Interpretation Guide

2020 Conditions and Procedures

National Architectural Accrediting Board

October 24, 2025

www.naab.org

Introduction

The *Interpretation Guide to the 2020 Conditions* is a companion document intended to provide guidance to programs and teams in the accreditation process. This document also contains references from the *2020 Procedures for Accreditation*—such as information on evidence required for Program and Student Criteria which are not part of the Architecture Program Report (APR)—to assist in writing the APR and in preparation for a visit. This Interpretation Guide includes examples to illustrate potential approaches that programs might take and resources that can be helpful and are not requirements. For transparency, this document contains instructions for both the APR and the Visiting Team Report (VTR) so both program administrators and visiting team members can see the information that is provided to each. The intent of the Interpretation Guide is to serve as a living document that will be periodically updated based on comments and questions from programs and teams. As such, programs and teams are encouraged to contact the NAAB office with questions and clarifications. This document is not considered a part of *The Conditions for Accreditation.* It is advisory to and non-binding on the Board.

A list of accreditation resources, forms, and templates are available on the NAAB website here. Please check our website periodically for a list of new and updated resources.

Interpretation Guide Key

	Interpretation Guidance
	References from APR Template
	References from the 2020 Procedures
	Conditions under a temporary stay. A list of those conditions can be viewed here.

Instructions for Preparing Architecture Program Reports (APR)

The Architecture Program Report (APR) serves both as a self-study for the program and as the principal source document for conducting the visit. The APRs for programs seeking Initial Candidacy, Continuing Candidacy, and Initial Accreditation are very similar to the APR for Continuing Accreditation, and any variation from this format is provided later in this document.

Content

Interpretation for Programs and Teams

- The APR is a document that requires the program to engage in self-assessment and provides a narrative description of compliance with each condition and the processes for continuous improvement.
- In its APR, the program is expected to succinctly describe how it meets each of the Conditions for Accreditation. The team will enter a response under each Condition in the VTR to indicate their findings for each accredited degree being reviewed.
- To the extent that photographs, tables, or other types of information support the program's narrative, they may also be included, but not to the detriment of the narrative.
- If a program has more than one accredited degree being reviewed, each APR must clearly articulate what is common to both programs and what is unique to each (such as required courses).
- Beginning in 2026, all APR's will be submitted using the Accreditation Management System (AMS).

1—Context and Mission

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

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Response is limited to three (3) pages and includes descriptions of:
    - Geographic setting.
    - How the program's mission influences its pedagogy.
    - How institutional mission and context influence the program.
    - How the program develops multi-disciplinary relationships.
    - Relationship of program to the university community.
    - How the program encourages students and faculty to learn inside and outside of the classroom.
    - Course and program delivery modality (in-person, on-line, hybrid etc.).

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- University mission documents.
- College mission documents.
- Departmental mission documents.
- Strategic plan/priorities.
- A description of regular faculty professional development opportunities that address how faculty are encouraged to learn inside and outside the classroom.
- A description of community service opportunities, including specific examples of how the program leverages unique opportunities in the community or how the community context influences the program.
- Research opportunities, including examples of how these opportunities impact or are impacted by the program's context and/or mission.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify the program's mission and context.
- Cite examples from the APR or those observed during the visit to provide a clear understanding of the program's context and mission.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met/*Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession

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

Overall Guidelines

Interpretation for Programs

- The Shared Values may be expressed in the range of opportunities, activities, and curriculum offered by the academic unit as a whole and not limited to only those efforts required by the professional degree.
- Shared Values should be evident throughout programs and units as whole and not solely within the curriculum. For each value, describe:
    - How the value follows through to, and are substantiated within, the Program and Student Criteria and non-curricular experiences.
    - How the program continuously addresses this value as part of its long-range planning. This evidence aligns with Condition 5.2 Planning and Assessment.
- Programs have found success in maintaining a consistent approach to the discussion of all the values throughout the APR.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence:

- A diagram detailing how values are represented in the curriculum. This can be a part of the PC/SC matrix that identifies where values are addressed through curricular and/or non-curricular activities.
- Links to the program's website where values are discussed. The site may also serve as evidence if it provides concrete examples of how the program embodies a specific value.
- Evidence of where the values are addressed in the strategic plan.
- Non-curricular activities that represent an approach to the values.
- Research opportunities linked to the values.
- Examples of specific projects or community relationships that address the values.
- Examples of how the Shared Values are implemented by the program in various aspects of the conditions in addition to those evidenced in Condition 3 Program and Student Criteria.
- Examples of program or student learning outcomes related to the values.
- A description of an assessment strategy and evaluation of the values-related outcomes.
- Evidence regarding the current status of progress toward the value.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify that the program effectively incorporates each shared value. Review the narrative and evidence regarding:
    - How the values follow through to, and are substantiated within, the Program and Student Criteria and non-curricular experiences.
    - How the program continuously addresses these values as part of its long-range planning.
- Do not evaluate or assess the program's shared values as weak/strong, etc.
- Verify the narrative through the meetings with students, faculty, administration, and program director regarding how the Shared Values are implemented by the program and show up in various aspects of the curriculum, governance, student learning outcomes, etc.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions during the site visit.

- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy)*

Guidelines for Each Value

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Provide a narrative describing how the program develops graduates with an understanding of design as a multidimensional process involving research, prototyping, iteration, evaluation, redesign and problem resolution leading to the discovery of new opportunities and creating value.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- A description and evidence of the program's design philosophy.
- Evidence of opportunities for sustained, action-oriented dialogue to identify and address significant issues regarding the sustainability, resiliency, equity, safety, and quality of the built environment.
- Evidence of opportunities for design thinking and integrated design solutions throughout the program, college and the university.
- A description of program and/or student learning outcomes sought for these values. Assessment data should substantiate progress toward the outcomes.
- A description of how elements of this value correlate with specific Program or Student Criteria. If provided, this evidence should align with but not duplicate the evidence provided for those criteria.
- Evidence of the value in long-range planning including programmatic strategic planning documents, meeting notes, etc.

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Provide a narrative describing how the program develops graduates with an understanding of the impact of their work on the natural world as well as on public health, safety and welfare.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Evidence of opportunities for students to address the potential impact of the built environment on the natural world.
- Evidence of opportunities for students to evaluate the potential impact of their work on public health, safety, and welfare.
- Evidence of specific projects or community relationships that address environmental stewardship.
- Evidence of opportunities that prepare graduates to be active, engaged citizens, able to understand what it means to be professional members of society and to act ethically on that understanding.
- A description of program and/or student learning outcomes sought for this value. Assessment data should substantiate progress toward the outcomes.
- A description of connections between the program and research on environmental stewardship.

- A description of how elements of this value correlate with specific Program Criteria or Student Criteria, if provided, this evidence should align with but not duplicate the evidence provided for those criteria.
- Evidence of the value in long-range planning including programmatic strategic planning documents, meeting notes, etc.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion*: This Condition is under a temporary stay.*

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Provide a narrative describing how the program develops graduates with an understanding of how to create and share design focused knowledge to address varying and changing conditions.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Evidence of research and scholarly activities for students and faculty that develop new knowledge and contribute to or spur innovation
- Evidence of connections between practice and the program
- A description of the academic unit's philosophy for fostering innovation in the program
- Evidence of professional development activities
- Evidence of interdisciplinary or specialized strategies that foster innovation or continuous improvement in the discipline
- Evidence of opportunities for participation in innovation-based design competitions (such as the Solar Decathlon).
- A description of program and/or student learning outcomes sought for this value. Assessment data should substantiate progress toward the outcomes.
- A description of how elements of this value correlate with specific Program Criteria or Student Criteria. If provided, this evidence should align with but not duplicate the evidence provided for those criteria.
- Evidence of the value in long-range planning including programmatic strategic planning documents, meeting notes, etc.

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

A portion of this Condition *is under a temporary stay.*

Interpretation for Programs

Narrative describing how the program develops graduates with an understanding that architects practice in collaboration with other disciplines, the communities served and clients.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Evidence of opportunities for leadership, collaboration (including multi-disciplinary collaboration) and community engagement embedded in the curriculum.
- Evidence of opportunities for non-curricular leadership and collaboration for students (such as multi-disciplinary competitions like ULI Hines or student organizations).

- Evidence of opportunities for curricular and non-curricular community engagement, such as service-learning projects, pro bono work, local educational outreach, advocacy work, and board service.
- Evidence of connections between the program and professional organizations that address multi-disciplinary collaboration.
- A description of program and/or student learning outcomes sought for this value. Assessment data should substantiate progress toward the outcomes.
- A description of how elements of this value correlate with specific Program Criteria or Student Criteria. If provided, this evidence should align with but not duplicate the evidence provided for those criteria (such as PC 6 Leadership and Collaboration).
- Evidence of the value in long-range planning including programmatic strategic planning documents, meeting notes, etc.

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

Interpretation for Programs
Provide a narrative describing how the program develops graduates with an understanding of the body of knowledge, history and theory, and the role of the architect in the listed contexts, AND how the program inculcates in its students an appreciation of the need for lifelong learning in the practice of architecture.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Evidence of interdisciplinary approaches that address the elements of this value.
- Evidence of opportunities for professional development for students.
- Evidence of connections between students and professionals that focus on continuing education opportunities.
- Evidence of opportunities for students to engage with IPAL or AXP programs.
- Evidence of opportunities for students to connect with professionals in the field.
- Evidence of continuing education opportunities for students, faculty and alumni.
- A description of program and/or student learning outcomes sought for this value.
- Assessment data should substantiate progress toward the outcomes.
- A description of how elements of this value correlate with specific Program Criteria or Student Criteria. If provided, this evidence should align with but not duplicate the evidence provided for those criteria.
- Evidence of the value in long-range planning including programmatic strategic planning documents, meeting notes, etc.

3—Program and Student Criteria

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

Overall Guidelines for Program and Student Criteria

Interpretation for Programs

- Programs are encouraged to preface their discussion of the individual PCs/SCs with any common assessment methodologies and mechanisms applicable to multiple PCs/SCs, to which individual PC/SC responses may reference to avoid unnecessary redundancy.
- The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.
- The manner in which programs respond to the aggregated assessment for continual improvement is at the program's discretion, given their individual circumstances, and could include curricular refinements or other measures appropriate to their situation.

Interpretation for Teams

- Teams have the option to preface their discussion of individual PCs/SCs with discussion of any common assessment methodologies and mechanisms applicable to multiple PCs/SCs, to which individual PC/SC responses may reference to avoid unnecessary redundancy.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy)*.

Required Matrix: A Program and Student Criteria Matrix, PC/SC Matrix is required for each accredited degree program and each track offered (if tracks are assessed differently). Identify the primary assessment points for each PC and SC. The matrix should answer the question: What are the key courses or non-curricular activities where student learning for each criterion occurs and the program assesses student learning outcomes (i.e., assessment points).

- The PC/SC Matrix can also be used as a curriculum map if the program highlights, through a mechanism such as words or color-coding, the key assessment points for each PC and SC.
- If any criteria are expected to have been met in preparatory or pre professional education prior to admission to the NAAB-accredited program, indicate as such using the matrix. The process the program uses to evaluate this work is described in Condition 4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education.
- Limit the designations to the primary evidence source(s) and course(s) in which the greatest evidence is found.

3.1 Program Criteria (PC)

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

The following (from the *2020 Procedures*) describes the types of evidence required for the assessment of PC:

Primary Evidence for Program Criteria (PC). *The program will submit the primary exhibits as evidence for PC to the visiting team in an electronic format 45 days before the visit.*

Program Criteria should be evaluated holistically relative to curricular and extracurricular offerings and the students' experience of them. The program must provide a narrative description

of how the program achieves each criterion. The program must also provide evidence that each criterion is assessed by the program on a recurring basis, and must summarize the modifications made to its curricula and/or associated program structures and materials based on findings from these assessment activities since the previous review.

***Supporting Materials**: The program must provide supporting materials demonstrating that its objectives have been accomplished. These may include policy documents, individual course materials (e.g., syllabi) as well as documentation of activities occurring outside specific courses.*

Interpretation for Programs

- Program Criteria (PC) represent broad and fundamental knowledge, understanding, and skills underlying the profession that all students need to demonstrate as they progress through the program.
- Program Criteria (PC) require programs to evaluate how they structure the entirety of the student experience to ensure the eight Program Criteria are addressed and assessed by the time of graduation. These criteria take a holistic approach to how instruction and experiences contribute to students' knowledge acquisition and understanding.
- PCs focus only on the accredited program and are required of all students in the program. The Criteria may be met through curricular and/or non-curricular activities.
- Note that assessment evidence relevant to NAAB accreditation should focus on specific outcomes aligned to stated NAAB criteria. Programs are free to discuss additional program self-assessment of outcomes beyond or corollary to these criteria to provide a holistic view of their assessment process, though aspects of the required assessment should be clearly identified and highlighted.
- All courses identified as key assessment points in the matrix should be included in the narrative, self-assessment, and supporting materials.
- Programs must provide relevant material for all tracks (if the program has multiple tracks).
- All evidence must be anchored in the program's existing learning activities.
- Programs have found success by maintaining a consistent approach to the discussion of all the Program Criteria throughout the APR. This might take the form of consistent headers in the APR for each required element of the response (Narrative, Self-Assessment, Supporting Materials) with dedicated links to assessment and supporting materials relevant to that PC, or other similar intuitive organizational strategies.
- Programs are encouraged to preface their discussion of the individual PCs/SCs with any common assessment methodologies and mechanisms applicable to multiple PCs/SCs, to which individual PC/SC responses may reference to avoid unnecessary redundancy.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Assessment plans and reports related to the specified Program Criteria.
- Points of assessment for each criteria – noted in the PC Matrix (i.e., where is the PC is assessed).
- Direct and indirect assessment methods with benchmarks (i.e., how is the PC assessed).
- Data collection plan and aggregated data of student learning to demonstrate student achievement (i.e., when the PC is assessed).
- Aggregated data with analysis and comparison against benchmarks (i.e., assessment data was collected and how the data was analyzed and compared to the benchmark).
- A summary of modifications based on the analysis of the assessment data made to the curricula and/or associated program structures and materials. (i.e., what actions the program took after reviewing the assessment to address any identified deficiencies in achievement of desired outcomes or further improve achievement of program outcomes).

- Connections between approaches described to support Shared Values that relate to specific Program Criteria.
- Program review documentation related to the specified Program Criteria. Programs may provide examples of student work to illustrate elements of specific Program Criteria. If programs provide student work, teams are not required to review it; however, student work CANNOT substitute for the required narrative or evidence of self-assessment.

Interpretation for Teams

- Evaluate Program Criteria holistically relative to curricular and extracurricular offerings and the students' experience of them.
- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address each criterion and their approach to recurring assessment. If "not met," describe missing elements.
- Use the PC/SC matrix to identify key assessment points for each criterion.
- For each PC, the team must **verify and document** that the program:
    - Has an approach to address each criterion in curricular and non-curricular experiences to ensure that students understand or have the ability to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, abilities, and/or values in each of the PCs.
    - Engages in assessment of each criterion on a recurring basis as required,
    - Makes modifications to the curricula and/or associated program structures based on findings from these assessment activities.
- The team should comment on the primary source where they found this evidence (e.g., course syllabi, specific assignments aligned to NAAB criteria/sub-criteria, projects, process work, studio crits, study-abroad requirements, non-curricular activities, etc.) and/or what was missing.
- The team should comment on how they confirmed the evidence (e.g., through discussions with stakeholders and other interactions during the site visit, etc.).
- Teams have the option to preface their discussion of individual PCs/SCs with discussion of any common assessment methodologies and mechanisms applicable to multiple PCs/SCs, to which individual PC/SC responses may reference to avoid unnecessary redundancy.
- In addressing individual PCs, teams have found success in maintaining a consistent format in their responses. This might take the form of structuring responses consistently to note: how the program addresses the substance of the PC (including where in the curriculum or non-curricular activities); the assessment process and outcomes; and how the team confirmed their evaluation. If common aspects of assessment methodologies apply to multiple PCs and have been noted by the team in an introductory response, teams can reference that in their subsequent responses in order to minimize redundancy.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Include how this approach is introduced, applied, and assessed in the curriculum as well as supporting courses.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence:

- Curricular experiences -- reflected in the PC Matrix

  - Syllabi and/or schedules for classes directly related to the content for this criterion – direct teams to the specific learning outcomes, content, and assessment points within the documentation.
  - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities specifically related to career paths and career opportunities within the field of architecture or utilizing an architecture education.
  - Required community engagement projects that showcase career paths and opportunities in the field of architecture or utilizing an architecture education.

- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience
  - Lecture series, including panel discussions, directly related to career paths and career opportunities in the field of architecture or utilizing an architecture education.
  - Required orientation sessions related directly to the introduction of architecture career paths and opportunities.
  - Annual orientations by the program's Architectural Licensing Advisor, including introduction to the AXP training/documentation process and other NCARB career resources.
  - Mentorship, networking, internship, and career fairs that all students experience.

- Assessment points for each element of this PC, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, and a summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to this assessment.
  - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program's curriculum, structure, and other experiences meet each element of this criterion. If "not met," describe missing element(s) in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Address the extent to which the program effectively assesses outcomes related to each part of this criterion, does this on a recurring basis, and makes improvement to its approach or curriculum in response to that assessment.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy)*.

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Program responses should take particular note that the criterion emphasizes the integrated nature of the design process, as well as design at multiple scales, for which team evaluators will be specifically looking.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Curricular experiences -- reflected in the PC Matrix:
  - Description of the program's design process/studio sequence, including how the design process is introduced, applied, and assessed in coursework.

    - Syllabi and/or schedules for coursework identified in the PC matrix as primary points of student learning for the program's design philosophy – direct teams to the specific outcomes, content, and assessment points within the documentation.
    - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities/projects specifically related to the role of design within the built environment.
    - Required community engagement projects that require students to engage in the design process.

- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience:
    - Required design charrette(s) that address the specifics of this criterion.
    - Required lectures, field trips, and/or other resources that impact all students' design learning objectives.
    - Research activities and resources that impact curricular and/or non-curricular student learning.

- Assessment points for each element in this PC, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, and a summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to this assessment.
    - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program's curriculum, structure, and other experiences meet each element of this criterion. If "not met," describe missing element(s) in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Note specifically how the program responds to the integrative nature of the design process and how it addresses design at multiple scales and settings.
- Address the extent to which the program effectively assesses outcomes related to each part of this criterion, does this on a recurring basis, and makes improvement to its approach or curriculum in response to that assessment.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Programs should note that this PC may encompass both coursework on environmental control systems as well as curricular/non-curricular material addressing sustainability at the macro level.
- Programs should specifically note how it addresses **all** the various perspectives listed in the criterion.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Curricular experiences – reflected in the PC Matrix:

  - Description of the program's sustainability philosophy and the courses/sequence of courses where it is addressed, including how the concepts of this criterion are introduced, applied, and assessed in coursework.
  - Syllabi and/or schedules for classes and studios directly related to the content for this criterion – direct teams to the specific learning outcomes, content, and assessment points within the documentation.
  - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities/projects specifically related to ecological knowledge and responsibility.
  - Required studio and community engagement projects that require students to address the intersection of the built and natural environments and understand the role architects can take in mitigating climate change.

- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience:
  - Required design charrette(s) that address the specifics of this criterion.
  - Research activities and resources that impact curricular and/or non-curricular student learning.
  - Lecture series, including panel discussions that all students experience directly related to ecological knowledge and responsibility in the field of architecture.

- Assessment points related to each element of this PC, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to this assessment
  - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address each element of this criterion. If "not met," describe missing element(s) in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Address the extent to which the program effectively assesses student learning related to each part of this criterion, does this on a recurring basis, and makes improvement to its approach or curriculum in response to that assessment.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

A portion of this Condition *is under a temporary stay.*

Interpretation for Programs

- Programs should specifically note how it addresses ***all*** of the various perspectives listed in the criterion**.**

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence:

- Curricular experiences – reflected in the PC Matrix:

  - Description of how the program approaches history and theory, including the courses/sequence of courses in which the concepts of this criterion are addressed, and how the concepts of this criterion are introduced, applied, and assessed in the coursework.
  - Description of how the program specifically addresses multicultural and interdisciplinary perspectives in architectural/urban history and theory.
  - Required off-campus or study-abroad coursework that exposes students to different cultural histories and contexts.
  - Syllabi and/or schedules for classes directly related to the content for this criterion – direct teams to the specific learning outcomes, content, and assessment points within the documentation.
  - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities/projects specifically related to the history and theory of design.
  - Required community engagement projects that require students to address the history and theory of design in varying contexts.

- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience:
  - Required design charrette(s) that address the specifics of this criterion.
  - Lecture series, including panel discussions, directly related to the history and theory of architecture.
  - Research activities and resources impacting curricular and/or non-curricular student learning.

- Assessment points for each element in this PC, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to this assessment.
  - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address each element of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing element(s) in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Address the extent to which the program effectively assesses student learning related to each part of this criterion, does this on a recurring basis, and makes improvement to its approach or curriculum in response to that assessment.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Note that this PC can encompass both technical research and innovation as well as architectural research in other fields, such as the humanities, behavioral, and social sciences, among others. As such, programs should highlight how students in the accredited program are introduced to avenues for research and innovation appropriate to its mission and context.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence:

- Curricular experiences – reflected in the PC Matrix:
    - Description of how the program approaches research and innovation, including the courses/sequence of courses in which the concepts of this criterion are addressed, and how the concepts of this criterion are introduced, applied, and assessed in the coursework.
    - Syllabi and/or schedules for classes directly related to the content for this criterion – direct teams to the specific learning outcomes, content, and assessment points within the documentation.
    - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities/projects specifically related to research and innovation testing.
    - Required community engagement projects that require students to address research and test innovations.

- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience:
    - Required design charrette(s) that address the specifics of this criterion.
    - Research colloquia and/or conferences.
    - Collaboration with research centers/institutes.
    - Research activities and resources that impact curricular and/or non-curricular student learning.
    - Lecture series including panel discussions directly related to research and innovation in the field of architecture.

- Assessment points for each element of this PC, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to this assessment.
    - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address each element of this criterion. If "not met," describe missing element(s) in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Address the extent to which the program effectively assesses student learning related to each part of this criterion, does this on a recurring basis, and makes improvement to its approach or curriculum in response to that assessment.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

A portion of this Condition is under a temporary stay.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Curricular experiences – reflected in the PC Matrix:

  - Description of how the program approaches leadership and collaboration, including the studios and courses/sequence of courses in which the concepts of this criterion are addressed, and how the concepts of this criterion are introduced, applied, and assessed in the coursework.
  - Description of how, why, and when the program integrates collaborative studio and/or project work in the curriculum.
  - Syllabi and/or schedules for classes directly related to the content for this criterion – direct teams to the specific learning outcomes, content, and assessment points within the documentation.
  - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities/projects specifically related to leadership and collaboration in multidisciplinary teams and changing physical and social contexts.
  - Required community engagement studios and projects that require students to address the complexities of leadership and collaboration in varying contexts.
  - Community and stakeholder participation in studios/coursework impacting student learning outcomes.

- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience:
  - Required design charrette(s) that address the specifics of this criterion.
  - Activities/collaborations with student, professional, and/or community organizations that address leadership and collaboration for all students.
  - Formalized mechanisms for student input and participation in curricular development and studio culture.
  - Lecture series including panel discussions directly related to leadership, collaboration, and multi-disciplinary teams.

- Assessment points for each element of this PC, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to this assessment.
  - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address each element of this criterion. If "not met," describe missing element(s) in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Address the extent to which the program effectively assesses student learning related to each part of this criterion, does this on a recurring basis, and makes improvement to its approach or curriculum in response to that assessment.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Programs have found success in meeting this PC through developing, implementing, and assessing the effectiveness of formalized policy documents on learning and teaching

culture, as a formalized Learning and Teaching Culture Policy can help one's program by giving students, faculty, administrators, and staff the language to express concerns and work with each other towards solutions. Note, however, that the PC does not require programs to have specific policy documents, per se, as long as they demonstrate how they encourage and ensure a positive learning and teaching culture.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Institutional or program mission, vision, values, culture, and/or diversity/equity/inclusion/belonging approaches and policies that address elements of this criterion. The program's response should describe its approach to addressing these with each of the four constituencies noted in the criterion.
    - Active links to the current institutional/program teaching/learning and/or studio culture policy(ies).
    - Inclusion of elements of the AIA Guides for Equitable Practice and/or the AIAS model Learning, Teaching, and Culture Policy.
    - Formalized mechanisms for recurring student input and participation in curricular development and studio culture, including participation in the assessment process.
    - Evidence of faculty retreat/meetings specifically addressing the teaching and learning culture policy development and evaluation. Link directly to the section and page with the relevant discussion.
    - Evidence of meetings of joint committees or town-halls of faculty, administrators, staff, and students specifically addressing the learning and teaching culture policies, and evidence of the discussions and policies being revised regularly for resilience and accuracy, as each year brings new students and faculty.
    - Description of the program's learning and teaching philosophy and approach, including any courses in which elements of the criterion are introduced, applied, and assessed in the coursework.
    - Projects that build a positive teaching and learning environment while addressing the elements of this criterion, including project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities specifically related to the criterion.
    - Lecture series, including panel discussions, directly related to fostering a positive teaching and learning environment that addresses the elements of this criterion.
- Assessment points for the elements of this PC, direct and indirect assessment methods including evaluation of the efficacy of any teaching and learning culture policy, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, and a summary of modifications made to the program, policies, and experiences related to this assessment. This may include data related to reported violations or grievances filed in accordance with the policy.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure, policies, and other experiences address each element of this criterion, including awareness of studio culture policies. If "not met" describe missing element(s) in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Although a best practice, note that this PC does not require programs to have specific policy documents, per se, but rather that they demonstrate how they encourage and ensure a positive learning and teaching culture.
- Address the extent to which the program effectively assesses its achievement each part of this criterion, does this on a recurring basis, and makes improvement to its approach or curriculum in response to that assessment.

- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion*: This Condition is under a temporary stay.*

3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes
A program must demonstrate how it addresses the following criteria through program curricula and other experiences, with an emphasis on the articulation of learning objectives and assessment.

Interpretation for Programs

- The Student Criteria (SC) represent specific levels of understanding and ability related to architectural practice that students are expected to attain as they progress through the program. Student Criteria are addressed through curricular or non-curricular activities that all students in the accredited degree program experience.
    - While SCs are achieved through required coursework, required electives may be included if students can choose between multiple courses with the same learning outcomes. An example would be a requirement that students select at least one of a menu of study abroad, study away, service learning, or individualized study requirements that the program offers, each designed to achieve a specific learning outcome related to the SC in addition to any other course-specific outcomes.
- Studio presentations, studio crits, and juries can also be noted, as applicable, in regard to both instructional materials as well self-assessment mechanisms.
- Best practices for outcomes-based self-assessment include:
    - Evidence of student learning outcomes associated with each criterion.
    - Points of assessment for each learning outcome identified in the SC Matrix (i.e., where is the SC assessed).
    - Direct and indirect assessment methods with benchmarks (i.e., how is the SC assessed).
    - Data collection plan (i.e., when is the SC assessed).
    - Aggregated data of student learning to demonstrate student achievement, with analysis and comparison against benchmarks (i.e., what assessment data is collected and how it is analyzed and compared to the benchmark).
    - Summary of modifications, based on the analysis of the assessment data, made to the curricula and/or associated program structures and materials (i.e., what actions the program took after reviewing the assessment to address any identified deficiencies in student learning achievement or further improve outcomes).
- Assessment of individual student learning and actions taken to improve outcomes on an individualized basis may contribute to a program's overall self-assessment strategy, though it cannot in itself replace the aggregated assessment described above.
- Note that assessment evidence relevant to NAAB accreditation should focus on specific learning outcomes aligned to stated NAAB criteria. Programs are free to discuss additional program self-assessment of objectives beyond or corollary to these criteria to provide a holistic view of their assessment process, though aspects of the required assessment should be clearly identified and highlighted.
- All courses identified in the matrix are included in the narrative, self-assessment and supporting materials.
- Provide relevant material for all tracks (if the program has multiple tracks).
- All evidence must be anchored in the program's existing learning activities.

- Programs have found success by maintaining a consistent approach to the discussion of all of the Student Criteria throughout the APR. This might take the form of consistent headers in the APR for each required element of the response (Narrative, Self-Assessment, Supporting Materials, and, for SC.5-SC.6, Student Work) with dedicated links to assessment and supporting materials relevant to that SC, or other similar intuitive organizational strategies.
- Programs are encouraged to preface their discussion of the individual PCs/SCs with any common assessment methodologies and mechanisms applicable to multiple PCs/SCs, to which individual PC/SC responses may reference to avoid unnecessary redundancy. (See 3.0 above.)

SC.1 - SC.4: Requirements

The following (from the *2020 Procedures*) describes the types of evidence required for the assessment of SC.1 through SC.4:

Primary Evidence for Student Criteria (SC) SC.1 through SC.4. *These criteria will be evaluated at the understanding level. The program will submit the primary exhibits as evidence for SC.1-4 to the visiting team in an electronic format 45 days before the visit. Programs must provide the following:*

Narrative*: A narrative description of how the program achieves and evaluates each criterion.*

Self-Assessment*: Evidence that each student learning outcome associated with these criteria is developed and assessed by the program on a recurring basis, with a summary of the modifications the program has made to its curricula and/or individual courses based on findings from its assessments since the previous review.*

Supporting Materials*: Supporting materials demonstrating how the program accomplishes its objectives related to each criterion. Organize the supporting exhibits in the format specified by the NAAB and include the following for each course associated with the student learning outcome:*

a) ***Course Syllabus****. The syllabus must clearly articulate student learning outcome objectives for the course, the methods of assessment (e.g., tests, project assignments), and the relative weight of each assessment tool used by the instructor(s) to determine student performance.*

b) ***Course Schedule****. The schedule must clearly articulate the topics covered in the class and the amount of time devoted to each course subtopic.*

c) ***Instructional Materials****. The supporting materials must clearly illustrate the instructional materials used in the course. These may include a summary of required readings, lecture materials, field trips, workshop descriptions, and other materials used in the course to achieve the intended learning outcomes.*

Interpretation for Programs: SC.1-SC.4

- Programs should ensure they address ***all*** parts of each criterion, both in terms of student learning objectives, pedagogical methodologies, learning outcomes, and assessment of outcomes.

Examples of evidence that the program may provide

- Connections between approaches described to support Shared Values that relate to specific Student Criteria.
- Program review documentation, assessment plans, and reports directing the team to the data related to the specific Student Criteria.

- Programs may provide examples of student work to illustrate elements of specific SC.1-SC.4 criteria. If programs provide student work, teams are not required to review it; however, student work CANNOT substitute for the required narrative or evidence of self-assessment.
- Note: the PC/SC Matrix can also be used as a curriculum map with a key to identify assessment points.

Interpretation for Teams: SC.1-SC.4

- Evaluate Student Criteria 1-4 at the **UNDERSTANDING** level.
- Review the matrix and the narrative to determine where the program addresses the Student Criteria.
- Review the digital evidence and student work (if applicable) to validate the matrix and the narrative regarding how the program ensures that students understand or have the ability to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, abilities, and values detailed in each SC.
- Describe succinctly the extent to which the program meets each element and sub-element of the criteria, and comment on the primary source of the evidence (e.g., course syllabi, specific assignments aligned to NAAB criteria/sub-criteria, projects, process work, studio crits, etc.).
- Describe succinctly the recurring assessment process and verify assessment measures for each criterion. If the team has prefaced its discussion of PCs/SCs with a description of assessment processes common to multiple criteria, it can reference that discussion where applicable to avoid redundancy.
- Verify the timeline for collecting and analyzing the assessment results.
- Review the program's analysis; programs should be comparing the data collected for each of the assessed criteria against its established benchmarks to determine whether the program is meeting its own benchmarks. Note that failing to meet a benchmark is not in itself a cause for the SC to be "not met," provided that the program acts upon this assessment to address the deficiency.
- Verify the modifications made to curricula and/or associated program structures and materials based on findings from these assessment activities.
- Teams should comment on how they confirmed the evidence (e.g., through discussions with stakeholders and other interactions during the site visit, etc.).
- If "not met" describe missing elements in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.

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

Interpretation for Programs

- According to the AIA, Health, Safety, and Welfare (HSW) refers to aspects of architecture that aim to protect the public by ensuring the physical well-being of building occupants through design elements that prevent injury, promote positive experiences, and provide equitable access, encompassing both the health and safety of users as well as their overall welfare within a building or site. "Licensed architects and affiliated design professionals have, in their professional practice, a positive duty to protect the public's health, safety, and welfare. Learning programs must address knowledge intended to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the occupants of the built environment, as defined below:
    - **Health:** Those aspects of professional practice that improve the physical, emotional, and social well-being of occupants, users, and any others affected by buildings and sites.

    - **Safety:** Those aspects of professional practice that protect occupants, users, and any others affected by buildings or sites from harm.
    - **Welfare:** "Those aspects of professional practice that enable equitable access, elevate the human experience, encourage social interaction, and benefit the environment." (NCARB Continuing Education Guidelines)
- Programs have found success in clearly defining their approach to the elements of SC.1 HSW in the Built Environment vis-a-vis SC.3 Regulatory Context when one or more of the elements may be applicable to both SCs.
    - Although there may be some degree of overlap between SC.1 and SC.3, particularly in regard to code requirements for life safety, SC.1 focuses specifically on student understanding of how HSW considerations manifest in user experience of the built environment.
    - Programs should clearly distinguish how different aspects of these elements in the respective criteria are addressed in distinct student learning objectives.
- Programs should ensure that they provide evidence of addressing HSW at multiple scales ("from buildings to cities"), for which visiting teams will be specifically looking.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence:

- Curricular experiences – reflected in the SC Matrix:
    - Identify the student learning outcome(s) for this criterion
    - Description of how developing an understanding of the impact of the built environment on health, safety, and welfare is addressed, including the courses/sequence of course in which the concepts of this criterion are addressed. Include how the concepts of this criterion are introduced, applied, and assessed in the coursework.
    - Syllabi, schedules and learning materials for classes directly related to the content for this criterion – direct teams to the specific learning outcomes, content, and assessment points within the documentation related to this criterion.
    - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities/projects specifically related to the elements of this condition.
    - Required community engagement projects that require students to address this criterion.

- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience:
    - Required design charrette(s) that address the specifics of this criterion.
    - Lecture series, including panel discussions that all students experience directly related to the impact of the built environment on health, safety and welfare.
    - Activities/collaborations with on-campus resources, professional organizations or community organizations that address this criterion.

- Assessment points for each element of this SC, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to this assessment.
    - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum and other experiences address this criterion.
- Address the extent to which the program provided evidence that each student learning outcome associated with this criterion is developed and assessed by the program on a

recurring basis, with a summary of the modifications that the program has made to the curricula and/or individual courses based on findings from its assessment.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of supplemental materials during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Note that the second part of this SC requires students to understand the changing environment of professional practice. Programs must provide evidence of student learning objectives and outcomes related to this understanding in addition to the substantive elements of professional practice itself.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Curricular experiences – reflected in the PC/SC Matrix:
    - Identify the student learning outcome(s) for this criterion.
    - Description of how the program ensures students develop an understanding of professional practice including the courses/sequence of courses in which the concepts of this criterion are addressed. Includes how the concepts of this criterion are introduced, applied, and assessed in the coursework.
    - Syllabi, schedules and learning materials for classes directly related to the content for this criterion – direct teams to the specific learning outcomes, content and assessment points within the documentation related to this criterion.
    - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities/projects specifically related to the elements of this condition.
    - Required community engagement projects that require students to address this criterion.
- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience:
    - Required design charrette(s) that address the specifics of this criterion.
    - Lecture/speaker series including panel discussions directly related to professional practice.
    - Annual orientations by the program's Architectural Licensing Advisor, including introduction to the AXP training/documentation process and other NCARB career resources.
    - Community-based projects.
    - Mentorship, networking, and internships that all students experience.
    - Activities/collaborations with on-campus resources, professional organizations or community organizations that address this criterion.
- Assessment points for each element of this SC, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to assessment.
    - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum and other experiences address each element of this criterion.
- Address the extent to which the program provided evidence that each student learning outcome associated with this criterion is developed and assessed by the program on a recurring basis, with a summary of the modifications that the program has made to the curricula and/or individual courses based on findings from its assessment.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of supplemental materials during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Programs have found success in clearly defining their approach to the elements of SC.3 Regulatory Context vis-a-vis SC.1 HSW in the Built Environment when one or more of the elements may be applicable to both SCs.
    - Although there may be some degree of overlap between SC.1 and SC.3, particularly in regard to code requirements for life safety, SC.3 focuses specifically on student understanding of how regulatory requirements (such as building codes, zoning ordinances, government agency reviews, entitlement approvals, etc.) apply to and impact development of design projects.
    - Programs should clearly distinguish how different aspects of these elements in the respective criteria are addressed in distinct student learning objectives.
- Programs should ensure that they provide evidence of addressing regulatory context at multiple scales ("buildings and sites"), for which visiting teams will be specifically looking.
- Note that the second part of this SC requires students to understand how architects **evaluate** regulatory context in projects. Programs must provide evidence of student learning objectives and outcomes related to understanding this evaluative process in addition to the substance of the regulatory context itself.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence:

- Curricular experiences – reflected in the SC Matrix:
    - Identify the student learning outcome(s) for this criterion.
    - Description of how the program addresses the regulatory context of the built environment including the courses/sequence of courses in which the concepts of this criterion are addressed. Include how the concepts of this criterion are introduced, applied and assessed in the curriculum as well as supporting courses.
    - Syllabi, schedules and learning materials for classes directly related to the content for this criterion – direct teams to the specific learning outcomes, content, and assessment points within the documentation related to this criterion.
    - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities/projects specifically related to the elements of this condition.
    - Required community engagement projects that require students to address this criterion.

- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience:
    - Required design charrette(s) that address the specifics of this criterion.
    - Lecture/speaker series including panel discussions directly related to the regulatory context of the built environment and the development of the architect's process to comply with it.
    - Activities/collaborations with on-campus resources, professional organizations or community organizations that address this criterion.

- Assessment points for each element of this SC, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to this assessment.
    - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum and other experiences address each element of this criterion.
- Although there may be some degree of overlap between SC.1 and SC.3, particularly in regard to code requirements for life safety, SC.3 focuses specifically on student understanding of how regulatory requirements (such as building codes, zoning ordinances, government agency reviews, entitlement approvals, etc.) apply to and impact development of design projects.
- Address the extent to which the program provided evidence that each student learning outcome associated with this criterion is developed and assessed by the program on a recurring basis, with a summary of the modifications that the program has made to the curricula and or individual courses based on findings from its assessment.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element and sub-condition of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of supplemental materials during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

Interpretation for Programs

- This SC covers the broad range of technical knowledge that an architect must understand, and may include building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and construction tectonics, as well as emerging digital and computational technologies utilized in design and construction.
    - SC.4 does not prescribe a specific list of required technical knowledge; programs must describe their approach to teaching aspects of technical knowledge consistent with their mission and context, with corresponding student learning objectives and assessment of their achievement.
- Note that the second part of this SC requires students to understand the manner in which architects **evaluate** technologies in projects. Programs must provide evidence of student

learning objectives and outcomes related to understanding this evaluative process in addition to the substance of the technical knowledge itself.
- Note that evaluation of "performance objectives" may include a broad range of systems (e.g. structural systems or innovative construction technologies) and is not limited to areas such as energy performance or sustainability.
- As this element of SC.4 dovetails with the requirements of SC.6 for the ability to integrate the technical items included here into design thinking, programs have often found success in linking them, where understanding of the evaluative process is directly applied to a studio project, usually (though not necessarily) through a combination of technical coursework and contemporaneous design studios.
    - If programs take this route, including using common coursework as evidence for both criteria, they must ensure that evidence and assessment for the two SCs appropriately focus on the specific requirements of each respectively (i.e., understanding of technical systems and the evaluative process for employing them for SC.4, vs. ability to integrate those systems into overall design thinking in an architectural project for SC.6).

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Curricular experiences reflected in the SC Matrix:
    - Identify the student learning outcome(s) for this criterion.
    - Description of how the program addresses the technical knowledge of building construction and the process by which architects use to evaluate and apply it including the courses/sequence of courses in which the concepts of this criterion are addressed. Includes how the concepts of this criterion are introduced, applied and assessed in the curriculum as well as supporting courses.
    - Syllabi, schedules and learning materials for classes directly related to the content for this criterion – direct teams to the specific learning outcomes, content and assessment points within the documentation related to this criterion.
    - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities/projects specifically related to the elements of this criterion.
    - Process exercises connected to class assignments or studio projects that demonstrate both understanding and evaluation of different systems.
    - Required community engagement projects that require students to address this criterion, particularly in terms of the economics of building system choices.
    - Research or lab-based activities experienced by all students dealing with specific building technologies.

- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience:
    - Required design charrette(s) that address the specifics of this criterion.
    - Lecture/speaker series including panel discussions directly related to the technical knowledge of the built environment and the development of the architect's process to apply it.
    - Activities/collaborations with on-campus resources, professional organizations or community organizations that address this criterion.

- Assessment points for each element of this SC, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to this assessment.
    - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum and other experiences address each element of this criterion.
- Address the extent to which the program provided evidence that each student learning outcome associated with this criterion is developed and assessed by the program on a recurring basis, with a summary of the modifications that the program has made to the curricula and/or individual courses based on findings from its assessment.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of supplemental materials during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy)*

SC.5 Design Synthesis and **SC.6 Building Integration: Requirements**

The following (from the *2020 Procedures*, section 3.5.3) describes the types of evidence required for the assessment of SC.5 and SC.6:

Primary Evidence for SC.5 and SC.6. *These criteria will be evaluated at the ability level. Programs may design their curricula to satisfy these criteria via a single course or a combination of courses. Evidence supplied for these required courses is provided in the team room and include fully labeled exhibits of student work from each course section. Programs must provide the following:*

Narrative*: A narrative description of how the program achieves and evaluates each criterion.*

Self-Assessment*: Evidence that each student learning outcome associated with these criteria is developed and assessed by the program on a recurring basis, with a summary of the modifications the program has made to its curricula and/or individual courses based on findings from its assessments since the previous review. If the program accomplishes these criteria in more than one course, it must demonstrate that it coordinates the assessment of these criteria across those courses.*

Supporting Materials*: Supporting materials demonstrating how the program accomplishes its objectives related to each criterion. Organize the supporting exhibits in the format specified by the NAAB and include the following for each course associated with the student learning outcome:*

a) ***Course Syllabus****. The syllabus must clearly articulate student learning outcome objectives for the course, the methods of assessment (e.g., tests, project assignments), and the relative weight of each assessment tool used by the instructor(s) to determine student performance.*

b) ***Course Schedule****. The schedule must clearly articulate the topics covered in the class and the amount of time devoted to each course subtopic.*

c) ***Instructional Materials****. The exhibits must clearly illustrate the instructional materials used in the course. These may include a summary of required readings, lecture materials, field trips, workshop descriptions, and other materials used in the course to achieve the intended learning outcomes.*

Student Work Examples: *The program must collect all passing student work produced for the course(s) in which the learning outcomes associated with this criterion are achieved within one year before the submission of the APR, or the full academic cycle in which the courses are offered. The visiting team will evaluate approximately 20 percent (no less than three, no more than thirty examples) of the student work collected in this time frame, selected by the NAAB at random*

before the visit. The program may self-select additional student work, up to 10 percent, for the visiting team to review.

If several courses are used to satisfy the SC, the class lists from each course must be aligned so that a random selection process will collect the work of each student selected in all classes that are used to meet the SC. The student lists provided must comply with FERPA rules.

Interpretation for Programs: SC.5-SC.6

- In addition to the evidence requirements of SC.1–4, (narrative, self-assessment, and supporting materials), SC.5 and SC.6 also require student work as evidence. Student work must demonstrate how programs achieve their performance objectives for student knowledge, ability, and skill to make design decisions while synthesizing or integrating the elements described in SC.5 and SC.6 respectively.
- All evidence for SC.5-SC.6 should focus on demonstrating students' ability to synthesize or integrate applicable elements of the criteria into design decisions, *not* the mastery of the individual elements themselves.
- Programs are required to submit completed student work (from courses that have concluded) from a full academic cycle that precedes the submission of the APR.
    - *Example 1: A program submitting an APR in September 2026 may submit student work from the most recent academic cycle—fall 2025, spring 2026, and summer 2026.*
    - *Example 2: A program submitting an APR in March 2026 may submit student work from the most recent academic cycle—fall 2024, spring 2025, summer 2025.*
- Programs may design their curricula to satisfy these criteria via a single course or a combination of courses. Evidence supplied for these required courses must be provided in the team room (digitally and/or physically) and include fully labeled exhibits of student work (including process work, if applicable) from each course section.
- If programs satisfy these criteria through a combination of interrelated coursework (e.g., a technical knowledge class whose elements are applied to a contemporaneous design studio project), programs should indicate how/where student learning is synthesized/integrated into design decisions affecting those elements together with any other elements listed in the criteria.
    - Assessment points may be in either or both classes as long as they are **assessing the ability to synthesize/integrate applicable elements into design thinking**.
    - Evidence (including course materials, student work, and assessment tools) should focus on **the ability to make design decisions demonstrating synthesis and/or integration, *not* mastery of individual elements**.
- Though each program must define their individual approach to and assessment of the development of these skills consistent with their own mission and context, many programs have found success in showing compliance with this criterion when the evidence provided relates to one project in which students are required to synthesize or integrate all requirements stated in the respective criterion. As noted above, projects can be addressed in one or multiple courses.
- All student work must be clearly labeled to identify the elements required for each criterion.

Interpretation for Teams: SC.5-SC.6

- Evaluate Student Criteria 5-6 at the **ABILITY** level.
- Describe succinctly the extent to which the program meets each element of these criteria, as described in the narrative and supported by course materials, assessment, and student work. Teams should comment on where they found the primary source of the

evidence (e.g., course syllabi, specific assignments aligned to NAAB criteria/sub-criteria, projects, process work, studio crits, etc.).

- Teams should evaluate these criteria in terms of **design decisions demonstrating synthesis and integration, *not* mastery of individual elements** that the criteria list to be synthesized or integrated. This applies to both student learning outcomes and self-assessment focused on synthesis/integration, i.e., teams should look for evidence of the ability to synthesize/integrate and assessment of student achievement of synthesis/integration.
    - Accordingly, deficiencies in applying any specific elements listed in the criteria, in themselves, should not be the critical factor in evaluating SC.5 and SC.6.
    - In addition, deficiencies in demonstrating synthesis/integration of any specific elements listed in the criteria should not necessarily indicate a "not-met" criteria if programs identify such a deficiency through self-assessment and provide evidence of acting upon that assessment to improve student learning outcomes.
- Describe succinctly the recurring assessment and verify assessment measures for each criterion. If the team has prefaced its discussion of PCs/SCs with a description of assessment processes common to multiple criteria, it can reference that discussion where applicable to avoid redundancy.
- Verify the timeframe for collecting and reviewing assessment results.
- Review the program's analysis; programs should be comparing the data collected for each of the assessed criteria against its established benchmarks to determine whether the program is meeting its own benchmarks. If benchmarks are not met, is the program responding appropriately to improve student learning outcomes?
    - For example, if a program establishes a benchmark that requires 80% of student projects to adequately reflect the ability to make design decisions that integrate all aspects of SC.6, then the program must demonstrate through its assessment data and student work that it is meeting its established benchmark, which is 80% in this example. In such a scenario, if the program finds that it did not meet its benchmark, the team will confirm whether the program used the assessment results to identify gaps and develop strategies to foster improvement (i.e., missing a benchmark does ***not*** necessarily result in an "not met" evaluation).
- Verify modifications made to curricula and/or associated program structures and materials based on findings from these assessment activities.
- Teams should comment on how they confirmed the evidence (e.g., through discussions with stakeholders, review of student work evidence in the team room, and other interactions during the site visit).
- If a criterion is found to be "not met," describe missing elements in sufficient detail that the program will be able to develop a targeted Plan to Correct if the evaluation is upheld by the board.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

Interpretation for Programs

- As noted above in the *Interpretations for Programs: SC.5 - SC.6*, the focus of the program's narrative, evidence (including student work), and self-assessment for this criterion is students' **ability to synthesize** the various user-oriented items listed into their design decisions for architectural projects, ***not*** the mastery of each contributing item in themselves.

- To the extent that requirements of SC.5 for the ability to synthesize design elements and considerations into an architectural project dovetail with the requirements of SC.1/SC.3 for understanding the evaluative process for application of various elements and considerations, programs have often found success in linking them within the curriculum, where understanding of the evaluative process is directly applied to a studio project, usually (though not necessarily) through a combination of supporting coursework and contemporaneous design studios.
- If programs take this route, including using common coursework as evidence for multiple criteria, they must ensure that evidence and assessment for the various SCs appropriately focus on the specific requirements of each respectively.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence:

- Curricular experiences reflected in the SC matrix:
    - Identify the student learning outcome(s) for this criterion.
    - Description of how the program addresses developing students' abilities to make design decisions that synthesize the required elements of the criterion, including the courses/sequence of courses in which the concepts of synthesis are addressed. Includes how the concepts of synthesis are introduced, applied, and assessed in the curriculum as well as supporting courses.
    - Syllabi, schedules and learning materials for classes directly related to the content for this criterion – direct teams to the specific learning outcomes, content and assessment points within the documentation related to this criterion.
    - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities/projects specifically related to the elements of this criterion.
    - Process work and exercises from design studios and/or supporting coursework that illuminate students' design thinking and how it synthesizes the listed elements.
    - Project narratives and diagrams from student work relating and demonstrating the synthesis of the various listed factors in the project design process.
    - Required community engagement projects that require students to address this criterion.

- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience:
    - Required design charrette(s) that address the specifics of this criterion
    - Lecture/speaker series including panel discussions that all students experience directly related to developing students' abilities to make design decisions and synthesize the required elements of this criterion.
    - Activities/collaborations with on-campus resources, professional organizations or community organizations that address this criterion.

- Assessment points for synthesis of each element of this criterion, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to this assessment.
    - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum and other experiences address this criterion.
- As noted above in the *Interpretations for Programs: SC.5 - SC.6*, the focus of the program's narrative, evidence (including student work), and self-assessment for this criterion is students' **ability to synthesize** the various design elements and parameters

listed into their design decisions for architectural projects, ***not*** the mastery of each contributing item in themselves. Accordingly, teams should evaluate program responses for SC.5 in terms of how elements are synthesized into design thinking; deficiencies observed in students' understanding or application of any of the listed elements in isolation should be addressed in other SCs/PCs specifically addressing them (primarily SC.1, SC.3, and PC.3).

- Address the extent to which the program provided evidence that each student learning outcome associated with this criterion is developed and assessed by the program on a recurring basis, with a summary of the modifications that the program has made to the curricula and/or individual courses based on findings from its assessment.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of supplemental materials and student work during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

Interpretation for Programs

- As noted above in the *Interpretations for Programs: SC.5 - SC.6*, the focus of the program's narrative, evidence (including student work), and self-assessment for this criterion is students' **ability to integrate** the various technical items listed into their design decisions for architectural projects, ***not*** the mastery of each contributing item in themselves.
- To the extent that requirements of SC.6 for the ability to integrate systems into an architectural project dovetail with the requirements of SC.4 for understanding the evaluative process for application of various technical systems, programs have often found success in linking them within the curriculum, where understanding of the evaluative process is directly applied to a studio project, usually (though not necessarily) through a combination of technical coursework and contemporaneous design studios.
- If programs take this route, including using common coursework as evidence for both criteria, they must ensure that evidence and assessment for the two SCs appropriately focus on the specific requirements of each respectively (i.e., understanding of specific technical systems and the evaluative process for employing them for SC.4, vs. ability to integrate those systems into overall design thinking in an architectural project for SC.6).

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence:

- Curricular experiences reflected in the SC Matrix:
    - Identify the student learning outcome(s) for this criterion.
    - Description of how the program addresses developing students' abilities to make design decisions that integrate the required elements of the criterion, including the courses/sequence of courses in which the concepts of integration are addressed. Include how the concepts of integration are introduced, applied, and assessed in the curriculum as well as supporting courses.
    - Syllabi, schedules and learning materials for classes directly related to the content for this criterion – direct teams to the specific learning outcomes, content and assessment points within the documentation related to this criterion.

  - Project briefs and assessment rubrics for learning activities/projects specifically related to the elements of this criterion.
  - Process work and exercises from design studios and/or supporting technical coursework that illuminate students' design thinking and how it integrates the listed elements.
  - Project narratives and diagrams from student work relating and demonstrating the integration of the various listed factors in the project design process.

- Non-curricular experiences that all students experience:
  - Required design charrette(s) that address the specifics of this criterion.
  - Lecture/speaker series including panel discussions directly related to developing students' abilities to make design decisions and integrate the required elements of this criterion.
  - Activities/collaborations with on-campus resources, professional organizations or community organizations that address this criterion.

- Assessment points for integration of each element of the criterion, direct and indirect assessment methods, how assessment results are collected and analyzed, summary of modifications made to the program and student experiences related to this assessment.
  - The NAAB website contains example templates of self-assessment tools and assessment reports that programs may use as a resource for consistent assessment reporting.

Interpretation for Teams

- Describe the extent to which the program demonstrates how its curriculum and other experiences address this criterion.
- As noted above in the *Interpretations for Programs: SC.5 - SC.6*, the focus of the program's narrative, evidence (including student work), and self-assessment for this criterion is students' **ability to integrate** the various technical items listed into their design decisions for architectural projects, ***not*** the mastery of each contributing item in themselves. Accordingly, teams should evaluate program responses for SC.6 in terms of integrating elements into design thinking; deficiencies observed in students' understanding or application of any of the listed elements in isolation should be addressed in other PCs/SCs that specifically address them (primarily SC.4).
- Address the extent to which the program provided evidence that each student learning outcome associated with this criterion is developed and assessed by the program on a recurring basis, with a summary of the modifications that the program has made to the curricula and or individual courses based on findings from its assessment.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements in sufficient detail for the program to develop a Plan to Correct if the deficiency is upheld by the board.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of supplemental materials and student work during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy)*.

4—Curricular Framework

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

4.1 Institutional Accreditation

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

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Provide links that the university's public website regarding regional accreditation.
- Describe pending accreditation actions and provide evidence they are disclosed to the public.
- Describe adverse accreditation actions and provide evidence they are disclosed to the public.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- *Required*: A copy of the most recent letter from the regional accrediting commission/agency regarding the institution's term of accreditation.
- Links to the institution's public website disclosing accreditation status and pending or adverse actions.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify the most recent letter from the regional accrediting commission or agency regarding the term of accreditation.
- Describe any pending and adverse accreditation actions (such as probation or sanction) from the regional accrediting agency.
- Verify all institutional accreditation information (including pending and adverse actions) is available on the university's public website and that current and prospective students are aware of it and can gain access to it.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element and sub-condition of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of documents during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum

The NAAB accredits professional degree programs with the following titles: the Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M.Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D.Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and optional studies.

4.2.1 **Professional Studies.** Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program are the core of a professional degree program that leads to licensure. Knowledge from these courses is used to satisfy Condition 3—Program and Student Criteria. The degree program has the flexibility to add additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. In its documentation, the program must clearly indicate which professional courses are required for all students.

4.2.2 **General Studies.** An important component of architecture education, general studies provide basic knowledge and methodologies of the humanities, fine arts, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences. Programs must document how students earning an accredited degree achieve a broad, interdisciplinary understanding of human knowledge. In most cases, the general studies requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution's baccalaureate degree. Graduate programs must describe and document the criteria and process used to evaluate applicants' prior academic experience relative to this requirement. Programs accepting transfers from other institutions must document the criteria and process used to ensure that the general education requirement was covered at another institution.

4.2.3 **Optional Studies.** All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum to allow students to develop additional expertise, either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking courses offered within the department offering the accredited program but outside the required professional studies curriculum. These courses may be configured in a variety of curricular structures, including elective offerings, concentrations, certificate programs, and minors.

For many decades, the terms B.Arch., M.Arch., and/or D.Arch. have been recognized as referring to NAAB-accredited professional degree programs that are accepted by several NCARB jurisdictions as a requirement for jurisdictional licensure or that facilitate obtaining jurisdictional licensure. Using those terms for nonaccredited programs may result in confusion on the part of the public and may be misleading to students, to prospective students, to the profession, and to other educational institutions. To mitigate that possibility, the terms B.Arch., M.Arch., and D.Arch. are reserved for use by the institutional sponsor's NAAB-accredited architecture degree programs, except in cases where compliance with this requirement would violate state, federal, or national law. Additionally, the institutional sponsor's nonaccredited architecture degree programs must place clear statements in all relevant publications and marketing materials, electronic as well as print, that the programs are not NAAB-accredited and may not be accepted as meeting licensure requirements in many NCARB jurisdictions.

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

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

4.2.5 **Master of Architecture**. The M.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate coursework and a minimum of 30 semester credits of graduate coursework. Programs must document the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for both the undergraduate and graduate degrees.

4.2.6 **Doctor of Architecture**. The D.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 210 credits, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate and graduate coursework. The

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

Interpretation for Programs

- For each accredited program, list the courses and credits required for all students in each accredited degree, and categorize whether required professional studies, elective professional studies (where students elect one or more courses from a required list of courses), general studies, or optional studies. Refer to the Curriculum Chart template available on the NAAB website.
- Describe differences in requirements between multiple paths or tracks for accredited degrees with the same name including detailing differences in required credits and the reasons for those differences.
- Document the minimum number of credits required by the institutional accreditor for the NAAB accredited bachelor's, master's, or doctorate degrees.
- Document the number of credits for general studies required by the institution and the minimum number required by the institutional accreditor.
- Describe how general studies credits are obtained.
- Describe the optional studies available both within and outside of the school/department of architecture.
- List all non-accredited degree programs, if any, offered in the same administrative unit, especially pre-professional degrees in architecture and post-professional degrees.
- Demonstrate that any non-accredited architecture programs offered by the institution clearly state that these programs are not NAAB-accredited and may not meet licensure requirements in all NCARB jurisdictions. This statement should be included in all relevant publications and marketing materials describing these programs.
- For graduate programs or for undergraduate programs accepting transfer students, state the criteria and process used to meet the credit requirements. This process should be a part of the transfer process described in Condition 4.3.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- *Required*: Completed templated charts for credit assignment for all accredited programs.
- Institutional degree requirements -identify number of credits and category of credits (general education, optional/elective, program core).
- Institutional catalog – identify the specific policies related to credit ascription and the required credits for each accredited program.
- Explanation of Curriculum.
- Diagram of curriculum showing division and progression of credits.
- Discussion of differences between degree tracks including differences in admissions criteria and degree requirements.
- Links to descriptions of non-accredited architecture programs with required language
- Options for elective coursework including course descriptions.

Interpretation for teams

- Review and verify the total number of credits required for each program and that each meets the stated required minimums.
- Verify that all accredited programs include Professional Studies, General Studies and Optional Studies.

- Verify the number of general credits required in the program and that this meets the requirement of the institutional accreditor. Verify how students obtain these credits.
- Review Professional Studies required course information for each accredited degree
- Verify optional studies available inside and outside the department.
- Confirm non-accredited architecture programs at all levels and verify required language.
- Delineate differences between different tracks for the same degree, paying close attention to differences in the number of required professional studies credit hours. Provide an explanation of why different tracks require a different number of professional studies credits.
- Review the criteria used to satisfy this condition for transfer students.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element and sub-condition of this criterion., If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education

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

4.3.1 A program must document its process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria when it admits a student to the professional degree program.

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

4.3.3 A program must demonstrate that it has clearly articulated the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content in the admissions process, and that a candidate understands the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program before accepting an offer of admission.

Interpretation for Programs

- Describe the process and established standards for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria when admitting students to the professional degree program.
- Describe the process by which the prior academic coursework of students admitted to the accredited program is evaluated. This description must include the process for verifying general education credits, professional studies credits and, where appropriate, the basis for granting "advanced standing" and determining that students have achieved student learning outcomes that map to criteria assessed in courses for which students are awarded credit. This information is to be documented in a student's admissions and advising record. Describe the process for determining whether any gaps in student achievement exist with respect to the NAAB accreditation criteria. The program should also describe the process by which students remediate any gaps, either before admission or during the degree program.
- Describe communication to the candidate and demonstrate they understand the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program before accepting an offer of admission.

- Provide access to student admissions and advising records as part of the site visit. Admissions and advising documents may be viewed as hard copy or electronically via a secure platform.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Institutional catalog – direct the team to specific language about the evaluation of preparatory education.
- Transfer credit policy- provide links to any program-specific policies.
- Credit evaluation processes and requirements.
- Policies regarding admission requirements, documents and admission decisions. Provide the specific location including a link to relevant documents to demonstrate that these materials are publicly available.
- Admissions policies and requirements for each track (if applicable).
- Evidence demonstrating fair and consistent application of admissions standards. Evidence can include multiple admissions files comparing results and are verified by the team through discussions with students, alumni, or advisory bodies.

Interpretation for Teams

- Review transfer and admissions policies, documents, and process.
- Review students' admission and advising records.
- Verify through interactions with students, access and orientation to admissions information and transparency of process for evaluating preparatory education, if applicable.
- Verify evidence of fair and consistent application of admissions standards, though multiple admission files reviews and discussions with students, alumni and/or advisory bodies.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of documentation during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

5—Resources

5.1 Structure and Governance

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

5.1.1 **Administrative Structure**: Describe the administrative structure and identify key personnel in the program and school, college, and institution.

5.1.2 **Governance**: Describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures and how these structures relate to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Organizational charts.
- Governance policy – direct the team to the specific policies that support the elements of this condition.
- Governance processes – direct the team to the most relevant evidence that demonstrates the role of program faculty, staff and students in programmatic and institutional processes.

- Faculty constitution/governance documents – reference specific sections that support the elements of this condition.
- Documentation and/or links including charters, membership documentation, agenda and minutes of committees on which the degree program's faculty, students, and/or staff serve related to programmatic and institutional governance.
- Documentation from faculty retreats/meetings – direct team members to specific meetings that reflect faculty participation in programmatic and institutional governance.
- Voice of the student surveys with associated changes resulting from the analysis of the data. Identify the specific instances in which the voice of the student was incorporated into the governance process and direct the team to that evidence.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures and how these structures relate to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.
- Validate the narrative with students, faculty and staff to ensure they understand their role in governance and have opportunities for involvement.
- Describe the extent to which the program has described its Administrative and Governance Structures and how the information was verified during the site visit through interactions and review of documentation. Describe the extent to which the program meets each element and sub-condition of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy)*.

5.2 Planning and Assessment

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

5.2.1 The program's multi year strategic objectives, including the requirement to meet the NAAB Conditions, as part of the larger institutional strategic planning and assessment efforts.

5.2.2 Key performance indicators used by the unit and the institution.

5.2.3 How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated multiyear objectives.

5.2.4 Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program as it strives to continuously improve learning outcomes and opportunities.

5.2.5 Ongoing outside input from others, including practitioners.

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

Interpretation for Programs

- The program is expected to engage in continuous improvement and to have a planning process to support it. The objective of long-range planning is to plan for change, growth, and improvement over time. The program describes how institutional planning and program-level planning are interrelated, and if the planning process is university-wide or unit-based. The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessment are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student achievement.
- A general cycle of planning and assessment includes establishing outcomes, identifying direct and indirect assessment measures and key performance indicators (KPI)s, anchoring them with benchmarks, and collecting and analyzing data to make program changes and improvements.
- Describe the planning process for continuous improvement.

- Describe the multi-year strategic objectives and initiatives that address programmatic and institutional needs as well as NAAB values (Condition 2 and 3) and the plan to meet all NAAB Conditions, including all Program and Student Criteria.
- Describe key performance indicators related to the program, institution, objectives and initiatives including those related to student learning.
- Describe how the program's planning and continuous improvement processes intersect with the institutional processes.
- Describe the current status of progress toward the mission and stated multiyear objectives.
- Describe the strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program as it strives to continuously improve learning outcomes and opportunities.
- Describe how outside input from other stakeholders (students, university community, the public and practitioners) is gathered as a part of an ongoing process. Describe how changes are made to the program based on this information.
- Describe how the results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and change the student experience to promote student and faculty success.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Key performance indicators (KPIs) used by the program. Explain connections between KPIs used by the academic unit and the institution.
- Dashboard including KPIs and performance levels. Programs should be specific in using data, particularly when referencing trends, comparisons and benchmarks. Identify the source of the data, what it represents and the rationale for its selection.
- Program strategic plan/priorities and updates – specifically direct the team to:
    - SWOT analysis
    - Program self-assessment
- Institutional/college level strategic plan/priorities and reports/updates – direct the team to the objectives and initiatives that are relevant to the program.
- Institutional/College assessment planning documents and reports/updates– direct the team to the portions of the planning documents and reports that are relevant to the program and its planning and assessment activities.
- Recruitment/enrollment plan – direct the team to concrete examples of how these plans are incorporated into the program's multi-year planning process.
- Institutional program review report(s) – link to the relevant details of the program's review.
- Documentation from faculty retreats/faculty meetings - direct team members to specific meetings that reflect faculty discussion of and participation in the planning process for continuous improvement such as discussions of KPIs, strategic initiatives and other elements of this condition.
- Stakeholder input data and documentation of how it is used - Identify the specific instances in which stakeholder was incorporated into the planning and improvement process and direct the team to that documentation.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify the process of planning for continuous improvement and the evidence provided for each sub-condition through the review of planning and assessment documents and through interviews.
- Validate the objectives and initiatives related to shared values, Program Criteria and Student Criteria are evident in Conditions 2 and 3 respectively.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element and sub-condition of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of documentation during the site visit.

- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

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

5.3.1 The relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including NAAB program and student criteria.

5.3.2 The roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

Interpretation for Programs
This condition is similar to 5.2 Planning and Assessment in that both are closely tied to Condition 3 Program Criteria and Student Criteria. The processes described in this narrative should reflect the evidence provided for Condition 3.

- Describe how student learning objectives are identified.
- Describe the data and information sources used to inform the development of student learning objectives.
- Describe the program's process for assessing and adjusting curriculum based on the outcomes of the assessment.
- Describe the data collection and analysis process used to assess the student learning objectives.
- Describe the relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including all NAAB program and student criteria.
- Describe the roles and responsibilities of all of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.
- Describe how the processes and evidence provided in Condition 3 for PCs and SCs align with the programmatic and institutional assessment processes.
- Describe the connections between the programmatic and institutional assessment processes.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- A chart or graphic identifying all the parties in the curricular assessment process, and the roles and responsibilities of each.
- Assessment planning documents, reports and updates. Direct the team to specific evidence related to the program's assessment processes identified in this condition such as:
    - Program assessment schedule
    - Self-assessment
- Program review documentation- link to specific evidence of the program's participation in program review such as the relationship between course assessment and curricular development and the development of curriculum based on the outcomes of assessment of student learning.
- Documentation from faculty meetings/ retreats – direct teams to specific instances of faculty engaging in curricular assessment and development based on the assessment of student learning using links or citations.
- Curriculum diagrams/maps.
- End of course evaluation documentation – identify concrete examples of how end of course evaluation evidence was used to develop and change the curriculum. Direct teams to those specific instances using links or citations.

- Curriculum committee documentation/notes – direct teams to concrete examples of curriculum development based on the outcomes of assessment. Direct teams to those examples using links or citations.

Interpretation for teams

- Verify well-reasoned process for assessing and adjusting the curriculum of the accredited program based on the outcome of the assessment. Confirm connections between this process and those described in Condition 3.
- Validating the relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including NAAB program and student criteria.
- Verify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives through the review of documents and interviews on site.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element and sub-condition of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of documentation during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development

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

5.4.1 Demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty in a way that promotes student and faculty achievement.

5.4.2 Demonstrate that it has an Architect Licensing Advisor who is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. These duties include attending the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay up to date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.

5.4.3 Demonstrate that faculty and staff have regular opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.

5.4.4 Describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, mental well-being, career guidance, internship, and job placement.

Interpretation for Programs

This condition addresses all human resources responsible for the program including full and part time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, technical staff, administrative and other support staff.

- Describe faculty workload policies and practices including teaching loads and course assignments. Include full-time and part-time instructional faculty.
- Complete the required faculty qualifications information required in the APR.
- Describe the resources (including financial) available to faculty and the extent to which faculty teaching in the program take advantage of these resources.
- Provide the name of the Architect Licensing Advisor and evidence that the advisor is attending the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay up to date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.
- Reference the most recent NCARB spreadsheet to confirm ALA qualifications.

- Describe how faculty members remain current in their knowledge of the changing demands of the discipline, practice and licensure.
- Describe opportunities for staff professional development that contribute to program improvement.
- Describe the available student support services, including:
    - Academic and personal advising.
    - Mental well-being.
    - Career guidance, and internship placement where applicable. This information should align with the more robust discussion of Career Development Information required in Condition 6.3.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Resume/CV for each member of the instructional faculty who teach in the professional degree program (*required*).
- Faculty workload policies and examples of workload specific to the department.
- Architect Licensing Advisor program-level job description.
- Report from NCARB demonstrating that the advisor meets NCARB expectations for ongoing training in this role.
- Staff development calendar available to program staff.
- Faculty development calendar available for program faculty.
- Links to faculty and staff development opportunities which might include grants, service release, research services- direct teams to the best evidence to support the elements of this condition.
- Policies supporting faculty and staff development – identify how policies and opportunities contribute to program improvement.
- Links to student support services – identify those that are available to students as related to this condition.
- Student support services usage data – identify how students in the accredited program use the available services.
- Student survey data regarding support services – identify how students in the accredited program provide feedback regarding the available services.
- Career services programming – identify those career services available to students in the accredited programs. Data regarding usage of and satisfaction with these services by students in the accredited program may also be used as evidence.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify the narrative that the program has appropriate and adequately funded human resources to support student learning and achievement.
- Verify that the program balances the workload of all faculty to promote student and faculty achievement.
- Verify that the Architect Licensing Advisor is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description and meeting NCARB expectations for ongoing training to stay up to date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.
- Reference the most recent NCARB spreadsheet to confirm ALA qualifications.
- Validate faculty and staff professional development opportunities that contribute to program improvement.
- Confirm sufficient support services are available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, mental well-being, career guidance, internship, and job placement.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element and sub-condition of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.

- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of documentation during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

***5.5* Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion:** *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*

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

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Describe all physical resources that support all learning formats and pedagogies used by the program.
- Teaching modalities that do not include full on campus residency of all students such as online, or hybrid formats or off-site centers (i.e.: international campuses, urban centers and the like) require the program to describe the effect (if any) that these formats have on digital and physical resources, as well as how the digital and physical needs of online, off-site or hybrid students are met.
- Describe the physical resources assigned to the program, including all spaces used for teaching/learning, scholarship, service, advising and public interaction.
  Teaching/learning spaces to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning include:
    - lecture halls
    - seminar spaces
    - small group study rooms
    - labs
    - shops
    - equipment
- Describe spaces that support and encourage the faculty roles and responsibilities, including:
    - preparation for teaching and
    - research and
    - mentoring and
    - student advising
- Describe any proposed, planned, approved or in-process changes to the physical resources.
- Identify any significant problems that impact the operation or services with a brief explanation of plans by the program or institution to address it.
- Describe the approach for emergency response, disaster recovery and business continuity. This plan may be a part of the larger university plan. Include recovery plans to allow the program to continue to serve students in the event of a prolonged disruption.

Examples of Evidence

- Floor plans of the facilities used by the architecture program.
- Space utilization studies.
- Student surveys – direct the team to feedback specific to the physical resources of the program.
- Faculty surveys - direct the team to feedback specific to the physical resources of the program.
- Support for remote learning students – direct teams to the supports available to remote students of the accredited program(s).
- Plans for physical resource changes, updates – direct teams to concrete examples of changes that will directly impact the experience of students in the accredited program.
- Tour of the facilities (virtual and/or in-person) – provide visibility into physical resources that support the accredited program.
- Off-campus facilities – document those resources available to students in the accredited program while they are assigned to facilities not on the main campus.
- University/College or Program Emergency Response and Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity plans – direct the teams to the information, processes and procedures that address the specialized needs of the accredited program(s). Include information about how the program has implemented these plans. Plans should include recovery for operations and information.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify the description of the physical resources including all spaces used for teaching and learning, scholarship and public interaction.
- Validate any proposed, planned, approved or in-process changes to the physical resources.
- Validate plans for addressing any significant physical resource issues that impact the program's operation of services and delivery of learning outcomes.
- Verify how having students in different teaching modalities impacts physical resources.
- Confirm how the physical resource needs of students enrolled in all teaching modalities are met.
- Verify all physical resources through a tour and through discussions with faculty, staff, and students.
- Validate the disaster and information recovery plans through interactions with faculty, staff and students.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element and sub-condition of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions, tours and review of documentation during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

5.7 Financial Resources

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

Interpretation for Programs

- institutional process for allocating financial resources to the accredited degree program(s).
- Describe the expense and revenue categories over which the program has control and influence.
- Describe the scholarship, fellowship, and grant funds available for students and faculty.

- Describe any pending reductions or increases in enrollment over the next term of accreditation and plans for addressing these changes.
- Describe any pending reductions or increases in funding and over the next term of accreditation plans for addressing these changes.
- Describe any changes in funding models over the next term of accreditation for faculty compensation, instruction, overhead, or facilities since the last visit and plans for addressing these changes.
- Describe any planned or in-progress institutional development campaigns over the next term of accreditation that include designations for the program (e.g. capital projects or endowments).

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Enrollment summary – link directly to the sections relevant to the accredited program(s).
- Budgeting process graphic/chart – identify how/where the accredited program(s) participate in the process.
- Budget documents – direct the team to specific sections of the documents that provide the best evidence to support that the program has adequate financial resources for the next term of accreditation.
- Scholarship documents – direct the team to specific evidence related to scholarships for the accredited program(s).

Interpretation for Teams

- Review planning and budgetary documents for changes to revenue or expenses. Verify that the program has appropriate institutional support and financial resources to support student learning and achievement during the next term of accreditation.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of documentation during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

5.8 Information Resources

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

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

Interpretation for programs

- Architectural librarians are trained in identifying and locating design resources. In addition to supporting students and faculty in accessing design resources, they are often utilized as key resources for teaching sound research methodologies; in some institutions, they hold faculty status and are teaching/team-teaching research-oriented classes for students in the professional program.
- Describe the institutional context for library and information resources.
- Describe the library and information resource collections, services, staff, facilities, and equipment that includes a brief description of the content, extent, and formats represented in the current collection and the subject areas represented.

- Describe the qualifications and role of the architecture librarians visual resource professionals who provide discipline-relevant information services that support teaching and research.
- Describe any significant problems that affect the operation or services of the libraries, visual resources collections, and other information resources facilities that support the accredited program and plans for addressing them.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Organizational chart for the library and information resources related to the accredited program(s).
- Job descriptions for architecture librarians and visual resource professionals.
- Links to library and library resources related to the accredited program(s).
- Library budget and/or holdings – specifically related to the accredited program(s).
- Student surveys with feedback regarding library resources related to the accredited program(s). Direct the team to this evidence using links or citations.
- Faculty surveys with feedback regarding library resources. Direct the team to this evidence using links or citations.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify the narrative through tours and in discussions with librarians, faculty, staff and students.
- Verify the extent to which the program ensures convenient and equitable access to architecture literature and information and appropriate visual and digital resources.
- Verify that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resource professionals for appropriate support.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of documentation during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy)*.

6—Public Information

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

6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Provide URL links for the web pages on which the documents and resources described above are available and how the links are accessed from the program's website.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Current, active website and/or catalog links to required language.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify this information via the links and in discussions with faculty, staff and students.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

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

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Provide URL links for the web pages on which the documents and resources described above are available and how the links are accessed from the program's website.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Current working links for required documents.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify the required information is available via the links and validate availability in discussions with faculty, staff and students.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

6.3 Access to Career Development Information

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

Interpretation for programs

- Describe career development and placement services available with respect to students' career, education and employment plans. These services should support students' ability to:
    - Develop plans.
    - Evaluate the plans.
    - Implement the plans.
- These resources should align with the career guidance support discussed in Condition 5.4.4.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Student data that provide feedback regarding usage and satisfaction related to career development information for students in the accredited program(s). Direct the team to this evidence using links or citations.
- Internship or career exploration coursework and assessment results for students in the accredited program(s).
- Career services resources and offerings for students in the accredited program(s).
- Architectural Experience Program (AXP) offerings.
- ALA programs and/or offerings.

- Guidance for students in the accredited program(s) for finding internships.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify availability of support services to assist students with their career, education and employment plans at all stages.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of documentation during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents

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

a) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB awarding accreditation or candidacy
b) The Architecture Program Report (APR) submitted for the last visit
c) NCARB ARE pass rates

Interpretation for Programs

- Provide current and active URL links for the web pages on which the documents and resources described above are available.
- If programs may not publish any of the required documents because doing so would contravene applicable state, federal, or national laws, provide a direct link to the applicable law in the response.
- Provide a link to the NCARB ARE pass rates webpage. The program may, if it chooses, add language explaining the status of its students or graduates in relation to participation in the ARE process.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

Current working links for all required documents. Links should direct the viewer to the document's location on the program's website rather than a direct link to the document.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify availability of all required information via the links and in discussions with faculty, staff and students
- If the program has indicated that publishing any of the required documents would contravene applicable state, federal, or national laws, and provided a direct link to the applicable law in the response, review the program's explanation and the link to the applicable law provided by the program. Summarize this information and provide the link to the statute in a validated link.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

6.5 Admissions and Advising

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

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

Interpretation for Programs

- Provide policies and procedures that govern the evaluation of applicants for admission to the accredited programs for first-time, first-year students as well as transfers from within and outside the institution.
- Describe how the program evaluates content from prior academic coursework and how it applies to the accredited program. Provide links to the appropriate policies and forms. This process should align with the process described in Condition 4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education.
- Describe how decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing are made. Provide links to the appropriate policies and forms.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Current working links for required documents/policies.
- Scholarship documentation/offerings for students in the accredited program(s)
- Admissions process documentation.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify the required information via the links and in discussions with faculty, staff and students.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of documentation during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

6.6 Student Financial Information

6.6.1 The program must demonstrate that students have access to current resources and advice for making decisions about financial aid.

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

Interpretation for programs

- Describe and provide links (as appropriate) to current resources for students to make decisions about financial aid with the path from the program's webpage. Links should direct the viewer to the document's location on the program's website rather than a direct link to the document.
- Describe the process for students to obtain advice for making decisions about financial aid.

- Describe the process for estimating all expenses associated with the accredited degree program.
- Provide links to the required information; financial information and resources may be on either institutional or program-specific webpages.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Financial Aid Office website – direct teams to specific resources for informing students about financial options and making decisions about financial aid.
- Cost of attendance estimator/Net Price Calculator – provide a link to the calculator for the college/program if applicable.
- New Student Orientation – direct teams to evidence specific to new student financial planning and information about potential expenses over the life of the program. Examples of additional expenses that architecture students might incur are required including study abroad trips, laptops, specialized software, printing, studio materials, etc.

Interpretation for Teams

- Verify the narrative regarding availability of financial information to students through review of the evidence and in discussions with faculty, staff and students.
- Financial information and resources may be on either institutional or program-specific webpages.
- Verify that resources for estimating educational costs allow students to estimate the total cost of the NAAB-accredited degree program specifically.
- Describe the extent to which the program meets each element and sub-condition of this criterion. If "not met" describe missing elements.
- Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions and review of documentation during the site visit.
- Team Findings: Met/Not Met; *Not Yet Met (for programs in candidacy).*

Glossary

Aggregated data – data that has been collected and combined to generate actionable information. When information is combined through sums, counts, or averages, personal identifiers are removed, and the data is combined in a way that allows analysis of trends to inform decision making. Common examples of aggregated data would include when clinical trials combine patient data to assess a drug's efficacy, or more familiarly, when architecture firms combine staff compensation points and expenses in order to establish firm-wide fee multipliers. For outcomes-based assessment, data may be aggregated by course, track, academic year, or other indicators to help programs analyze performance. When aggregating data, programs should consider what information is needed to support decision making. For example, the average of specific course, assignment, or project grades rather than individual student performance data.

Assessment – a systematic process by which programs evaluate student learning against established student learning outcomes and gather and analyze data for use in improving student learning. Assessment may be undertaken at the assignment, course, program, college or institutional level. To undertake assessment, programs must have a standard (outcome) against which the students are evaluated. Evaluations must be undertaken regularly so that data can be gathered systematically. The results of assessment are combined in a way that permits analysis so that action can be taken based on the results.

Assessment point – a key place where student learning is evaluated and data collected for review and analysis. When student learning is evaluated within the curriculum, an assessment point will be associated with a particular assignment in a specific course. Depending upon the learning outcome being assessed, programs may be able to identify specific questions on an exam or a particular section of a project. When student learning is evaluated in a non-curricular activity, an assessment point will be associated with a specific activity that every student experiences at the same relative time in their academic journey (i.e.: junior portfolio review).

Benchmark – a standard or reference point used to compare and evaluate performance, often derived from historical data or best practices. For example, a university system may establish a minimum graduation rate or first-year retention standard that is expected from all programs in the system, serving as a fixed metric to evaluate program effectiveness.

Direct Measure of Student Learning - faculty evaluations of a student work product such as a test, project exam, essay, or portfolio to determine student performance and attainment of knowledge and skills. To determine how well students have demonstrated the skills, faculty typically use rubrics to generate information on student learning that can be aggregated and analyzed.

Examples of Evidence – in the context of the Interpretive Guidelines, an example of evidence is a piece of documentation that *may* be used to document compliance with a condition. Examples of evidence are not required but are instead pieces of information that programs have used in the past to demonstrate compliance with a condition. They are not the only possible pieces of evidence, and referencing all of them does not guarantee a result of "met" by the team. For programs to demonstrate compliance with a condition, documentation to meet ALL elements and sub-conditions of the condition, including assessment results (as required) is required.

Indirect Measure of Student Learning – students self-report their own learning by reflecting on their attainment of knowledge and skills. Indirect measures of student learning may be collected through end-of-course evaluations, reflective essays and student surveys. Though the student voice in learning assessment is important, indirect measures of student learning in-and-of themselves are not sufficient evidence of student learning.

Integration – the action or process of combining two or more things in an effective way. (https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/integration)

In the context of SC.6, ***building integration*** focuses on a student's ability to develop a building solution that combines the functional, technical, and/or aesthetic considerations of the items listed in the criterion, and to demonstrate that ability through the design decision-making process. Demonstrating this process of building integration should, accordingly, show evidence of how the building solution thoughtfully incorporates these requirements effectively.

Key Performance Indicator (KPI) – an important measure used to evaluate performance. Common KPIs for universities include student-focused indicators such as student retention, graduation rates, employment rate (post-graduation) and organization-focused indicators such as performance vs. budget, FTE headcount, advising caseload and student usage of support services. Programs and institutions select KPIs that provide a complete picture of performance and may help diagnose reasons for performance issues. For example, retention and term-to-term persistence are leading indicators for the outcome indicator of graduation rate. Data for KPIs is gathered, analyzed and monitored regularly, based on a timeline determined by the program and/or institution.

Met – The program demonstrated, described, or documented (as required) evidence of compliance with the NAAB Condition for Accreditation.

Not Met – The program failed to demonstrate, describe, or document (as required) evidence of compliance with the NAAB Condition for Accreditation.

Not Yet Met – (Candidacy Only) The program is making appropriate progress toward being compliant with the NAAB Condition for Accreditation by the time they apply for initial accreditation.

Rubric – A rubric is a scoring tool that clearly outlines the expectations for an assignment by listing criteria and describing different levels of quality for each criterion, commonly stated in coursework syllabi. It provides a framework for evaluating student work, allowing detailed feedback on strengths and areas for improvement.

Self-Assessment – a process by which a program reviews its performance, compares it to a benchmark and determines whether it has achieved success.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) – a clear statement that defines a minimum standard of student performance related to specific knowledge, skills and abilities that they are expected to develop over the course of a specific activity. Student learning outcomes are often worded, ''By the end of this course, students will be able to...''. SLOs allow for student performance evaluation.

Synthesis – the mixing of different ideas, influences, or things to make a whole that is different, or new. (https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/synthesis)

In the context of SC.5, ***design synthesis*** focuses on a student's ability to create a design solution that is greater than the sum of its parts, and to demonstrate that ability through the design decision-making process. Demonstrating this process of design synthesis should, accordingly, show evidence of how the various elements listed in the criterion influenced development of the design solution, though they might not be readily isolated in themselves within that solution.

Trend – the same measurement taken at three or more points in time. For example, freshman year retention might be measured in August of every year. A review of three or more years' worth of freshman year retention data will show a trend. Analyzing trend data over time can inform a program if they are approaching, meeting, or exceeding related benchmarks (see definition above).