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I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The team thanks all members of the Department of Architecture and the Golisano Institute for Sustainability (GIS) community for hosting us and facilitating our work. We thank the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) administrative officers who met with us for providing a more encompassing view of the academic context. We met with the new RIT president, David C. Munson, who is committed to the interdisciplinary model advanced by his predecessor and sees the architecture program as a locale for integration of creativity and innovation. The team also met with administrative officers who played a major role in establishing an architecture professional degree program at RIT. The team thanks the student leaders for committing additional time to meet with us.

We had access to the member of the academic community who make GIS and the architecture department function, as well as the professional community that, in large part, advocated for having an architecture program at RIT and that continues to support it in tangible and intangible ways.

We owe special thanks to Donna Podeszek for making sure that all logistics arrangements necessary for fulfilling our task were in place. Also thanks to Paul Allen, who provided assistance on Internet connectivity and other IT matters.

The team room was well organized and reflected the M. Arch. integrated curriculum, in which the sustainability courses tie drawing, history, practice, and planning with design studios and the integrated building systems courses. The design of the components of the team room followed one of the goals of the program to reduce waste and to reuse. Team room components, designed and constructed by students, will be reused in the studio space.

The program’s direct relationship with the GIS gives it a unique position nationally and internationally. The department of architecture is an academic unit within the umbrella of an organization for applied research, sponsored programs and initiatives. The GIS’s new facilities are a living learning laboratory. Faculty and students from the M. Arch. program collaborate with peers and colleagues in the two other academic programs and share resources. This includes having access to courses in the sustainability program curricula, and to a number of research centers and initiatives at the GIS, across campus and outside.

The connection is extended further to the College of Imaging Arts and Sciences (CIAS) courses and programs, to its wood shop, and to the Wallace Center, which houses the architecture and sustainability library collection, has a librarian dedicated to architecture, and provides many other information resources and support. The architecture program collaborates with other academic programs on campus, including Public Policy, Environmental Science, and Facilities Management.

The department maintains a strong relationship with local practitioners who serve as adjunct faculty, participate in reviews, and are members of the Architecture Program Advisory Council (APAC). The department facilitates the university’s and the program’s requirement for co-op learning and internship, and the growth of scholarships and endowment fund. AIA Rochester advocated for the creation of the program and maintains a close relationship of support with the program, faculty, and students.
Consistent with the program's goals, two new full-time tenure-track faculty members have been hired since the last NAAB visit. They project that as the number of students in the program grows, one more full-time position will replace some of the part-time adjunct faculty positions.

Students in the M. Arch. program have diverse backgrounds and cultures. They have formed an effective community of peers that collaborate on the use of resources, peer-to-peer learning, and the organization of events to benefit all.

The program responded to the comments of the 2015 NAAB team by reorganizing the curriculum to strengthen the integrated buildings systems sequence, the studios, and the sustainability courses. Faculty are to be praised for the redesign of the curriculum and for the students' technical competence and design integration skills. Of note is the rethinking of design from the perspective of performance rather than primarily from formal considerations. Much has been achieved, and more is at work.

The team looks forward to the exploration of the opportunities identified to develop the program fully. The program is discussing the development of a research agenda that takes advantage of the setting and relationships, and is considering a plan for the future that maintains and evolves the accredited professional program with a unique focus.

b. Conditions Not Achieved

II 4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

SPC Not Met

A.6 Use of Precedents

B.6 Environmental Systems

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2009 Condition 1.1.4, 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.

2015 Team Assessment: Earlier this year, the university completed and adopted Greatness through Difference: RIT's 2015-2025 Strategic Plan. The GIS 2.0 Academic Unit 2025 Strategic Plan has also recently been adopted. Both plans provide frameworks for the alignment of the architecture program's development with the strategic vision of RIT and the GIS for the future. While the Architectural Program Advisory Council (APAC) has now been formed and has convened by teleconference, no progress has been made in "identifying a list of key indicators that will be analyzed at regular intervals" as stated in the APR. As noted by previous visiting teams, the program continues to evolve from its original founding principles. For example, the dramatic rise in the number of advanced placement students and the significant growth in the international student
population are two developments that point to the need to collect data routinely and from multiple sources in order to consider how developments impact the alignment with long-range plans and inform strategic decision-making. The team considers this cause for concern not fully resolved, and, therefore, this condition is Not Met.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is now l.1.5. See section l.1.5 Long Range Planning of this VTR for specific comments. The condition is met.

2009 Condition l.1.5, Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How the program is progressing toward its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.
- Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:
  - Solicitation of faculty’s, students’, and graduates’ views on the teaching, learning, and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
  - Individual course evaluations.
  - Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.
  - Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.
  - The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that progress has been made since the 2013 NAAB team visit as the program evolves and matures. The program does not have its own strategic plan. Rather, it uses the GIS plan as a guide for the direction of the program. The procedures for self-assessment as defined by the NAAB have been established and are beginning to be implemented, but there is not yet sufficient evidence for how assessments are being used to improve the program. The team determined that this condition is not yet resolved and is, therefore, Not Met.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is now l.1.6. See comments under l.1.6 of this VTR. The condition is met.

2009 Criterion A.1., Communication Skills: Ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively.

2015 Team Assessment: The evidence for communication skills as an ability to read, write, speak, and listen varied widely from high-pass to low-pass, particularly in written evidence displayed in the team room (i.e., overall organization, paragraph and sentence structure, the use of complete sentences, grammar, and spelling). Therefore, this
criterion is Not Met. Cited coursework was ARCH 621 – Architectural History I and ARCH 622 – Architectural History II.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: In the 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation this criterion is now A.1 Professional Communication Skills. See comments under Il.1.1 Student Performance Criteria A.1 in this VTR. The criterion is met.

2009 Criterion A.6., Fundamental Design Skills: Ability to effectively use basic architectural and environmental principles in design.

2015 Team Assessment: The student work did not consistently reflect evidence of an ability to effectively use basic architectural and environmental principles in the cited course, ARCH 632 – Architectural Design II. Although these principles are identified in the course syllabus, the student coursework and projects did not consistently demonstrate that the principles were being employed or demonstrate an ability to use them. Therefore, this criterion is Not Met.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: In the 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation this criterion is now incorporated into A.4 Architectural Design Skills. See comments under Il.1.1 Student Performance Criteria A.4 in this VTR. The criterion is met.

2009 Criterion A.7., Use of Precedents: Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

2015 Team Assessment: As an ability to examine and comprehend fundamental principles in relevant precedents, three courses were cited for student work examples: ARCH 733 - Architectural Studio III, ARCH 734 - Architectural Studio II, and ARCH 751 - Architectural Theory. Although some evidence was found, it did not consistently reflect an ability, from low-pass to high-pass projects, with respect to this criterion, and therefore, this criterion is Not Met.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: In the 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation this criterion is now A.6, Use of Precedents. See comments under Il.1.1 Student Performance Criteria A.6 in this VTR. The criterion is not met.

2009 Criterion 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.
2015 Team Assessment: The student work displayed for the primary designated course, ARCH 733 – Architectural Studio III, did not consistently demonstrate the ability to prepare a comprehensive program, and, therefore, this criterion is Not Met.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: See comments under II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria B.1 in this VTR. The criterion is met.

2009 Criterion B.6., Comprehensive Design: Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student’s capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following SPC:

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

2015 Team Assessment: Evidence of comprehensive design skills did not consistently rise to the full required level of ability for the integration of the SPC included in this criterion. This was particularly true for the work displayed in the team room. The team requested supplemental evidence from projects not displayed in the team room, and, to the credit of the program, the additional work provided came closer to the intent of the SPC than that in the team room. However, the evidence did not appear representative of all design sections, and, in the end, the team chose to remain with the original assessment of Not Met.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: In the 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation this criterion is incorporated into C.2 Integrated Evaluations and Decision Making Design Process, and C.3 Integrative Design. See comments under II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria C.2 and C.3 in this VTR. Both criteria are met. C.2 is met with distinction.

2009 Criterion B.10., Building Envelope Systems: Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

2015 Team Assessment: Student work for the cited course, ARCH 742 – Integrated Building Systems II, did not reflect an understanding of the basic principles in the appropriate application of building envelope systems, and, therefore, this criterion is Not Met.
2017 Visiting Team Assessment: In the 2014 NAAAB Conditions for Accreditation this criterion is now incorporated into B.7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies. See comments under II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria B.7 in this VTR. The criterion is met.

III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

This part addresses the commitment of the institution and its faculty, staff, and students to the development and evolution of the program over time.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 1 – IDENTITY AND SELF-ASSESSMENT

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission, and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program’s pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.

- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. This includes the program’s benefits to the institutional setting, and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university’s academic plan. This also includes how the program as a unit develops multidisciplinary relationships and leverages opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.

2017 Analysis/Review: The Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) was founded in Rochester, New York in 1829 as the Athenaeum. In 1891, the Athenaeum merged with the Rochester Mechanics Institute, forming the basis for the current institution.
The RIT mission aims to:

"provide a broad range of career-oriented educational programs with the goal of producing innovative, creative graduates who are well-prepared for their chosen careers in a global society.... pursue new and emerging career areas....[and] develop and deliver curricula and advance scholarship and research relevant to emerging technologies and social conditions."

The M. Arch. program combines design, application, interdisciplinarity, and innovation paralleling RIT's founding principles. RIT's Master of Architecture program is the product of an interdisciplinary and interprofessional committee formed in 2008. It enrolled its first cohort of students in the fall of 2011. It is a three-and-one-half year, full-time graduate program designed primarily for students with an earned bachelor's degree in a nonarchitecture field. The program is housed in the Golsano Institute for Sustainability (GIS) and shares some resources with the College of Imaging Arts & Sciences (CIAS). The program was founded upon four "cornerstones": sustainability, urbanism, integrated learning/integrated practice, and technology, and five principles that align with NAAB's five perspectives. These are described in the 2017 APR-IA.

The architecture program benefits RIT by providing interdisciplinary collaboration, an exhibition culture, distinguished speaker series, applied research campus sustainability, and direct community engagement through a variety of projects.

The M. Arch. program facilitates the advanced standing of students from RIT's Interior Design and Civil Engineering Technology. The GIS academic offerings also include a MS in Sustainable Systems, and a PhD in sustainability. M. Arch. students can also take elective courses in the following RIT programs: Sustainable Engineering, Industrial Engineering, Environmental Science, and Environmental Health and Safety Management. In addition, RIT's Urban and Community Studies Program together with its Master in Public Policy provide M. Arch. students with the opportunity to expand their knowledge about the urban realm.

The architecture program's association with the Rochester architecture and design community offers numerous opportunities to students for on-site work, as well as studio projects based upon projects and problems posed by the community. RIT's required cooperative education experience (co-op) is essentially a paid practicum in which students apply their studio learning to the real-world practice of architecture.

I.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff in all learning environments, both traditional and non-traditional.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy that also includes a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition to the matters identified above, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.

- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include, but are not limited to, participation in field trips, professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.
2017 Analysis/Review: The program has demonstrated that it provides an atmosphere in which students can learn effectively and positively not only from the faculty but from each other. A cross-section of the students in the program met with the team representing the three years. Of these students, almost half were women, a significant portion were nontraditional students, and international students. The students agreed their decision to attend the program at RIT was because of its supportive environment, the sustainability focus, and hands-on learning.

The studio policy, readily available to the students and faculty, comprehensively covers a range of studio interactions forms. The policy is formally open to review and change every two years, and is informally reviewed at any time should students or faculty deem it necessary. Beyond the written policy, studio culture is also positive. Students are encouraged to practice healthy learning habits and time-management skills for personal lifestyle benefit and for professional development. Students practice peer-to-peer learning and have created a culture of sharing information, as well as resources. This collaborative attitude is to be commended and shows that this program has not only encouraged but formed connections that cross social and cultural boundaries, given the high percentage of international students in the program and the diversity of backgrounds and experience. Furthermore, the students have formed a chapter of AIAS, demonstrating a desire to continue learning and serving others outside of the classroom. Students have access to faculty, administrative staff, and the program head. Both the faculty and the students have demonstrated a cohesive vision and commitment to the learning process that is invaluable and fundamental to a successful learning culture.

The program has incorporated two course requirements that emphasize student learning outside the classroom in the form of the co-op and global experience programs. The co-op program provides students with real world experience in the setting of an architecture firm and exposes students to what employment in the field is like. This experience is not only valuable for academic reasons but provides the students with beginning experience that will help them become more competitive hires after graduation. The global experience program allows students the opportunity to travel abroad to develop a broader understanding of architecture and culture. Both co-op and global experience build a diverse and effective learning culture that is positive, engaging, and beneficial to students.

I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students as compared with the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution during the next two accreditation cycles.

- The program must document that institutional-, college-, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

2017 Analysis/Review: The program demonstrates a commitment to equality and diversity through documentation in the 2017 AP-R:IA, in the team room, and through meetings and observations.

Meetings with students and faculty indicate diversity in both groups. According to the information reported by the program to NAAB, in 2016 there were two full-time tenured faculty members, both men; and one tenured part-time female faculty member. The two recent hires are full-time tenure-track assistant professors: one is an African American male and the other a nonresident white female. During the 2015-2017 academic years, among seven adjunct faculty members, one is a woman. For the same period, of the five full-time faculty three are men, and two are women. Meetings with the program’s
administrative officers confirmed a future faculty hire will increase faculty diversity. In our conversations, students expressed appreciation for the inclusive culture of the school, and some stated that it was one of the reasons they selected RIT for their graduate education. The program integrates social equity through its mission to provide sustainable design education. Adding to the program’s richness is a large contingent of international students, mainly from Asia. International recruiting will continue.

RIT has an Office for Diversity and Inclusion within the division of Academic Affairs responsible for recruitment of diverse faculty and professional staff. The Office of Faculty Recruitment oversees every faculty and professional staff search to ensure diverse applicant pools and equity in decision-making. Architecture faculty searches adhere to hiring processes set up by this office. The Office of Faculty Recruitment maintains a database of minority and women graduate students as a referral source for faculty openings. Architecture is included in the database. RIT funds AALANA (African American, Latino/Hispanic, Asian and Native American) and female students. RIT has an active McNair Scholars Program, a federally funded program that supports undergraduate students from underserved populations who wish to attend graduate school. RIT administers the “AdvanceRIT” program, funded through a large institutional transformation grant from the National Science Foundation. The project’s goals are to increase the representation of women STEM faculty at RIT and to increase their representation among campus leadership. The university is also home to a “Future Stewards Initiative,” an agreement between the university and American Indian/Alaska Native governments and communities for the purpose of providing educational and experiential programs for AI/AN scholars and facilitating their return to tribal communities. Within the student population, the Master of Architecture program enrollment includes a diverse cross-section of students covering gender, race, disability, and ethnicity. Annually at the department of architecture stakeholders’ meetings and the faculty advance/retreat, social equity, diversity, and inclusiveness issues are discussed and addressed as part of the self-assessment process. In an annual feedback session, students are also asked to provide input and comments in these areas.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Collaboration and Leadership. The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders.

B. Design. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multi-dimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed at addressing increasingly complex problems, engaging a diverse constituency, and providing value and an improved future.

C. Professional Opportunity. The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and career paths for architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings, and in local and global communities.

D. Stewardship of the Environment. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the
environment and the natural resources that are significantly compromised by the act of building and by constructed human settlements.

E. Community and Social Responsibility. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens that are able to understand what it means to be a professional member of society and to act on that understanding. The social responsibility of architects lies, in part, in the belief that architects can create better places, and that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program's response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to positively influence the development of, conservation of, or changes to the built and natural environment.

2017 Team Analysis/Review: The APR-IA prepared by RIT for the M. Arch. program for this accreditation visit describes the following defining perspectives for the program. Information gathered during our visit corroborates the institute’s description:

A. Collaboration and Leadership: The GIS M. Arch. program course of study focuses on enabling students to work productively—both as leaders and contributors—in cross-professional teams and to practice the leadership and partnership skills necessary to a team's success. This is demonstrated in the shared course work, field trips, lecture series and access to research with the sustainability programs at the GIS. The required Urban and Regional Planning course and social science and art history electives expose architecture students to related and different practices and ways of thinking across campus. Universitywide initiatives and centers are open to faculty and students such as the annual innovation and creativity festival ImagineRIT, the Student Innovation Center, and the Student Entrepreneur House.
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B. Design: Graduates develop design fluency through multidimensional areas of emphasis including global perspectives, urban design and planning, sustainability, and integrated systems and practice. The goal of the associated multistage design process is a rich and integrated end product.

C. Professional Opportunity: Practice-based learning is facilitated by the required co-op experience, mentoring by local practitioners, interaction with professors of practice, required global experience, course integrated preparation for licensure, and participation in AIAS. All of these help prepare well-rounded graduates for traditional and alternative career paths in local and global communities.

D. Stewardship of the Environment: The focus of this program is "to address the pressing environmental exigencies of the 21st century." This focus on understanding and taking responsibility for stewardship of the environment and natural resources is realized through a suite of required courses on building performance, energy optimization, and building integrated design, together with the application of sustainable principles and requirements in design studios and other required courses. The students are encouraged to enroll in a host of elective graduate courses in sustainable engineering, industrial engineering, environmental science, and environmental health and safety management.

E. Community and Social Responsibility: Required program course work includes regular interaction "not only with area professionals, but also with city leaders, with highly diverse city neighborhoods, and with active city organizations." ARCH 752 Urban and Regional Planning, together with the Urban Studio, gives students the opportunity "to propose and implement sustainable preservation and adaptive re-use solutions in the city of Rochester. This involvement with community participants, business stakeholders, and policy makers underscores the value and importance" of the community and social responsibilities of future practitioners and leaders.

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement with a ratified planning document and/or planning process. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources, to identify patterns and trends so as to inform its future planning and strategic decision making. The program must describe how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college, and university.

2017 Team Analysis/Review: The architecture program incorporates RIT's continuous improvement process, which includes the annual assessment of the program's goals and objectives in comparison with its vision and direction. This process is closely connected with the program's self-assessment procedures, which are demonstrated as noted in the following section, I.1.6, Assessment.

RIT's 2015-2025 Strategic Plan, "Greatness Through Difference," mentions the architecture program specifically as demonstration of the university's commitment to innovation, agility, and foresight, highlighting it for being "among the first to consider sustainability as a curricular element equal in importance to design." The GIS and the department of architecture, recently adopted their own strategic plan—the GIS 2.0 Academic Unit 2025 Strategic Plan—aligning with the university's plan.

In keeping with RIT's strategic plan the architecture program's educational objectives and goals follow five main objectives: career education and student success, student-centered research university, leveraging difference, affordability, value and return on investment, and organizational agility. These correlate to NAAB's five perspectives. The 2017 APR-IA includes a table chart indicating the relationship between the two, and the co-curricular and extracurricular activities that support each.
As described in the 2017 APR-IA, and confirmed by the team in our conversations with the program head, faculty, and members of the local professional community, the educational objectives are reviewed annually by an advisory council, the program faculty, and a curriculum committee. Also, the program holds an end-of-year conversation with the student body, and the program head informally meets twice per semester with the student leadership. The university requires an annual student learning outcomes assessment progress report specific to each program. The program has identified key indicators which include trends, practice techniques and patterns, and demographic changes and professional paths.

I.1.6 Assessment:

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

- How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated objectives.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives.
- Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

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

B. Curricular Assessment and Development: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments, and must identify 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.

2017 Analysis/Review: Each program at RIT develops a Program Level Outcomes Assessment Plan (PLOAP) using a common template developed collaboratively by the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC), which comprises representatives from every college and degree-granting unit. The architecture program head is a member of SLOAC.

Programs must submit an annual progress report. NAAB’s five perspectives and student performance criteria are directly linked and included in the program’s student learning outcomes. The progress report results are shared with the provost’s office, board of trustees, deans, the SLOAC, departments, and programs. The results are used to measure universitywide initiatives on student learning and continuous program improvement and are included as a metric in the university’s academic program analysis. The RIT architecture program places much weight on the evaluation and assessment of studio work, noting that it provides the “pulse” of the program.

In the 2017 APR-IA Section 2, Progress Since the Last Visit, the program responded to each condition and student performance criteria not met, causes of concern, and discussed actions taken to resolve deficiencies and challenges. Also discussed in the APR-IA is progress towards multiyear objectives. Since the NAAB visit in 2015, the program has increased the collaborative and integrative efforts of the sustainability, technical, and representation courses and the design courses in each of the three years of the program through project and assignment matching. The changes in the 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation supported the program’s effort to integrate the various areas of the curriculum. The addition of the sustainability perspective facilitated an expanded agenda with the Golisano Institute for Sustainability and other units within campus and outside.
Five groups participate in the program's assessment process, each from a different perspective: the Architecture Advisory Council (APAC), the Supervisor/Mentor/Professors of Practice Roundtable, the Mentor Matching Program (every student is assigned one upon first enrollment in the program), the Thesis Committees, Professional Juries/Invited Critics, and Alumni. Also, there are annual and biannual formal and informal assessments.
PART ONE (): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has 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.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and the teacher that promotes student achievement.

- The program must demonstrate that an Architecture Licensing Advisor (ALA) has been appointed, is trained in the issues of the Architect Experience Program (AXP), has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the ALA position description, and regularly attends ALA training and development programs.

- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.

- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including, but not limited to, academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

[X ] Demonstrated

[] Not-Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment: Since 2015 there have been two new full time position hires, one replacing a faculty member who resigned at the end of 2014. The program stated in the 2014 APR-IA that a complete faculty core would be composed by a program head, four FTE faculty, and adjunct professors-of-practice. At present an additional FTE faculty position is to be filled for a total of four. The program has a designated administrative staff member who is supported by the GIS staff. It was noted in the team’s conversations with administrators, faculty, and staff that in the near future, when the enrollment in the architecture program increases, there may be a need for an additional administrative staff position.

As documented in the 2017 APR-IA and in the team room, and verified in the team’s conversations with the program’s administrators and faculty, and through observations, RIT’s policies on promotion, tenure, and annual review include expectations for faculty “participation in the scholarship of their disciplines”.

The Golisano Institute for Sustainability and the Department of Architecture have dedicated professional development funds available to faculty for travel to professional conferences and other activities, providing opportunities for individual scholarship, development, research and creative exploration. Each year, faculty are offered support for professional development by offsetting the cost of professional membership fees, attending conferences, and other activities. Additional support may also be provided to those who present papers at conferences.

Meetings with faculty and students confirmed, and the APR-IA indicates that Professor Jules Chiavaroli serves as the Architecture Licensing Advisor. Prof. Chiavaroli participated in the most recent NCARB ALA Conference, and the team confirmed there have been lectures to share related information with students.

The APR-IA and the team’s meetings with the faculty provide evidence that over the last two academic years, all faculty members have engaged in a variety of scholarly and professional activities, locally, nationally, and internationally. In the visit the team confirmed that these activities and opportunities have contributed to the growth of the program.

Meetings with students, faculty, and staff, as well as documents available in the team room, provided evidence that academic advising is provided by professors and supported by a staff member. Career
guidance is provided through RIT. Internship opportunities are provided through ARCH-699 Co-op Architecture. Job placement services are provided through RIT. AIA Rochester supports these efforts.

1.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including labs, shops, and equipment.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- Information 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, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

[X] Described
[ ] Not Described

2017 Team Assessment: The APR-IA prepared by RIT for the M. Arch. program for this accreditation visit includes descriptions, diagrams, and photographs of M. Arch. program spaces, together with shop and institutional spaces. Although the APR is less specific in its description of how all these spaces are used, the team received clear explanations from students and faculty as to how the spaces function. We observed that in addition to spaces often associated with accredited architectural programs at other institutions, students and faculty in the M. Arch. program at RIT also had access to some facility resources and instrumentation that provided added opportunities to experiment with and validate specific approaches to sustainability using real-world conditions and testing methods.

The team has visited and verified the relevant spaces, reviewed space requirements and usage patterns with students and faculty, and discussed planning considerations. Spaces verified include studio and studio support spaces, shop space, institutional spaces, and computer resource spaces.

Regarding shop space, the APR-IA notes that as the M. Arch., and other campus programs continue to grow, the department’s “shop resource has become increasingly confining.” The department continues “to explore additional fabrication space options, both throughout the university as a whole and within overall GIS space allocation in particular.” Accordingly, they have also included a request for more shop space in their documentation for RIT’s universitywide budget hearings.

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Demonstrated
[ ] Not Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of financial resources was found in the APR-IA and in the meetings with faculty and staff responsible for budget strategy and administration, and through on-site observations.
of the program and student feedback. RIT provides the Master of Architecture program an initial "permanent budget" based on the needs of the program and the institutional funding available. For the Master of Architecture program, this budget was established when the program was launched in 2011. The permanent budget is carried forward from year to year. Annually, the institution has a budgeting process where all programs develop a list of funding needs, categorized as either permanent or one-time, for the following academic year. The requests are presented to the Budget Committee by the program dean/director during the budget hearing process. The Budget Committee reviews all institutional requests and approves an allocation for the items that will be funded in each program. Budget allocations are based on the institutional funding available. Institutional funding available is based on the original budget model established when the program was launched in 2011.

The Master of Architecture program controls its direct expense categories based on the budget allocation and development funds available. This includes salary, lab supplies, hardware/software, equipment, membership, student recruitment/marketing, travel, student support, tuition assistance and staff development. The program also has control over generating development funds and how they are utilized to support the students.

The program has fellowship, scholarship and general gifts funds that are used annually to provide tuition support in addition to the funding available from the university for tuition assistance. The program has generated over $250,000 in support from outside contributions committed to date. AIA Rochester member firm representatives spoke about the importance of supporting the program through contributions to student scholarship programs. The program also has separate funding line to assist new faculty with development, and the program continues up to the time of tenure review.

The program does not anticipate a reduction in funding as the permanent budget rolls from year to year. This expectation was also expressed in meetings with financial staff. Increases in funding are based on the university's annual budgeting process, and increases in funding for salaries are expected during the annual merit increase process. No other funding increases are expected for the FY17-18 year. In the APR-IA, and in conversations with the program, GIS and university officials, the visiting team found assurances that the program has the financial resources necessary to be successful, and the upper administration expressed support for the financial needs of the program.

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

Further, the program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architectural librarians and visual-resource professionals who provide information services that teach and develop the research, evaluative, and critical-thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

[X] Demonstrated

[ ] Not Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment: The program has demonstrated an immense investment into the information resources available to the students. Students have access to a large and growing collection of materials supported by an engaged librarian. RIT spent over $80,000 last year alone expanding the architecture collection, and is committed to continuing to do so. The library subscribes to 42 architecture-specific journals in print and is increasing the number of digital subscriptions to periodicals.

The librarian is actively devising ways to make the material more easily available to students, such as bringing new books to GIS for students to check out and encouraging faculty to submit titles for acquisition. The librarian directly works with students facilitating their academic work and thesis...
research. Students confirmed they have a working relationship with the architecture librarian, and see great value in having the support. The architecture theses are available online via RIT Scholar Works.

The university provides for basic software needs across campus. The GIS has a fully equipped teaching/ work lab for the exclusive use of architecture and sustainability students. The architecture program requires students to have a laptop and software that is available at no cost to students, or is very affordable. The program also has a small cadre of workstations next to the studio, and a laser cutter for the exclusive use of architecture students. The students expect the number of workstations and software, and the digital fabrication facilities to expand. The GIS building is in itself a major resource, as its performance is constantly monitored, and the architecture students participate in its assessment. Also, the architecture program studios are next to a specialized research lab, facilitating students' familiarization with high-end research equipment and work. Some of the students complete their co-op experiences in these labs.

Through the RIT library system students and faculty have access to specialized databases: the Art and Architecture Archive, ARTstor, and the Avery Index to architectural periodicals. It also offers access to a significant selection of image databases: CAMIO, Oxford Art Online, Rhizome. The library also offers access to video material on architecture, some of it via streaming video.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

- **Administrative Structure:** The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and the school, college, and institution.

- **Governance:** The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[X] Described

[ ] Not Described

**2017 Team Assessment:** The APR-IA describes its structure and personnel, together with the roles of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance, in the context of administration and governance of the architecture program, the Golisano Institute for Sustainability, and the institution.

The decision to house the Department of Architecture within GIS creates a tangible and singular alliance between the M. Arch. program and the GIS's allied academic and research programs in sustainability. The APR-IA provides a detailed description of the structure and governance of the new architecture program.

The RIT narrative describes the program as being "jointly under the Golisano Institute for Sustainability and the College of Imaging Arts and Sciences" and states that "the head engages with both the GIS director and the CIAS dean, while the program is administratively housed and financially structured within GIS. An organization chart included in the APR-IA provides clarification regarding the nuances of this governance structure. The team confirmed the accuracy of the chart through conversations with both GIS and CIAS leadership, and with other university administrative officers.

Both our own conversations with senior administrative officials and the RIT APR-IA document itself offer additional relevant evidence about the program's governance structure. Of particular importance is the fact that within RIT, the Golisano Institute for Sustainability is the functional equivalent of a college; its director has the same access, funding, leadership functions, and opportunities as any dean at RIT. The GIS director, Dr. Nabil Naar, also serves as RIT's assistant provost for academic affairs. In addition to the Master of Architecture, the GIS offers an M.S. in Sustainable Systems and a PhD in Sustainability.
The head of the architecture program, Dennis Andrejko, is a member of the university’s Resource Allocation and Budget Committee. Architecture program Prof. Jules Chiavaroli represents the GIS in the Academic Senate, and as its vice chair, he is a member of the Senate’s Executive Committee. Architecture program professor Dr. Giovanna Potestà is a member of the university’s Faculty Affairs Committee. Architecture and sustainability program professor Dr. Gabrielle Gauad (on leave at the time of the visit) is alternate GIS academic senator. Architecture program professor Nana Andoh is a member of the university’s Academic Affairs committee. The staff is represented by the Staff Council.

Internally students are organized mainly via the AIAS. Campuswide, there is the RIT Student Government Cabinet. Students (undergraduate and graduate) can compete for a senator or director position, or become members of a committee. The Cabinet represents students in the University Council. At present no architecture student is a student director, senator, director, or committee chair.
CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

This part has four sections that address the following:

- **STUDENT PERFORMANCE.** This section includes the Student Performance Criteria (SPC). Programs must demonstrate that graduates are learning at the level of achievement defined for each of the SPC listed in this section. Compliance will be evaluated through the review of student work.

- **CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK.** This section addresses the program and institution relative to regional accreditation, degree nomenclature, credit hour requirements, general education, and access to optional studies.

- **EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION.** The NAAB recognizes that students entering an accredited program from a preprofessional program and those entering an accredited program from a non-preprofessional degree program have different needs, aptitudes, and knowledge bases. In this section, programs will be required to demonstrate the process by which incoming students are evaluated and to document that the SPC expected to have been met in educational experiences in non-accredited programs have indeed been met.

- **PUBLIC INFORMATION.** The NAAB expects accredited degree programs to provide information to the public regarding accreditation activities and the relationship between the program and the NAAB, admissions and advising, and career information, as well as accurate public information concerning the accredited and non-accredited architecture programs.

Programs demonstrate their compliance with Part Two in four ways:

- A narrative report that briefly responds to each request to "describe, document, or demonstrate."

- A review of evidence and artifacts by the visiting team, as well as through interviews and observations conducted during the visit.

- A review of student work that demonstrates student achievement of the SPC at the required level of learning.

- A review of websites, links, and other materials.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

Instructions to the team:

1. When an SPC is MET, the team is required to identify the course or courses where evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found.

2. If an SPC is NOT MET, the team must include a narrative that indicates the reasoning behind the team’s assessment.

3. After completing the VTR, the team must prepare an SPC matrix (using a blank matrix provided by the program) that identifies the courses in which the team found the evidence of student achievement. The team’s matrix is to be appended to the VTR as Appendix 2.

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Being broadly educated.
- Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.
- Communicating graphically in a range of media.
- Assessing evidence.
- Comprehending people, place, and context.
- Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.

A.1 Professional Communication Skills: Ability to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 611 Architectural Representation I, ARCH 612 Architectural Representation II, ARCH 751 Architectural Theory, ARCH 753 Research Seminar/Thesis Preparation, ARCH 761 Understanding Sustainability, ARCH 751 Architectural Theory, and ARCH 790 Thesis. Evidence for ability to use appropriate representational media was found in ARCH 611-612. Evidence for ability to write was found in ARCH 751, ARCH 753, and ARCH 790. Evidence for ability to speak effectively was found in ARCH 761 midterm project where the evaluation rubric documents verbal delivery and body language.
A.2 Design Thinking Skills: Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.

[X] Met

[ ] Not-Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 733 Architectural Studio III: Adaptive Fall semester 2016. This evidence was displayed by students’ ability to combine site and precedent analysis with conceptual development and multiple program schemes resulting in one cohesive design product. The thought process is clearly documented and easily traced from analysis to concept creation and the translation into finished building designs.

A.3 Investigative Skills: Ability to gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

[X] Met

[ ] Not-Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARC ARCH 751 Architectural Theory, ARCH 753 Research Seminar/Thesis Preparation, and ARCH 761 Understanding Sustainability. In ARCH 751 evidence was found in the theoretical analysis of seminal projects. In ARCH 753 evidence was found in the various exercises leading to the thesis proposal. In ARCH 761 evidence was found in many assignments varying from the analysis and evaluation of a specific subject to a general question on a subject.

A.4 Architectural Design Skills: Ability to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

[ ] Not-Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 631 Architectural Design I and ARCH 632 Architectural Design II. In ARCH 631, Project 1 and Project 2 from Fall 2016 demonstrated use of formal and environmental principles in design. In ARCH 632, Project 2 from Spring 2017 demonstrated use of organizational and environmental principles for two and three dimensional design of a single family home.

A.5 Ordering Systems: Ability to apply the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

[ ] Not-Met
2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student design diagrams and drawings prepared for courses, ARCH 631 Architectural Design I and ARCH 632 Architectural Design II.

A.6 Use of Precedents: Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is not met. Some evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 731 Architectural Studio I: Site, ARCH 733 Architectural Studio III: Adaptive, and ARCH 751 Architectural Theory. Evidence to support the students' understanding of “examining and comprehending fundamental principles” was found in the theoretical analysis of architectural projects work for ARCH 751. At an urban scale, evidence demonstrating ability to “examine and comprehend fundamental principles” derived from precedent analysis of urban form was found. But no explicit evidence was found of “making informed choices” on the design of these urban projects. Work for ARCH 733 includes limited analysis of existing buildings for reuse. Additional materials were provided upon the team’s request. Evidence demonstrating ability to examine, comprehend and apply the principles was found in the ARCH 731 project “Meditation Center” generated this semester (fall 2017). By itself this work does not constitute sufficient evidence. Therefore, the team concludes that given the evidence collected in the team room, work produced by students in the period between the previous 2015 candidacy visit and this initial accreditation visit does not offer substantial evidence demonstrating ability to fulfill this criterion.

A.7 History and Culture: Understanding of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, and regional settings in terms of their political, economic, social, and technological factors.

[X] Met

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 621 Architectural History I and ARCH 622 Architectural History II. Additional materials provided upon the team’s request for ARCH 621 and ARCH 622 demonstrated an understanding of the technological factors.

A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity: Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to buildings and structures.

[X] Met

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 621 Architectural History I, ARCH 622 Architectural History II, ARCH 641 Fundamentals of Building Systems, ARCH 761 Understanding Sustainability, and
ARCH 763 Sustainable Building Metrics. Some evidence was found in ARCH 621 and ARCH 622 on spatial patterns. Some evidence was found in ARCH 641 in exercises on different perceptions of space, and on studies on movement patterns in residential environments. Some evidence was found in work on social environmental metrics for ARCH 761, and in one assignment on "Consensus Driven Impact Weighting" for ARCH 763. Additional materials were provided at the team’s request.

Realm A: General Team Commentary: In the previous NAAB visit, three criteria (reviewed under the 2009 NAAB Conditions for accreditation) were found not met: A.1: Communication Skills, A.6: Fundamental Design Skills, and A.7: Use of Precedents. In the NAAB 2014 Conditions A.1 is now Professional Communication Skills; A.6 is now A.4 Architectural Design Skills; and A.7 has been renumbered A.6: Use of Precedents. This last is the only criterion in Realm A that is not met in this review, but progress has been made since the last visit. To resolve the deficiencies noted in 2015 for A.1, the program moved intensive writing to ARCH classified upper level courses and requires some students to take an English language course. Also, the Expressions in Speaking and Writing for Architects elective course was created. For A.4 work in the 1st year studio continues to emphasize these skills, and they are reinforced in every studio form that point on.

Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. Additionally, the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately.

B.1 Pre-Design: Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Met

[-] Not-Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 731: Architectural Studio 1, ARCH 734: Architectural Studio II: Urban, and ARCH 733: Architectural Studio III: Adaptive. Work for ARCH 731, in particular Project 1 from 2017, demonstrated assessment of client and user needs in programming exercises, inventory of spaces and requirements for the program and analysis of site conditions. Work for ARCH 734 demonstrated code review and analysis for sustainability and the impact of those factors on design. Work for ARCH 733, in particular Project 1 from fall 2016, demonstrated assessment of client and user needs, inventory of spaces, and use of site selection and design assessment criteria.
B.2 Site Design: Ability to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation in the development of a project design.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 731: Architectural Studio I: Site-Fall 2017, as well as in ARCH 733: Architectural Studio III: Adaptive. Student work showed clear evidence of understanding site conditions and elements and demonstrated ability to respond architecturally to topography, views, ecological factors, and circulation. The student work also demonstrated the ability to design within an existing urban fabric and be conscious of community values and consider adjacent aesthetics and context.

B.3 Codes and Regulations: Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student code review documents and design drawings prepared for courses ARCH 735 Architectural Studio IV, Integrative and ARCH 742, Integrated Building Systems II.

B.4 Technical Documentation: Ability to make technically clear drawings, prepare outline specifications, and construct models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student outline specification and design work products prepared for courses ARCH 735 Architectural Studio IV, Integrative and ARCH 742, Integrated Building Systems II.

B.5 Structural Systems: Ability to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravity, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 742 Integrated Building Systems II, ARCH 743 Integrated Building Systems III, and ARCH 735 Architectural Studio IV: Integrative. For ARCH 742, student work on criteria tests indicated demonstration of basic structural principles and selection of structural systems, and spring 2017 term project demonstrated understanding of gravitational, seismic, and lateral force, as well as structural systems selection in design of an office building project. For ARCH 743, the spring
2017 City Center project demonstrated application of the ability of structural systems to withstand gravitational, seismic, and lateral forces and structural system selection.

B.6 Environmental Systems: Ability to demonstrate the principles of environmental systems’ design, how design criteria can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This demonstration must include active and passive heating and cooling, solar geometry, daylighting, natural ventilation, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is not met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in the areas of environmental systems design, including active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics. Evidence was not found, however, in the area of geographic diversity. Evidence was found supporting understanding of different climates and different design techniques, but there was not clear evidence of the application of those techniques in making design decisions. Evidence of ability to reconcile climate needs with design has been shown for the Rochester area, but there is no evidence of application of the ability to accommodate other climate factors in functional design decisions in more diverse geographic climates beyond Rochester’s immediate region.

B.7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies: Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 742, Integrated Building Systems II.

B.8 Building Materials and Assemblies: Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components, and assemblies based on their inherent performance, including environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 742, Integrated Building Systems II.

B.9 Building Service Systems: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems, including mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation security, and fire protection systems.
[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 743 Integrated Building Systems III, and ARCH 744 Integrated Building Systems IV. For ARCH 743, term projects for fall 2016 and 2017 demonstrated understanding of mechanical, plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation and fire protection systems. For ARCH 744, the Charlotte Street project from spring 2017 demonstrated an understanding of mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation security, and fire protection systems.
B.10 Financial Considerations: Understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

[X] Met – with Distinction

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met with distinction because the work demonstrates ability at a professional level in many projects. Evidence of student achievement at and above the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 734 Architectural Studio II: Urban, ARCH 743 Integrated Building Systems III, and ARCH 762 Industrial Ecology Fundamentals. For ARCH 734, student work from spring 2017 demonstrated a high level of understanding of project cost analysis. For ARCH 743, the term project for the Wollensak Building demonstrated a broad understanding of construction cost estimation and life-cycle cost. For ARCH 762, the final team project demonstrated a high level of understanding of financial considerations for projects including financing, construction cost estimating, scheduling, and operation and life-cycle cost.

Realm B: General Team Commentary: In the previous NAAB visit, three criteria (reviewed under the 2009 NAAB Conditions for accreditation) were found not met: B.1 Pre-Design; B.6 Comprehensive Design (now C.2 Evaluation and Decision making, and C.3 Integrative Design); and B.10 Building Envelope Systems (now B.7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies). All four equivalent criteria were met. However, B.6 Environmental Systems was not met because there was no evidence demonstrating ability to apply design criteria in regions beyond Rochester. Most of the evidence supporting the criteria in Realm B was found in the Integrated Buildings Systems (IBS) course sequence.

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.
- Responding to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.
- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.

C.1 Research: Understanding of the theoretical and applied research methodologies and practices used during the design process.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 735 Architectural Studio IV: Integrative, ARCH 751 Architectural Theory, and ARCH 762 Industrial Ecology Fundamentals. In ARCH 751 evidence demonstrating understanding of theoretical research methodologies was found in the theoretical analysis projects. In ARCH 753 evidence was found demonstrating both theoretical and applied
Research methods in the work required for defining a strategy for pursuing an investigation. Evidence was also found in ARCH 762 on applied research.

C.2 Evaluation and Decision Making: Ability to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

[X] Met – with Distinction

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met with distinction because of exemplary analysis and documented decision-making involving student research, computer modeling, and interpretive sketches and diagrams. Evidence of student achievement at and above the prescribed level was found in the analysis and documentation prepared for courses ARCH 735 Architectural Studio IV: Integrative, and ARCH 762, Industrial Ecology Fundamentals.

C.3 Integrative Design: Ability to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 735 Architectural Studio IV: Integrative, spring semester 2017. Evidence displays students' ability to fully integrate building systems and structures, as well as sustainable measures involving passive systems and conceptual design decisions that are well considered and implemented. Projects are presented as working drawings clearly conveying the depth of technological intricacy that students have developed in the work, as well as the ability to clearly present that work.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: Realm C was not part of the 2009 NAAB Conditions applied in the previous NAAB visit. Criteria C.2 Evaluation and Decision Making, and C.3 Integrative Design were part of B.6 Comprehensive Design, which was not met in the 2015 visit. Both C2 and C.3 are met this time. C.2 is met with distinction because of exemplary analysis and documented design communicated through a variety of devices and media. Since the last visit the program used the review to strengthen the connections between studio, the integrated building systems courses, and the sustainability course.

Realm D: Professional Practice: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction.
- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.
- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture: Understanding of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect, and other key stakeholders, such as user groups and the community, in the design of the built environment, and understanding the responsibilities of the architect to reconcile the needs of those stakeholders.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 752 Urban and Regional Planning spring 2017, and ARCH 771 Professional Practice spring 2017. Evidence of clear client considerations and reconciliation of architectural needs and client needs is found in ARCH 752. Furthermore, evidence of consideration in regard to other stakeholders, as well as other parties necessary to the design and building process was found in the ARCH 771 course in the form of final business plans containing partnership breakdowns and profiles of consulting and subcontracted agencies.

D.2 Project Management: Understanding of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams; identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements; and recommending project delivery methods.

[X] Met – with Distinction

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met with distinction. Evidence of exemplary student achievement at and above the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 771 Professional Practice.

D.3 Business Practices: Understanding of the basic principles of business practices within the firm, including financial management and business planning, marketing, business organization, and entrepreneurialism.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 771 Professional Practice.

D.4 Legal Responsibilities: Understanding of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 771 Professional Practice. Quizzes and exams for the spring 2017 course demonstrated understanding of the architect's legal responsibilities as they affect the public and clients, as well as the practice of architecture.
D.5 Professional Ethics: Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice, and understanding the role of the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 771 Professional Practice. In particular the spring 2016 assignment 10 for this course demonstrated students' understanding of ethical issues in design and practice.

Realm D. General Team Commentary: All criteria in Realm D are met. D.2 Project Management was met with distinction because the work was above the prescribed level. Most of the evidence supporting the SPC was found in the ARC 771 Professional Practice. Work generated for some of the electives demonstrated student achievement but not all students participate in this. Also, the co-op and global experience if properly documented can potentially provide more evidence support.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation:

In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

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

2. Institutions located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

[X ] Met

{} Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: A statement of accreditation status from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education was included among the supplementary materials for the APR-IA.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following 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.

The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch., M. Arch., or D. Arch. for a nonaccredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Every accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements.

[X ] Met

{} Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: RIT offers a Master of Architecture in the form of a “non-preprofessional degree-plus” requiring an undergraduate degree plus 105 semester credit hours. Three tracks, or “masks,” are offered to complete the degree based on the student’s undergraduate degree. These are: 2.0 Year Mask, 2.5 Year Mask, and 3.5 Year Mask. The latter is for students with an undergraduate degree unrelated to architecture. It consists of 90 credit hours of professional studies, 12 credit hours of graduate electives, a 3 credit hour sustainability elective, and a non-credit co-op and global experience.
On admission, students' transcripts are audited to determine standing for advanced placement based on the credit hours waived. Required courses are waived and transfer credits are assigned only if a student has completed a course with a minimum of a B grade. Up to 27 credit hours of professional studies can be waived or transferred to complete the M. Arch., including 12 studio credit hours. Students in the 2.0 year mask are required to take 63 graduate credit hours of professional studies (ARCH classification), 12 credit hours of graduate electives, a 3 credit hour sustainability elective, and a non-credit required summer co-op experience and/or global experience for a total of 78 credit hours. The main difference between the 2.0 year mask and the 2.5 year is the time of enrollment in the thesis studio and the distribution of the graduate electives.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB Student Performance Criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.

- In the event that a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate that it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.

- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The program has diagrammed three possible tracks in terms of the number of years of study to complete the M. Arch. The "curriculum masks" for each of the three tracks are in the materials given to prospective students.

All sample student records provided to the team included a "tracking and planning" sheet summarizing the credit hours accumulated by a student. RIT Architecture uses a form to document "advanced standing" and "course waiver" approval at the time of admission to the program. It notes the RIT M. Arch. course with the equivalent course at another institution, credits received, and grade. Although the NAAB SPC are not explicitly noted next to a course number and title, the learning outcomes for ARCH courses are correlated to the SPC. Indicating the NAAB SPC assigned to each course waived on the form may add clarity to understanding the advanced standing in relation to the SPC fulfilled in undergraduate preprofessional courses.

Materials available in the team room binder "Evaluation of Undergraduate Work for Course Waiver and/or Advanced Standing" includes articulation agreements with other RIT programs, including the BFA in Interior Design and BS in Civil Engineering Technology for advanced standing in the M. Arch. program. Advanced standing places students in the first semester of the second year. The students must have completed with a minimum of a B grade at least two representation courses (ARCH 611, ARCH 612) and two architectural design studios (ARCH 631, ARCH 632). Also in the list for consideration for advanced standing are ARCH 621, ARCH 622, and ARCH 641. The articulation agreements map the ARCH courses learning outcomes with those of the corresponding INDE (Interior Design), and CVET (Civil Engineering Technology) courses.

The articulation agreement with SUNY Alfred allows for course waivers on ARCH 611, ARCH 612, ARCH 621, ARCH 622, ARCH 631, ARCH 632, and ARCH 741. The articulation agreement maps the ARCH courses learning outcomes, with the preapproved courses taken at Alfred State for the BS in Architectural Technology. The same system is used in the articulation agreement with SUNY Delhi Bachelor of Technology in Architectural Design and Building for waiving courses in the RIT M. Arch. Program (courses ARCH 611, ARCH 612, ARCH 621, ARCH 622, ARCH 631 and ARCH 632).
Documentation provided by the RIT M. Arch. program in the binder indicates that for students applying for advanced standing from institutions other than RIT nationally and from abroad, SUNY Alfred and SUNY Delhi, "the evaluation of equivalencies is conducted on an individual basis using a student's transcript(s), portfolio, course syllabi, and interview if needed." In the review of the sample students' records, the team found with very few exceptions that the courses waived for students admitted into the program with advanced standing from these institutions matched the courses listed in the advanced standing form.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the general public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online.

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 1, in catalogs and promotional media.

[ ] Met

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The exact language is used in the program’s web site, and in a brochure with the program’s information. It was not found in the 2016-2017 Graduate Course Descriptions Catalog and in some promotional materials.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty, and the public:

The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The Conditions for Accreditation in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004, depending on the date of the last visit)

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and 2015 Procedures for Accreditation are available online via the RIT Golisano Institute for Sustainability website, M. Arch. Accreditation web page.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The program has demonstrated that students have access to many career development options and assistance throughout their time at the university and beyond. With heavy support from the AIA Rochester chapter, the program hosts architecture-specific career fairs and lecture series that allow students to connect on a professional level. Also, the co-op program allows students to gain experience working in a firm and has resulted in lasting jobs. They also are provided resources for
II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs:

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

- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- All NAAB Responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB.
- The most recent APR,\(^1\)
- The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda.

[X ] Met

[ ] Not Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Availability of some of the items listed above is not applicable as this is an initial accreditation visit. The 2015 APR—Candidacy Continuation, and VTR—Candidacy Continuation, as well as the 2016 NAAB decision letter are available online via the RIT Golisano Institute for Sustainability website, M. Arch. Accreditation web page.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates:

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their websites to the results.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** This is not applicable given that this is a consideration for initial accreditation.

II.4.6 Admissions and Advising:

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions.
- Admissions requirements, admissions decision procedures, including policies and processes

\(^1\) This is understood to be the APR from the previous visit, not the APR for the visit currently in process.
for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing.

- Forms and process for the evaluation of preprofessional degree content.
- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships.
- Student diversity initiatives.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence has been demonstrated that the program has demonstrated that it provides ample information to students regarding the admissions process and all additional requirements of the architecture program. Students are also assigned a faculty advisor who functions as their academic advising resource to ensure they have access to the most up to date information about the curriculum and their future needs in the program. The students expressed that they felt their needs were fully met by this arrangement and preferred it over the centralized university advising center. All of the necessary information is available to the students on the architecture website through FAQs and other easily navigated links.
II.4.7 Student Financial Information:

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.

- 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.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence has been demonstrated that the university provides information and resources regarding initial tuition costs and processes for receiving financial aid, both in the form of loans and scholarships, as well as documents regarding loan repayment and loan counseling. Students have expressed the ease at which these resources are accessed as well as the helpfulness they have provided. Students also expressed a prior understanding to the costs not only of the program tuition and supplies required for an architecture education. All of these resources are readily available online through links on the architecture page and the financial aid office, as well as in person on campus.
PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit Annual Statistical Reports in the format required by the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation.

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

[X] Met

[-] Not-Met

2017 Team Assessment: A letter from the head of RIT’s M. Arch. program to NAAB dated March 8, 2017, certifying that the data are consistent with reports sent to other regional and national agencies was included in the binder “Supplemental Materials” available in the team room, and an electronic version was made available to the team via a Dropbox folder.

III.2 Interim Progress Reports: The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (see Section 10, NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2015 Edition).

[X] Met

[-] Not-Met

2017 Team Assessment: This is not applicable given that this is a consideration for initial accreditation.
IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

SPC

B.10 Financial Considerations: The criterion is met with distinction because the work demonstrates ability at a professional level in many projects. Evidence of student achievement at and above the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 734 Architectural Studio II: Urban, ARCH 743 Integrated Building Systems III, and ARCH-762 Industrial Ecology Fundamentals. For ARCH 734, student work from spring 2017 demonstrated a high level of understanding of project cost analysis. For ARCH 743, the term project for the Wollensak Building demonstrated a broad understanding of construction cost estimation and life-cycle cost. For ARCH 762, the final team project demonstrated a high level of understanding of financial considerations for projects including financing, construction cost estimating, scheduling, and operation and life-cycle cost.

C. 2 Evaluation and Decision Making: The criterion is met with distinction because of exemplary analysis and documented decision-making involving student research, computer modeling, and interpretive sketches and diagrams. Evidence of student achievement at and above the prescribed level was found in the analysis and documentation prepared for courses ARCH 735 Architectural Studio IV: Integrative, and ARCH 762, Industrial Ecology Fundamentals.

D.2 Project Management: The criterion is met with distinction. Exemplary evidence of student achievement at and above the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for course ARCH 771 Professional Practice.
Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

The team is required to complete an SPC matrix that identifies the course(s) in which student work was found that demonstrated the program's compliance with Part II, Section 1.

The program is required to provide the team with a blank matrix that identifies courses by number and title on the y axis and the NAAB SPC on the x axis. This matrix is to be completed in Excel and converted to Adobe PDF and then added to the final VTR.
NAAB-IA Visiting Team SPC Matrix Version: Oct.18, 2017

Student Performance Criteria Matrix

Relevance to Accreditation

A: measurable
M: measurable and for representation
U: understood
T: tested

Students' performance criteria expected to have been met in baccalaureate program. Advanced standing students may be granted credit for A. 1. 4. 4. 7. based on courses taken and skills demonstrated in portfolio.

Students' performance criteria to be met in Master of Architecture program in the following courses:

ARCH 631 Architectural Representation
ARCH 633 Architectural Representation II
ARCH 621 Architectural History I
ARCH 623 Architectural History II
ARCH 630 Architectural Materials
ARCH 630 Architectural Materials II
ARCH 641 Fundamentals of Building Systems
ARCH 699 Capstone Architecture

ARCH 739 Professional Studio I: Design
ARCH 739 Professional Studio II: Design
ARCH 739 Professional Studio III: Design
ARCH 739 Professional Studio IV: Design
ARCH 742 Integrated Building Systems
ARCH 743 Integrated Building Systems II
ARCH 744 Integrated Building Systems III
ARCH 744 Integrated Building Systems IV
ARCH 750 Architectural History
ARCH 751 Urban and Regional Planning
ARCH 753 Research Methods/Thesis Preparation
ARCH 751 Understanding Sustainability
ARCH 752 Industrial Economy/Design
ARCH 753 Sustainable Building Systems
ARCH 754 Professional Practice
ARCH 799 Thesis (and ARCH 799: Continuation of Thesis)

Global Experience

Not Met
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