National Architectural Accrediting Board

2026 Visiting Team Report

Program: [Name of University] [(B.Arch.)/(M.Arch.)/(D.Arch.)]

Type of Visit:

Date of Visit:

Contents

Prompts for Completing Team Analysis

- The Team found evidence of…
  - What team found in APR/digital evidence room
  - What team verified through requests for information
  - What team observed onsite
    - Groups the team met with
    - Information the team was able to verify with each group
- The Team did not find evidence of…
  - What team did not find in APR/digital evidence room
  - What team could not verify through requests for information
  - What team did not observe onsite
    - Groups the team met with
    - Information the team was not able to verify with each group

A. Summary of Visit

Team Instructions: Please provide a narrative in third person voice, i.e. "the team found...."

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

b. Conditions with a Team Preliminary Finding as Not Achieved *(list number and title, and subcondition.)*

B. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

20XX Condition/Criterion [quoted in full] [NOTE: This section will be completed by the NAAB staff for each visit.]

Previous Team Report (20XX):

Team Analysis:

C. Program Changes

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

Team Analysis:

D. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

Several conditions are under a temporary stay. A list of those conditions can be viewed here: *https://www.naab.org/blogs/naab/2025/09/18/stay-on-naab-conditions-with-dei-related-language*

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).

Team Instructions:
Copy and paste the program's response to "Summary of Statement 1 **–** Context and Mission" found in their APR, section 1 – Context and Mission in text box below.

Program Summary Statement of 1 – Context and 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.

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.

1—Context and Mission		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

Overall

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.

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.

2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession
Design
The team found evidence of
The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: ***This Condition*** is under a temporary stay.		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Knowledge and Innovation:		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: ***A portion of this Condition*** is under a temporary stay.
The team found evidence of
The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Lifelong Learning:		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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.

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 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.

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.

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 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.

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.

PC.1—Career Paths		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

PC.2 Design

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

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.

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.

PC.2 Design		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility

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

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.

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.

PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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

A portion of this Condition is under a temporary stay.

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.

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.

PC.4 History and Theory		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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

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.

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.

PC.5 Research and Innovation		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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

A portion of this Condition is under a temporary stay.

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.

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.

PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration
The team found evidence of
The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture

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

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.

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.

PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture
The team found evidence of

The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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

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 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.

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

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 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.

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.

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 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.

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

SC.2 Professional Practice		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

SC.3 Regulatory Context

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

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.

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.

SC.3 Regulatory Context		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

SC.4 Technical Knowledge

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

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.

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.

SC.4 Technical Knowledge		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 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.

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 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.

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.

SC.5 Design Synthesis		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

SC.6 Building Integration

How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and

assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance.

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.

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.

SC.6 Building Integration
The team found evidence of

The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 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.

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.

4.1—Institutional Accreditation		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 states as a requirement for state licensure or that facilitate obtaining state licensure. Using those terms for unaccredited 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 the case where compliance with this requirement would violate state, federal, or national law. Additionally, the institutional sponsor's unaccredited 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 U.S. states.

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 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.

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.

4.2—Professional Degrees and Curriculum		
4.2.1 Professional Studies		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

4.2.2 General Studies		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

4.2.3 Optional Studies		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

4.2.4 Bachelor of Architecture		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

4.2.5 Master of Architecture
The team found evidence of

The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

4.2.6 Doctor of Architecture
The team found evidence of
The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 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.

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.

4.3—Evaluation of Preparatory Education		
4.3.1		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

4.3.2		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

4.3.3		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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.

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.

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.

5.1—Structure and Governance		
5.1.1		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.1.2
The team found evidence of

The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 multiyear strategic objectives, including the requirement to meet the NAAB Conditions, as part of the larger institutional strategic planning and assessment efforts.

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

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

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

5.2.5 Ongoing outside input from others, including practitioners.

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

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.

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.

5.2—Planning and Assessment		
5.2.1		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.2.2		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.2.3		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.2.4
The team found evidence of

The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.2.5
The team found evidence of
The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 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.

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.

5.3—Curricular Development		
5.3.1		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.3.2		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 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 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.

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.

5.4—Human Resources and Human Resource Development
5.4.1
The team found evidence of
The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.4.2		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.4.3		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.4.4		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

~~**5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion**~~

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

~~5.5.1 Describe how this commitment is reflected in the distribution of its human, physical, and financial resources.~~

~~5.5.2 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's faculty and staff~~

~~demographics with that of the program's students and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.~~

~~5.5.3 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its students since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's student demographics with that of the institution and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.~~

~~5.5.4 Document what institutional, college, or program policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other social equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.~~

~~5.5.5 Describe the resources and procedures in place to provide adaptive environments and effective strategies to support faculty, staff, and students with different physical and/or mental abilities.~~

This Condition is under a temporary stay.

Interpretation for Teams

- *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*

TEAM'S ONSITE REVIEW:

This Condition is under a temporary stay.

5.5—Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion		
5.5.1		
The team found evidence of *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*		
The team did not find evidence of *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.5.2		
The team found evidence of *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*		
The team did not find evidence of *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.5.3		
The team found evidence of *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*		
The team did not find evidence of *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.5.4

The team found evidence of *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*		
The team did not find evidence of *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.5.5		
The team found evidence of *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*		
The team did not find evidence of *This Condition is under a temporary stay.*		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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.

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

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.

Examples of Possible Supporting 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.

5.6—Physical Resources		
5.6.1		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.6.2		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.6.3		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.6.4		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

5.6.5		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 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.

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).

5.7—Financial Resources
The team found evidence of

The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 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.

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.

5.8—Information Resources
The team found evidence of
The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 Teams

- Verify this information via the links and in discussions with faculty, staff and students.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

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

6.1—Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 Teams

- Verify the required information is available via the links and validate availability in discussions with faculty, staff and students.

Examples of Possible Supporting Evidence

- Current working links for required documents.

6.2—Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
a)
The team found evidence of

The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

b)		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

c)		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

d)		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 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.

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.

6.3—Access to Career Development Information		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 submitted for the last visit
c) NCARB ARE pass rates

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.

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.

6.4—Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents		
a)		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

b)		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

c)		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 a non-accredited degrees
d) Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships

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.

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.

6.5—Admissions and Advising		
a)		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

b)		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

c)		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

d)		
The team found evidence of		
The team did not find evidence of		
Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

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 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.

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.

6.6—Student Financial Information
6.6.1

The team found evidence of
The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

6.6.2
The team found evidence of
The team did not find evidence of

Team's Assessment of the Sub-Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

Team's Assessment of the Condition	☐ MET	☐ NOT MET

E. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, [Educator, Practitioner, Regulator, Student] Representative
Norma Sklarek, FAIA
Title
Organization
City, State
email@email.com

Educator Representative
Frank Lloyd Wright, AIA
Title
Organization
City, State
email@email.com

Practitioner Representative
Mary Louise Bethune, AIA, LEED AP
Title
Organization
City, State
email@email.com

Student Representative
Jane Doe, Assoc. AIA
Title
Organization
City, State
email@email.com

Observer
Jan Smith
Title
Organization
City, State
email@email.com

F. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Norma Sklarek, FAIA
Team Chair

Frank Lloyd Wright, AIA
Team Member

Mary Louise Bethune, AIA, LEED AP
Team Member

Jane Doe, Assoc. AIA
Team Member

Jan Smith
Observer