacted by the workload of both teaching and academic research. The faculty have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program development. There are funds available to faculty assisting them in financing their research and professional development such as the Faculty Development Grants, Faculty Research Stipends, and Simpson Fund. Although there are funds available for faculty to attend conferences to present their work, these funds are limited.

This subcondition is not met.

5.4.4 Based on the APR and meetings with students, it was confirmed there is an administrative structure to support student achievement. The School currently has two staff program coordinators to assist in administration of the M.Arch. and Ph.D. program and to support the School Director and the faculty. There is also professional counseling support, mental health support, health and wellness support, and special counseling services for students who received full tuition and stipend awards. The School also offers cooperative education that prepares students for critical engagement in professional practice.

This subcondition is met.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
5.5.1 The demographic composition of the program faculty and students was described in the APR and in an additional document requested by the team.

5.5.2 The APR articulates a commitment to increasing diversity of its faculty and staff. Comparison and relevant benchmarks were not described.

5.5.3 The APR articulates a commitment to increasing diversity of its students. The director has focused on the expansion of scholarships to support graduate students and has included five new scholarships devoted to recruiting minority or underrepresented students. Efforts to expand minority and underrepresented students at the undergraduate level are described and might impact graduate enrollment in the coming years. Comparison and relevant benchmarks are not described.

5.5.4 The APR references the university's Affirmative Action Plan and the related policies and procedures. It indicates that there has been a position established at the College level for a DEI director. This was a failed search in 2022-23 and is a continuing search. The team requested a more detailed description of the role of this individual was not made available.

5.5.5 The APR describes the services available through the office of Accessibility Resources for students, staff and faculty. The process of notification is described leading to accommodations. Students with physical disabilities are currently unable to access a significant portion of the graduate studios due to the lack of an elevator. The program indicates that accommodations are made when needed.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ **Not Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
5.6.1 A comprehensive list of facilities is described on p.99 of the APR. The College of DAAP is housed in two buildings in proximity to each other on the main UC campus. These structures provide over 300,000 square feet of lecture, lab and office space to serve the DAAP faculty and staff.

The facilities for the architecture program studios are described in the APR. On the seventh floor, 7001 is designated as the studio for advanced research and thesis studios and has desks for 45 students, added space for assembly, mobile digital screens, pin up areas, slop sinks, and printers and scanners for student use. The 8th floor of Alms was renovated in the summer of 2022.The old dropped ceiling was removed, new HVAC and electric drops were added, sinks were replaced, and the tile flooring removed. The existing desks were refurbished, and digital screens were added into the studios. The studio seats between 60-65 students and has capacity for 82 students. The 7060 studios are the next in line for refurbishing.

The APR notes and team confirmed that one of the two graduate studio spaces is not accessible. This space does not have elevator access and the egress stair does not meet code relative to guard rails. Students noted that this was a dangerous condition when carrying large models up and down to the review rooms. Currently students with temporary mobility issues have to be assigned desks on the lower

level. The team asked the administration what plans were in place that would correct this serious issue and were told that there were no plans. The provost was also not aware of this condition.

This subcondition is not met.

5.6.2 Public reviews are generally held on the fifth floor of the building in the Blue Box Gallery, the Grand Stair, and on occasion in the Reed Gallery. The end of year show of graduating student work, DAAPWorks is also held in these areas. Additional spaces in the Materials Library on the 8th floor and the Simpson Center on 7th floor are also used for class discussions and consultations with outside reviewers. Negotiations are currently underway with the College to find additional space in the College Annex building for assembly space for grad student research.

Facilities include lecture halls; ceramics, computer and photo labs; and "Makerspace" lab.

"One Stop" is the faculty support center for workshops on Design, Equity and Inclusion; Professional Development; Teaching and Learning; Digital Technology Solutions; and workshops from the Office of Research.

The DAAP Office of Research provides space and support of faculty research and encourages collaborations with industry and communities for design impact. Headed by the Associate Dean of Research this office offers workshops, grant writing help for faculty, and small stipends to start research projects.

This subcondition is met.

5.6.3 Each faculty member has been provided with an office and additional open space for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

This subcondition is met.

5.6.4 Physical resources support all learning formats and pedagogies. The University has Mandatory training in online teaching for digital platforms taught as online courses. These tutorials are updated yearly as software is improved. The school supplies large format digital screens in all studios, with additional screens located in the Simpson Center and Betz Materials Library (to be verified on site). All lecture classrooms in the college have digital presentation equipment that is serviced by staff in the college. Faculty are given laptops and service from the Digital Media Center to support their teaching and research. Specialized software can be requested through the college.

This subcondition is met.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ **Not Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The College works within the University's Performance Based Budget (PBB) model. Budgets are set by the Dean of the College and resources are allocated back to the individual schools and funds made available from the Dean's office are controlled by the School Director. Tenure and tenure track salaries are fixed (with a 3% annual increase) in the DAAP budget. All four schools within the College operate under a collective financial system so that gains and losses are shared throughout the College.

Resources are tuition driven with minor distributions allocated as a percentage of grants obtained from individual School faculty members.

A percentage of the tuition dollars generated are allocated as the base of scholarship offers. SAID had been operating with a 13% payback for scholarship until FY 2022. This was upped to 18% starting in FY2023; however, the sum total is similar to what the School received in 2018. An increase in the number of students increases the funding for this part of the scholarship funding.

During the visits, it was confirmed that the funding for the scholarships is adequate. However, there appears to be inadequate funding for faculty hiring. The program is having difficulty obtaining and retaining faculties due to insufficient funding.

The team was told that the Simpson Funds are not being used to their full potential and are not following the transformational intent of the gift.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
Students, faculty, and staff have access to the DAAP Library located in the Aronoff Center for Design and Art. The facility has been designed in an effort to incorporate new and emerging technologies and maximize information resourced both efficiently and flexibly. The DAAP Library is staffed by professionals with specialized subject knowledge and training in the arts and provides access to services such as UCL inter-library loans and administrative services. The head of the DAAP Library plans, budgets, directions, and formulates all collection and service activities and serves as the official liaison to the DAAP faculty and staff in collaborating with DAAP faculty on teaching, grant writing, and graduate student advising.

The DAAP Library provides access to a substantial 20th century Modern Collection, monographs and bound journals that include online and print periodicals and has a growing special collection of rare and hand-crafted books and objects. If DAAP does not have a resource that is needed by a student, faculty, or staff, seamless access is offered through OHIOLink. This service increases the availability of databases, e-journals, e-books, and unique digital collections, to be available for all.

Architecture students, faculty, and staff have access to dedicated library staff who have expertise in fine arts and history as well as a full-time paraprofessional staff member and student staffers. The head of the library oversees and acts as a resource for teaching and creating content of online tutorials and research tools. Student staff members primarily assist users with access services such as circulation services and stacks management.

The budget for the DAAP library covers faculty and staff salaries, electronic and print resources supplies, facilities and technology.
This evidence was confirmed with the school director in on-site interviews.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ Met

2024 Team Analysis:
The statement on the NAAB-Accredited degrees appears on the program's website, the exact language can be found at this link: https://daap.uc.edu/academic-programs/school-of-architecture-interior-design/master-of-architecture.html

The visiting team confirms that the information and link provided in the APR page 113 is working and meets the criterion.

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)

Team Findings:
☒ Met

2024 Team Analysis:
   a) *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition are found at the following link under the section titled "Accreditation - NAAB Conditions and Procedures" https://daap.uc.edu/academic-programs/school-of-architecture-interior-design/master-of-architecture.html*
   b) *Conditions for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2015) are found at the following link under the section titled *"Accreditation - NAAB Conditions and Procedures" https://daap.uc.edu/academic-programs/school-of-architecture-interior-design/master-of-architecture.html*
   c) *Procedures for Accreditation, 2020 Edition are found at the following link under the section titled "Accreditation - NAAB Conditions and Procedures" https://daap.uc.edu/academic-programs/school-of-architecture-interior-design/master-of-architecture.html*
   d) *Procedures for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2015) are found at the following link under the section titled *"Accreditation - NAAB Conditions and Procedures" https://daap.uc.edu/academic-programs/school-of-architecture-interior-design/master-of-architecture.html*

All NAAB Conditions and Procedure documents are made publicly available on the program's website.
The visiting team confirms the link provided in the APR on page 113 is working and meets the criterion.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
Students and graduates have extraordinary access to career development and placement services that help them develop, evaluate, and implement career, education, and employment plans.
Career and employment plans are organized through the University's well respected co-op program as noted in the APR. The University's Bearcat Promise Career studio provides students with career coaches and co-op advisers who assist with crafting an online professional profile, preparing for interviews and job offer negotiations, and learning how to introduce yourself at networking events. Information on the co-op program at the University of Cincinnati is found at: co-op.html

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

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
All NAAB Conditions and Procedure documents are made publicly available on the program's website. The visiting team checked the link provided in the VTR and took a visitor to an "Accreditation" section but did not have the detailed information required in the criterion. In Section 6.2, the link provided accurately directed a visitor to the correct information. The correct link can be found here:
https://daap.uc.edu/academic-programs/school-of-architecture-interior-design/master-of-architecture/curriculum.html

Section 6.4 Items a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, and i are *found at the following link under the section titled "Accreditation"* https://daap.uc.edu/academic-programs/school-of-architecture-interior-design/master-of-architecture.html

Section 6.4 Item j is not found at the link provided and/ or the link where the rest of the section's information is found.

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

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The visiting team found evidence of this criterion being provided in the link in the APR.

a, b, & c) Links to application form, instructions, and requirements for admission into the M.Arch. programs appear on the Master of Architecture page of the University's DAAP website at https://daap.uc.edu/academic-programs/school-of-architecture-interior-design/master-of-architecture.html. Further, non-accredited degree application forms, instructions, requirements, and content information can be found on the DAAP website at https://daap.uc.edu/academic-programs/school-of-architecture-interior-design.html.
d) Links to requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships can be found at the DAAP website under Admissions. https://daap.uc.edu/prospective-students/admissions.html
e) There is no clear indication of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures from the program response in the APR. Based on the program's statement on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, the program is aware of the lack of diversity and mentions attempts to redouble their efforts with a new initiative to engage the larger community in Cincinnati and the region. The school has identified the need to recruit talent in underrepresented communities and actively address additional funds and scholarships towards graduate recruitment.

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.

Team Findings:
☒ **Met**

2024 Team Analysis:
The program has shown that students have access to resources and advice for making decisions about financial aid on the Graduate and Professional Students page of the University of Cincinnati website: https://www.uc.edu/about/bursar/tuition-fees/graduate---professional-students.html. The estimated cost of attendance and participation for the Master of Architecture programs is provided to students in their offer letter to the school of architecture and interior design, addressed in the APR.

V.   Appendices

Appendix 1. Team PC/SC Matrix

Curriculum Mapping Matrix

Category / Criteria	ARCH 7001	ARCH7012	ARCH7021	ARCH7061	PD7021	ARCH 7002	ARCH 7013	ARCH 7022	ARCH 7081	ARCH 7071	COOP	ARCH 7004	ARCH 7013	ARCH 7072	ARCH 7054	ARCH 7036	COOP	ARCH 7005	ARCH 7062	ARCH 7037	ARCH 7082	ARCH 8001	ARCH 8011	ARCH 8041	ARCH 7036	ARCH 8009	ARCH 8010	ARCH 7036	ARCH 7036
Year/Term	ARCH ORDER STUDIO	DESIGN VIS. 1	HIST. OF ARCH TO 1600	CONSTRUCT. TECH.	INTRO TO COOP	CIVIC REALM	DESIGN VIS. 2	HIST. OF ARCH 1600 YO PRESENT	ENVIR. TECH 1	STRUCTURES 1	COOP	ADVANCED BUILDING DESIGN	DESIGN VIS.3	STRUCTURES 2	HIST OF CITIES	ELECTIVE	COOP	URBAN STUDIO	INTEGRATED TECH.	CONTEMP. THEORY	ENVIR. TECH 2	RESEARCH STUDIO	THESIS WRITING	PRO PRACTICE AND ETHICS	ELECTIVE	THESIS STUDIO	THESIS WRITING	ELECTIVE	ELECTIVE
Shared Values																													
Design																										■			
Env. Stewardship & Prof. Responsibility																		■	■							■			
Equity, Diversity & Inclusion																				■							■		
Knowledge and Innvoation																										■	■		
Leadership, Collab. & Community Engagemen											■						■									■			
Lifelong Learning																										■			
Program Criteria																													
PC.1 Career Paths																								■		■			
PC.2 Design																													
PC. 3 Ecological Know. & Respons.																		■	■							■			
PC. 4 History and Theory																										■	■		
PC. 5 Research and Innovation																										■	■		
PC. 6 Leadership and Collaboration											■						■							■		■			
PC. 7 Learning & Teaching Culture																													
PC. 8 Social Equity and inclusion																				■						■			
Student Criteria																													
SC. 1 HSW in the Built Environment																													
SC. 2 Professional Practice											■	■					■							■		■			
SC. 3 Regulatory Context												■						■						■		■			
SC. 4 Technical Knowledge										■									■		■			■		■			
SC. 5 Design Synthesis																													
SC. 6 Building Integration																													

Appendix 2. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator Representative
Judith Kinnard, FAIA
Professor
Tulane University
New Orleans, LA
jkinnard@tulane.edu

Team Member, Practitioner Representative
Yu-Ngok Lo, FAIA, NCARB, CDT, LEED AP
Principal
YNL Architects
Culver City, CA
ylo@ynlarchitects.com

Team Member, Regulator Representative
Gary E. Demele, FAIA, NCARB
President
Gary E. Demele, FAIA Architect
Long Lake, MN
gary.demele@gmail.com

Team Member, Student Representative
Elizabeth Daggett
M.Arch. Student
Drury University
Springfield, MO
rwbyrose77@gmail.com

Observer
Amy Benetti, AIA
Principal
MSA Design
Cincinnati, Ohio
abenetti@msaarch.com

VI.   Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Judith Kinnard, FAIA
Team Chair

Yu-Ngok Lo, FAIA, NCARB, CDT, LEED AP
Team Member

Gary E. Demele, FAIA, NCARB
Team Member

Elizabeth Daggett
Team Member

Amy Benetti, AIA
Observer