

Visiting Team Report

Iowa State University
Department of Architecture

B.Arch.

M.Arch.

Visit Dates: April 4-6, 2022

© 2021 by the National Architectural Accrediting Board. All Rights Reserved.

The logo for the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) is displayed in large, bold, white, sans-serif capital letters. The letters 'N', 'A', and 'B' are significantly larger than the 'A's, and they are closely spaced together.

National
Architectural
Accrediting

Visiting Team Report (VTR)

2020 Conditions for Accreditation

2020 Procedures for Accreditation

To be completed by NAAB Staff:

Institution	<u>Iowa State University</u>
Name of Academic Unit	Department of Architecture
Degree(s) <i>(check all that apply)</i> Track(s) <i>(Please include all tracks offered by the program under the respective degree, including total number of credits. Examples:</i> <i>150 semester undergraduate credit hours</i> <i>Undergraduate degree with architecture major + 60 graduate semester credit hours</i> <i>Undergraduate degree with non-architecture major + 90 graduate semester credit hours)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Bachelor of Architecture</u> 168 credit hours <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Master of Architecture</u> Track I: Undergraduate degree with architecture major + 62 graduate semester credit hours Track II: Undergraduate degree with non-architecture major + 102 graduate semester credit hours <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Doctor of Architecture</u> Track: Track:
Application for Accreditation	Continuing Accreditation
Year of Previous Visit	2013
Current Term of Accreditation <i>(refer to most recent decision letter)</i>	Continuing Accreditation (Eight-Year Term)
Program Administrator	Chair Deborah Hauptmann, PhD
Chief Administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located <i>(e.g., dean or department chair)</i>	Dean: Luis Rico-Gutierrez
Chief Academic Officer of the Institution	Jonathan Wickert, PhD Sr. Vice President & Provost
President of the Institution	Wendy Wintersteen, PhD

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The team would like to thank Provost Jonathan Wickert, Associate Provosts Ann Marie van der Zanden and Dawn Bratch-Prince, Dean Luis Rico-Gutierrez, and the Department of Architecture's faculty and students for their courtesy and commitment to the principles of educational assessment. We extend special thanks to Chair Deborah Hauptmann for a high level of attentiveness to all of the details and a cooperative responsiveness throughout the process. We recognize the efforts made by her, Professor Sharon Wohl, and the faculty to prepare all of the materials required for the review, including a clear and complete Architecture Program Report and a well-designed custom website for required documents and exhibits. These efforts facilitated the team's work before and during the visit, allowing the team to work proactively with the department to efficiently address questions and complete our assessment.

The team preceded the visit with a thorough exploration of the curricula of its two accredited degree programs. The team benefitted from a well-produced video tour that gave us an understanding of the department and the college as "place" as well as an academic unit, and the meetings with engaged faculty, staff, and students allowed us to perceive it as a vibrant community. During the visit, we were impressed with the degree to which the values and academic culture that people expressed aligned with the stated mission and the curricula.

Faculty are justifiably proud of their work as educators and creative professionals. Collectively they are in tune with the current expectations of the profession and the university—placing greater emphasis on collaboration and research. They fully appreciate the interdisciplinary possibilities of the College of Design, and also the opportunities that Iowa State University offers. Despite limited resources, they have made a resilient return from pandemic conditions. However, the faculty's remarkable success in obtaining large grants for impactful research increases their workload to manage them, suggesting an increasing need for post-award support. In addition, the current studio spaces and centralized-staffing policies result in certain limits on the kinds of projects that they can assign for their studios. As more disciplines embrace the creative studio pedagogy that has been the hallmark of architectural education, it is important to allow the architecture studio to continue to evolve.

Students are highly motivated and appreciative of a faculty and staff that support them. They are grateful for the access that they have to labs and workshops with traditional and cutting-edge technologies. They describe a culture of community, with an abundance of faculty and peer mentoring. Academic advising and other personal counseling are meeting student needs in a time of social anxiety. Undergraduates express appreciation of the freshman year common core for the college, which gives them a chance to build skills and to more fully consider their choice of major. Graduate students are appreciative of their courses, and the highly personal support they get from faculty. They are also forming bridges to their future professional world.

The administration of these programs is a complex matter that answers to university and professional requirements while staying attuned to community and to individual outcomes. While increased resources in any given category would likely boost the quality of the programs, perhaps the greatest need is for dedicated administrative staff. That need is already evident and will be growing as the department works to increase its processes and measures for program assessment now required to maintain accreditation.

A culture of design thinking is strongly evident throughout the curriculum; the department as a whole is strong in the shared disciplinary values of ecological responsibility along with a commitment to issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Iowa State's Department of Architecture

has long enjoyed a strong reputation nationally, fortified by award-winning faculty research and student work. Graduates of the program, at both the Bachelor's and Master's levels, are well prepared to succeed in achieving professional licensure and in the practice of architecture.

b. Conditions Not Achieved (list number and title)

The B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs have met all conditions.

II. Progress Since the Previous Visit

2009 Student Performance Criterion A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture (B.Arch and M.Arch): Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.

Previous Team Report (2013): For the B.Arch., the team determined that this requirement was not met to the necessary degree within the required history/theory sequence, Arch 221 History of Architecture I, and Arch 222 History of Architecture II. The program also strives to meet this requirement through the required electives component, Studies in Architecture and Culture (SACs). However, we found that some of the electives, particularly Arch 597, did not sufficiently cover non-Western architecture history, therefore not guaranteeing every student equal exposure to non-Western tradition. The course syllabus also did not identify itself as fulfilling this SAC required elective, even though students were advised that it would meet this requirement.

For the M. Arch, the same condition was found in terms of non-SPC fulfilling SAC required electives.

2022 Team Assessment: Initially this deficiency was addressed in the B.Arch. program with revisions to ARCH 221 and the addition of another required course, ARCH 323, Theories of Modern Architecture, which deals with predominantly Western themes, but includes critiques from minority perspectives. For the M.Arch. program, the required ARCH 595 was revised to address "Historical Traditions and Global Culture." It currently bookends the Western canon with global themes: architecture and nature, and regionalism and 'globalisms.' These were reasonable steps to take to address the 2014 Conditions.

Since then, there have been additional changes, fully described in the PC.4 narrative (APR, 34). There are now four required courses: the first is a topical theory seminar that incorporates historical study as needed; another is "Human Behavior and Environmental Theory," focusing on social structures and their relationship to spatial structures, as well as updates of the 221 and 323 courses described above.

The M.Arch. requirements now include four courses as well; ARCH 595 remains a broad survey, while ARCH 596 focuses on Landscape and Society, currently framed in an "old world/new world" dichotomy, ARCH 597 is a theory course, and ARCH 598 is a topical seminar able to address diverse social themes.

Together, these changes represent a robust engagement with historical knowledge and critical analysis. The current requirements of both programs address the previous deficiencies and meet the current requirements of the 2020 Conditions, PC.4 History and Theory.

2009 Student Performance Criterion B.2 Accessibility (B.Arch and M.Arch): Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical (including mobility), sensory, and cognitive disabilities.

Previous Team Report (2013): Although there is ample evidence that Accessibility is thoroughly covered in the elective course Arch 571 "Design for All People," the team could not find evidence of **ability** demonstrated in work of design studios or other required courses, both in the B.Arch and M. Arch programs.

2022 Team Assessment: Early response was aimed at the deficiencies noted and at the 2014 conditions. In the B.Arch. program, the responsibility to convey knowledge of codes and regulations was integrated into all technology courses with new learning objectives that also integrated the relevant material into studios. In the M.Arch. program, a module on Accessibility was developed for the technology course sequence, and new requirements for projects in the ARCH 603 comprehensive studio included accessibility and life safety. Continued changes and improvements to the course sequence in both levels are described in detail.

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment and SC.3 Regulatory Context have replaced B.2 Accessibility from the 2013 visit. These criteria are now met for both programs.

2009 Student Performance Criterion B.5 Life Safety (B.Arch and M.Arch): *Ability* to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

Previous Team Report (2013): No evidence of this SPC was found in the course work. Although the Arch 245 Building Science and Technology Module 2: Assemblies and Materials syllabus indicates it will be addressed, there was no further documentation of this. The second round of projects in the later submission addressed certain life safety applications; however, there were a considerable number of errors and code oversights, particularly in high pass projects. Similarly, the integration of life safety requirements in studio designs was not evident, with particular neglect of egress considerations.

2022 Team Assessment: Similarly, to accessibility, new life safety learning objectives were added to the newly configured courses in the technology sequence. Evidence for this was found in course lectures on relevant life safety topics and understanding the codes. For the B.Arch. program, the fourth- and fifth-year studio projects are expected to ensure that the designs exhibit compliance with accessibility and egress. For the M.Arch. program, a Life Safety module was added to the technology sequence and increased emphasis was placed on demonstrating its application in the ARCH 603 studio. External professionals with expertise in these topics were enlisted to assist in the curriculum development.

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment and SC.3 Regulatory Context have replaced B.5 Life Safety from the 2013 visit. These criteria are now met for both programs.

2009 Student Performance Criterion B.6 Comprehensive Design (B.Arch and M.Arch):
Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student's capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following SPC:

<i>A.2. Design Thinking Skills</i>	<i>B.2. Accessibility</i>
<i>A.4. Technical Documentation</i>	<i>B.3. Sustainability</i>
<i>A.5. Investigative Skills</i>	<i>B.4. Site Design</i>
<i>A.8. Ordering Systems</i>	<i>B.7. Environmental Systems</i>
<i>A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture</i>	<i>B.9. Structural Systems</i>
<i>B.5. Life Safety</i>	

Previous Team Report (2013): The B.Arch. and M. Arch programs have two comprehensive design studios (Arch 401 and 403; Arch 601 and 603). Although both documented multiple source research, the analysis of facts, the development of a rhetorical argument, bibliographic information, and the proper citation of sources in papers, there was no evidence found in the work shown that any students had developed the ability to integrate B.2 Accessibility and B.5 Life Safety into their project solutions.

2022 Team Assessment: For the B.Arch. program, the emphasis on integrating this knowledge into design projects was shifted from the ARCH 403 studio to the 302 and 401 studios which have better connections with the topics in the Sci-Tech course sequence. This is confirmed in the course syllabi.

The M.Arch. program increased the focus on accessibility and life safety issues in the ARCH 603 studio, in a way consistent with the 2014 Conditions and their requirements for integrated design.

SC.5 Design Synthesis and SC.6 Building Systems Integration have replaced B.6 Comprehensive Design from the 2013 visit. These criteria are now met for both programs.

III. Program Changes

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

2022 Team Assessment: The program at ISU has responded to two changes in the NAAB Conditions since their last visit. The 2014 Conditions were issued in time to form the basis of focused programmatic change in response to Conditions not Met in the 2013 VTR. These responses are detailed above in "progress since the previous visit." There were also changes made in each program to expand student learning in computational literacy.

The 2020 Conditions represent a major change of intention, not an adjustment of content. They were explained to the public in the 20-21 academic year, so programs facing accreditation in the 21-22 academic year could only begin to address the planning and assessment rigor now demanded. ISU has re-framed the curricular management and governance processes to articulate "data sources" and "sample outcomes" that can be tracked over time. Furthermore, the

College of Design's recently completed strategic plan offers the architecture department numerous metrics with which to align itself. It is clear that the department has embarked on formalizing continuous self-assessment and continuous improvement within both programs.

IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

More recent changes in the B.Arch. programs responding to the release of the 2020 Conditions include better coordination between the technology courses and studios, and a discussion is underway to update the Professional Practice and Human Behavior and Environmental Theory courses to reflect major social shifts in the profession, in the workplace, and in cultural values.

The APR acknowledges that the 2020 Conditions have a welcome intention of permitting "greater agility," they require some fundamental changes to how programs are conducted and reported. These changes will take considerably more time than curricular adjustments that were the focus of past accreditation processes.

The APR acknowledges that the new and heavily weighted focus of the 2020 Conditions on continuous self-assessment and improvement has just begun to be addressed and will take time to fully meet.

2022 Team Assessment: The Program has described a robust system of curricular meetings, self-assessments, strategic planning, and the mapping of the NAAB criteria throughout the entire curriculum. Their commitment to meeting new 2020 conditions with the focus on assessment criteria is well underway.

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).

[X] Described

Program Response:

We are an Architecture department housed within an Interdisciplinary College of Design, located in a midwestern college town at a Research 1 University. We have a strong outreach/land grant mission and are dedicated to providing students with opportunities to engage with their immediate context, while also

gaining insights into contemporary and global issues. Our program fosters student success through a synthesis of technical, theoretical, and design knowledge.

2022 Analysis/Review: The APR provided a good overview of the context and mission of the institutional context and geographic setting of the program and how they influence the program. A description was also provided of the overall context of ISU's College of Design and its mission, values, and vision. Most notable are the college's values, which include an emphasis on innovation, curiosity, collaboration and environmental and social responsibility, and its vision, which focus on developing abilities of leading interdisciplinary processes. The APR also provides a description of the program's relationship to its context at the department and college levels. For the B.Arch., the APR points to the common core year and the substantial elective and option opportunities available within the college. A number of faculty development and student extracurricular opportunities are also described; these were verified during the visit. Pedagogical opportunities identified include, at the undergraduate level, a healthy and diverse number of college and university-level minors, and at the graduate level, three college-level and one university-level double degree. Several research resources are also identified for both faculty and students.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

[X] Described

2022 Analysis/Review: Design: Exposure to multiple design initiatives locally and globally are hallmarks of the program's commitment to integrated design. A culture of design thinking is strongly evident throughout the curriculum, in student projects, competitions, travel opportunities, design build projects, community service initiatives and the yearly super studio. As part of an interdisciplinary College of Design, architecture students are immersed in broader perspectives on design production, ideas, and opportunities.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: The program emphasizes the integrated design studios at both graduate and undergraduate level. The graduate net-zero integrated studio frequently places among top-ten winners in the AIA COTE Top Ten Student Design Competition. There is a mature culture of student design competitions at multiple levels. Two of these competitions, the fourth year DLR Group Prize and the second year M.Arch. Shive-Hattery Student Design Competition, have criteria that directly relate to the focus of this shared value. Feedback from students indicated that the program's excellence in sustainability was a key issue in choosing this program. Student work reviewed by the team exhibited high levels of competency in performance analyses and design decision support.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: The department maintains a website page dedicated to DEI in which they pledge to “*maintain an intentional, active, and ongoing commitment to issues of diversity, equity & inclusion.*” The program has a policy of shared governance and is the process of drafting an updated strategic plan with input from faculty and staff with the goal of increasing already robust DEI content throughout the curriculum, lectures, service projects, travel, speakers, and research. The college employs a Director of Equity, Inclusion and Multicultural Student Success, available to students seeking individual support, as well as providing general mediation and consultation. International students in particular greatly appreciate this support as their transitions to American university culture can be daunting.

Knowledge and Innovation: The College of Design context promotes interdisciplinary learning through a common foundation core and through elective studios. Further, there are three college-based minors promoting innovative approaches to the department’s architectural focus. The University provides grants and fellowships to support scholarship and curricular innovation. The faculty are active in engaging collaboratively on grant opportunities outside the university as well. Students enhance their core program knowledge through second majors, the Honors program, and through resources such as the Architectural Robotics lab, the Computation and Construction lab, the Virtual Reality Application Center, and the new Student Innovation Center. This is evident in application in major research initiatives such as 3D printed housing prototyping. Successful grant applications to the National Science Foundation are yet another indicator of excellence.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: ISU has approximately 800 clubs and organizations that foster leadership, collaboration, and community engagement. Among them are sororities and fraternities, student government, intramural sports, marching band, academic and social organizations, and many community service groups. In the college, membership and leadership opportunities exist in the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS), the National Organization of Minority Architecture Students (NOMAS), Iowa Women in Architecture, DATUM student publication, and the College of Design Student Board. AIAS officers regularly attend faculty meetings and architecture faculty serve as student group advisors. Upper division students serve as mentors in first-year design core studios and drawing courses — demonstrating leadership, offering assistance, and providing service models.

Lifelong learning: The value of lifelong learning is inherent to the land-grant university idea—robust economies need continuous renewal from “paradigms of discovery” and application through education, extension, and practice. The faculty model diverse and complex engagements with architectural knowledge and production. Involving students and alumni in processes of participatory learning and curricular evaluation challenges the perception of learning as something bounded by time in school.

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.

3.1 Program Criteria (PC)

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

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

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the academic program centered around the syllabi of ARCH 482/582, Professional Practice. Other exposures include a lecture series of invited professionals and student activity groups such as AIAS, NOMAS and IAIWA (women in architecture). The program also offers career guidance and mentoring services and assists students in documenting professional experience through NCARB's AXP program with a full-time faculty member designated as the AXP Advisor. (APR, 20-22)

The hiring of new faculty in technology and professional practice positions supports the needs of the program and students. The shifting of the Career Fair to a virtual venue during Covid demonstrates the ability of the program to adjust to an ever-changing environment.

Assessment has a basis in quantitative evidence offered that will be tracked and aggregated over time: ARE Pass Rate trends, career fair employment opportunities, job placement rates, firm visit opportunities, and *Design Intelligence* ranking, for instance. Faculty discussions around improvements in these metrics also provide evidence and formed the basis for recent improvements mentioned above.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Evidence of the program's educational approach to instilling an integrated design process in their students is found in well-crafted syllabi, opportunities for design/build, and community service projects. Studios ARCH 201/202 are focused on form finding, scale, detail, and human factors. ARCH 301 focuses on site and small to mid-scale projects. The advanced studios provide flexible design alternatives from large scale projects to the integration of design with methods and materials. ARCH 302/401/402 studios allow students to delve into form and theory. Evidence of a departmental approach to design integration is found in the flowcharts provided to the team depicting how NAAB criteria are woven throughout the program's qualitative assessment pathways.

M.Arch.

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Evidence of the approach to design education is outlined in the syllabus materials centered around six key studios. ARCH 505, 506, and 507 are first year studios that introduce essential skills: architectural design, representation, modeling, and details in construction. Second year studios ARCH 601 and 602 address practice issues such as site-based adaptive re-use, sustainability, net-zero buildings and social, environmental and community – based issues. ARCH 603 allows students to explore the relationship of architecture as a complex interaction between materials with inherent physical characteristics, mobile socializing bodies, and changing environmental cycles. The curriculum provides opportunities to experience a design process that integrates multiple factors and explorations from practice to theory.

Evidence for both programs:

The curricula strongly support opportunities for field trips, design/build, and participation in national and international competitions. The OPN Masterclass invites globally recognized educators to hold intensive workshops with graduates and senior students. All students have access to view work on display and attend reviews and lectures. Students are encouraged to travel both in the US and globally and to learn

from diverse cultures. Students regularly participate in national competitions as well as numerous internal award programs for excellence in design.

Reviews are an important aspect of this program and numerous award-winning practitioners are invited to participate. Building on the advantages of virtual lectures, academics and architects from around the world have presented to the entire school as well as attended student reviews. Students become reviewers during critiques allowing opportunities to practice presentation and participate as peers with faculty.

As the direct result of strategies for continuing improvement in the curriculum, faculty are engaged in developing the curriculum throughout the year. The curriculum references NAAB criteria and the overall structure of class sequencing conforms to common learning objectives. Faculty incorporate their research initiatives throughout the program engaging students in both practical and theoretical approaches to design.

A new approach to assessment has been initiated with studio instructor surveys that gauge the degree of attention to learning objectives— creating them and assessing them – and their capacity to assure that instructors are aware of prior learning and building upon it, creating a more unified experience for students as they move through the studio sequence.

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.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Evidence of a holistic and balanced approach that provides students both with an understanding of the larger issues and contexts involved combined with a good level of understanding of the technical skills needed. Evidence includes ARCH 220, which introduces students at an early stage of their program to the role of designers in ensuring planetary welfare, while ARCH 230 & 231 include assignments that introduce students in the same early stage to some of technical aspects and assessment techniques needed to integrate these issues in their design decision making processes. ARCH 301 design studio emphasizes environmental awareness and integration of site resources. Evidence of extracurricular activities supporting this PC is also provided including relevant guest lectures and adaptive facade symposia which students were required to attend.

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Evidence of a holistic and balanced approach to this criterion within the M.Arch. program was also provided. ARCH 596 introduces students to relevant issues and context. ARCH 601, Sustainable Building Design Studios, provides students with an impressive experience combining a holistic understanding of the dynamic between the built and the natural environment and an introduction to design processes and assessment and analytical tools that allow students to integrate these issues into their design decision making. The studio has clear performance goals based on the AIA Framework for Design Excellence. ARCH 602 addresses the issues from the points of view of infrastructure, communities, and environmental justice. ARCH 582, Professional Practice, exposes students to assigned readings and guest lecturers that address the issues of sustainability in design. A range of elective courses is also available for M.Arch. students that address different aspects of the issues involved. They can also pursue a double degree in architecture and sustainable environments.

Evidence for both programs:

There are ongoing improvements in the area of studio and tech coordination to ensure sustainability is being integrated in early design stages. These include updating deliverables for ARCH 302/401 studio to include performance-based design and providing instructional videos to help faculty integrate performance based-metrics. A new faculty member with expertise in these areas was also hired in fall 2021. A similar set of improvements are also described for the History, Theory and Criticism Substantive area through which instructors placed more emphasis on sustainability concerns in HTC courses, especially ARCH 220. Evidence of a comprehensive reading list for this course was provided.

Assessment data going forward will include enrollment in the Sustainability Minor and the record of awards and honors such as the COTE Top Ten Awards.

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.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Evidence was found for the B.Arch. program in the course materials for ARCH 371, Human Behavior and Environmental Factors, ARCH 221, History of Pre-Modern Architecture, and ARCH 322, Histories and Theories of Modern Architecture. ARCH 221 is a standard history survey spanning from pre-history to the Enlightenment; student learning is gauged through quizzes and exams. ARCH 322 starts with the Enlightenment and includes material up to 1968. Students demonstrate learning through written lecture responses and a final essay, as well as participation in weekly discussions. This course has infused strategic recently published critiques of its otherwise standard (Bergdoll, Frampton) wisdom to this body of mostly Western-focused architectural history. ARCH 371 provides inquiries into human perception and cognition in natural and built environments without reference to particular historical contexts.

This group of courses is preceded by ARCH 220, a topical course that allows for cultural and political themes to be addressed in a highly focused context. This unusual first course in architectural history and theory allows students to find relevance in these areas of knowledge that might not be clear to them in the broader surveys that follow. In addition, the capstone studio, ARCH 403, requires intensive research into a theoretical issue and to produce a visual document of their findings in addition to application in a design project. This is an admirably rich and sophisticated capstone production, especially for undergraduates. These courses address diverse social, cultural, economic, and political contexts.

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Evidence was found for the M.Arch. program in ARCH 595, History, ARCH 596, Landscape and Society, and ARCH 598, Theory from 1969 to 2021. ARCH 595 is broad, framing core knowledge of Western civilization with theoretical topics that raise fundamental questions. ARCH 596 brings questions of power and representation to the fore in how societies structure their environments. ARCH 597 is grounded in cultural critiques of the last 50 years and so addresses diverse social, cultural, economic, and political contexts. These required courses are sufficient to meet PC.4, but it can be noted that an additional topical course is also required. There are also numerous elective courses allowing for focused study based on student interests.

Evidence for both programs:

Assessment of these courses and resulting improvements in the delivery of history and theory in general, has happened recently in accordance with traditional means—partly initiated by a new chair charged with addressing needs in this area. New hires with diverse perspectives created new courses that employed up-to-date pedagogies embracing current topics embedded in or along with historical knowledge. Currently, self-reflective assessment is occurring in the wake of remote pandemic teaching, and discussions are underway for possible permanent changes or options. These are documented in committee notes and curricular proposals.

While the processes described have not yet been tied to benchmarks and student outcomes, there is little doubt that the History and Theory curriculum has been subject to a variety of critiques and that improvements and innovations have been carried out to address them. Assessment going forward will include participation levels in the National Congress on Undergraduate Research and enrollments in the Critical Theory minor.

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.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Evidence for the integration of a research and innovation culture at the curricular level include ARCH 231, Advanced Design Representation, which introduces students to computer scripting, simulation, developing collaborative workflows and digital fabrication research. ARCH 347L, ARCH 445/445L (the technology sequence), and ARCH 403 (studio) all play supportive roles through focusing on research that is academically rigorous, critically informed and design led. Co-curricular aspects include DATUM, a student-led publication of student work and research, as well as opportunities to participate in several public programs and research centers. Evidence of a range of workshops, symposia, public programs and off campus activities available to students as well as student participation in university undergraduate research activities were also provided.

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Evidence of integrating this criterion in the curriculum include ARCH 506, which cultivates an iterative design process informed by feedback and full-scale fabrication. ARCH 595 and 597 explore research in the history and theory fields using collaborative annotation and the use of marginalia. ARCH 602 extends the scope of architectural research to include geological, social and environmental site histories, and provides innovative methods of architectural research. Evidence of a range of workshops, symposia, public programs, and off campus activities available to students were also provided. Most notable of those are the Adaptive Facades Symposia, and the Venice Biennale Sessions.

Evidence for both programs:

The APR states that the need for research and innovation is an integral part of the substantive curricular areas and is a recurring topic of discussion in faculty meetings. Evidence of ongoing enhancements that benefit both the M.Arch. and B.Arch. programs include the hiring of new faculty and the development of two well-equipped labs, the Computation and Construction Lab and the Architectural Robotics Lab. These labs offer excellent opportunities to engage students with state-of-the-art technology and equipment and

innovative research activities. Similar opportunities are also offered by a university research center, The Center for Building Energy Research, currently led by an architecture faculty member.

Assessment of quantitative measures include grants; investments in equipment and technologies that support experimentation, analysis, and fabrication; increased course offerings in research topics; and student awards.

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.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: As a land grant university, the responsibility is taken seriously to collaborate and consult with community organizations and representatives. Emphasis in many studios is placed on collaborative work requiring students to negotiate to advance their designs. This helps them develop as leaders: comfortable with conflict and differences of opinion and preparing them for the practice of architecture.

Supplemental Student Activities, including student led opportunities, are found on the program website.

Curricular evidence for the B.Arch. program is found in course syllabi for ARCH 401, 402, 403 and 482, Professional Practice. Evidence for the M.Arch. program is found in course syllabi for ARCH 506, 602 and 582, Professional Practice. There is clear evidence of a culture of collaboration in teams of two or three throughout the curriculum.

New partnerships with international programs in Africa and the Venice Biennale provide two new opportunities for students to be in leadership roles and learn how to collaborate with different cultures outside of the United States. New hires in Digital Fabrication (Design Build) and Advocacy work support the academic coursework (APR, 42-43).

Assessment includes metrics for student organization involvement, responses on the Global Student Survey, peer mentorship involvement, and design/build and Biennale involvement.

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.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Curricular evidence of a respectful and strong learning culture in the B.Arch. program is found in ARCH 403 Architectural Design Studio VII in the section syllabi providing statements and links to COVID health policies, studio policies, accessibility, anti-discrimination, religious accommodation, and expectations for classroom behaviors. Evidence of a respectful and strong learning culture in the M.Arch. program is found in ARCH 506 through examples of an in-progress self-assessment questionnaire. Critical self-assessment in dialogue with instructors and guest lecturers in reviews throughout the year determine final grades.

In 2021 the department developed a “Teaching and Learning Culture Statement” that will replace the Studio Culture Policy and provide students with clear expectations for non-discriminatory behavior.

It was clear from meetings with the Visiting Team that there is a strong community built between the students and faculty. Community grows through many informal interactions between students and between students and faculty throughout their time in the programs. Students were involved in the process of producing the new Teaching and Learning Culture statement.

Electives, exhibitions, lectures, travel opportunities, and the Masterclass offer engagement beyond the classroom, encourage innovation, and expose the entire program to a wide range of award-winning practitioners.

Advising team observations, patterns of student issues, and student group concerns are the source of initiatives. Assessment of the workload resulted in reduction of credit hours in both programs. Adjustments have been made in individual courses to re-balance workload and improve work/life balance in the wake of the pandemic. Metrics going forward will be tracked for graduation rates, travel participation rates, and extracurricular activity involvement as well as continued use of the Global Student Survey.

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.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Evidence was found for both programs in the course materials for ARCH 482/582, Professional Practice, and in the Department of Architecture Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement. For the B.Arch, additional evidence was presented from ARCH 371, Human Behavior and Environmental Factors. ARCH 220 and ARCH 402 support this PC in their intentions, but their content is variable, and students will have different experiences. Evidence was found in the M.Arch. program in ARCH 596, Landscape and Society, which includes topics on histories and representations of race, class, and gender in landscape and architecture, decolonial perspectives on whiteness, decolonial perspectives on western and capitalist conceptions of nature, ownership, and entrepreneurialism.

Assessment of this PC has begun with faculty retreats, architecture advisory council, Office of Diversity input and trainings, student groups (NOMAS and IAIW), faculty resources and insights were the source of initiatives, especially after the national social upheavals in the summer of 2020. The program administrators are focused on assuring that course offerings address this PC in a variety of ways such as a rich array of electives and studio topics that highlight social issues. They also support students directly in addressing individual situations or concerns.

Enhancements so far also include the hiring of two new faculty whose practice, research, and teaching focus on social justice, new diversity and land acknowledgement statements, a required annual diversity training for faculty, and a capture of used supplies now available for free for students in need of them.

Supplemental experiences that allow students to increase their understanding of socio-cultural issues in a diverse world include travel for study abroad and field trips, student diversity and student organizations that support underrepresented students, college, and university support for promoting equity and inclusion, as well as diversity in public lecture speakers and program topics.

ARCH 482 Module 8, Architecture as Business, focuses on the foundations of an ethical practice. Minutes from a 2021 faculty meeting recorded an evaluation of content of DEI present in curriculum and provided further evidence of the program's development of a strong learning and teaching culture.

The department maintains a dedicated page to DEI, [Department of Architecture Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Statement](#). The program has a policy of shared governance and is in the process of drafting an updated strategic plan with input from faculty and staff based on improving content on social and cultural issues.

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 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.

B.Arch. [X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: The B.Arch. program has numerous courses that expose the student to a multitude of HSW issues in the Built Environment. These include ARCH 482, Professional Practice, ARCH 371, Theory, ARCH 202, Design II, ARCH 302, Design IV, and ARCH 401, Design V. In addition, evidence was found in the "Technology Sequence" - ARCH 345, Building Science Tech I, ARCH 346, Building Science Tech II, ARCH 347, Building Science Tech III, ARCH 348, Building Science Tech IV, and ARCH 445, Building Science Tech V (APR, 46-48).

M.Arch. [X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: The M.Arch. program has numerous courses that expose the student to a multitude of HSW issues in the Built Environment. These include ARCH 582, Professional Practice. In addition, evidence was found in the "Technology Sequence" - ARCH 545, Building Science Tech I, ARCH 546, Building Science Tech II, ARCH 547, Building Science Tech III, ARCH 548, Building Science Tech IV, and ARCH 545, Building Science Tech V. Another example is a project entitled "Covid Mask Response – Face Shield" included as an Independent Study (APR, 46-48).

Evidence for both programs:

Assessment has been based in part on a detailed "Internal Assessment Map" and associated deliberations for distribution of technical student learning outcomes. This provides a firm foundation for continuous improvement. Ongoing tracking will include ARE pass rates, post-graduation employment rates, and Career Fair opportunities.

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.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Modules in ARCH 482/582, Professional Practice are the primary sources for curricular evidence demonstrating a well-designed overview of the elements of practice from contracts to ethics. Additional content on regulations in practice is evident in the technology sequence ARCH 345/545, 346/546, 347/547, 348/548, and 445. Students are encouraged to pursue employment in professional firms and there is a common culture of visiting offices and attending public programs and lectures. In this way, students gain exposure to professionals who engage in various types of practices.

Student performance is evaluated through completion of quizzes, assignments, activities, interviews with practitioners and a self-selected semester-long research project on contemporary issues in practice. The program has adjusted the curriculum in response to remote learning conditions by providing greater access to highly regarded national and international practitioners.

Syllabi clearly outline NAAB criteria and learning outcomes as well as grading rubrics. The course schedule identifies all topics covered in the modules, these include Stakeholder roles in Architecture, Project Management, Business Practices, Legal Responsibilities, Professional conduct and ethics and Cultural Diversity and Social Equity. Undergraduates are required to take ARCH 371, a course that provides detailed material on accessibility and universal design.

Described instructional materials include *The Architecture Student's Handbook for Professional Practice*, NCARB model Rules of Conduct, sample AIA contract documents and additional readings from periodicals, publications, websites, and other texts.

Assessment has a basis in quantitative evidence offered that will be tracked and aggregated over time: course evaluations, ARE Pass Rate trends, career fair employment opportunities, job placement rates, firm visit opportunities, and Design intelligence ranking for instance. Faculty discussions around improvements in these metrics will also provide evidence.

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.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: This criterion is met by the ARCH 482, Professional Practice and the Technology Sequence: ARCH 345 Building Science Technology I and ARCH 346 Building Science Technology II. ARCH 401 Design V demonstrates the student's understanding in aspects of Land Use Regulation (APR, 52-53). Each section's syllabus enumerates the same learning objectives with direct

citation of the requirements of SC.3. Each of the elements of SC.3 can be found in a required deliverable for one or both courses. Students must demonstrate understanding of regulatory codes, including accessibility, structural design, and materials/assembly.

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: This criterion is met by the ARCH 582, Professional Practice and the Technology Sequence: ARCH 545 Building Science Technology I and ARCH 346 Building Science Technology II (APR, 52-53). Each section's syllabus enumerates the same learning objectives with direct citation of the requirements of SC.3. Each of the elements of SC.3 can be found in a required deliverable for one or both courses. Students must demonstrate understanding of regulatory codes, including accessibility, structural design, and materials/assembly.

Evidence for both programs:

Assessment has been based in part on a detailed "Internal Assessment Map" and associated deliberations for distribution of technical course student learning outcomes. This provides a firm foundation for continuous improvement. Ongoing tracking will include ARE pass rates, post-graduation employment rates, and Career Fair opportunities.

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.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Evidence of student understanding in the area of technical knowledge was described through a common technical sequence for both B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs including 21 credit hours for the B.Arch. and 18 credit hours for the M.Arch. All cross-listed courses are structured in a lecture/lab format, with similar schedules and content. The only difference between the two programs relates to the lab assignments. Course syllabi, schedules, and a large amount of instructional material was provided for all courses within the sequence. The course syllabi and related material address all areas included within the criteria.

The syllabi and material provided describe a comprehensive, rigorous, and highly innovative technology sequence that offers considerable potential for integration with design studios. The sequence has been recognized by awards from NCARB and ACSA.

Non-curricular evidence provided include examples of student participation in competition at the state and national levels as well as strong list of practice-based guest lecturers from both architecture and engineering. Instructional support is also provided through the Computation and Construction Lab and the Architectural Robotics lab.

Evidence of a well-developed, comprehensive, and rigorous process of self-assessment and continuous improvement within the Technology Substantive Area was provided. This includes on-going monitoring of learning outcomes based on assessment data, participation from external stakeholders and evolving learning expectations based on emerging technology. Courses are taught by a consistent cohort of

instructors, which facilitates the ongoing assessment activities. Student learning is also monitored through rubrics and deliverables and information from that monitoring is used to steer changes in course delivery. The APR also describes several enhancements undertaken based on the outcomes of the assessment process including new faculty hires, software updates and updates to course content to align with the 2014 and then the 2020 NAAB Criteria. These content updates included enhancements of measured building performances and integrated assemblies.

A required textbook written by one of the instructors, Rob Whitehead's *Structures by Design: Thinking, Making, and Breaking*, shows an imaginative approach to teaching structures as design.

Evidence for both programs:

Sufficient documentation was provided for assessment processes, including assessment maps, meeting notes and sample correspondences. Data used to inform the assessment process was also provided. Data used to inform the assessment process was also provided including ARE pass rates, job placement statistics and a survey of UG technology students. In general, the assessment process described in the APR is exemplary and fully meets the expectation of SC.4 criterion.

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.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: This criterion is met by the ARCH 302 studio and the paired ARCH 348L lab. Each section's syllabus enumerates the same learning objectives with direct citation of the requirements of SC.5. Each of the elements of SC.5 can be found in a required deliverable for one or both courses. Site conditions are conveyed primarily through a required site plan; user requirements through project narrative and program specs (targeted and achieved); regulatory requirements and accessible design through code analysis in studio and through workshop assignments in lab and other. Environmental impacts of design decisions are measured, illustrated, and diagrammed.

Assessment occurs throughout the semester in the form of multiple reviews with instructors, peer reviewers, faculty members, and external professionals. Students receive verbal and written feedback with rubrics and the grades provide one measurable form of assessment. Instructors conduct an end-of-semester review of the courses and the student work and make recommendations for the following year. Students also complete individual surveys for course and self-assessment. Increased coordination of the studio and labs and plans for increasing the focus on measurement of certain environmental factors have been the primary improvements.

Summary of student achievement: A high degree of student achievement can be found in the elements of this criterion. All pertinent information can be found in the labs and process work. However, there is room for improvement in the consistency of application of the lab material in the studio projects.

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: This criterion is addressed by the ARCH 601 Sustainable Building Design Studio, in which students work in teams to produce a project from site selection and program development. The studio uses the criteria of the COTE design competition, but they also reference other

major approaches to energy management in all aspects of the design. They also fully address the regulatory requirements that govern the building systems as well as life safety and accessibility. Students produce both a graphic presentation of the final outcome and a document of the research and analysis stages in the development of the project. The development of rigorous workshops in the technical specialties was funded by a local firm and enabled the participation of expert professionals in each of the major topics.

Assessment is continuous throughout the course as various tasks are completed as sequential assignments. Studio reviews with external professionals and other faculty members provide verbal feedback. For this studio, students are encouraged to submit their projects to the COTE competition, providing further external validation. Faculty convene at the end of each semester to discuss student work across the curriculum and to recommend adjustments as needed. As indicated in the self-assessment diagram provided as evidence, ARE Pass Rates and post-graduation employment will be used as data for this assessment.

Summary of student achievement: On the basis of reviewing the syllabus and other course materials, it is clear that this studio has a robust pedagogy that meets the requirements of SC.5. On the basis of three projects available to the team, the student work demonstrates variability in meeting the course learning goals as applied to a design project. One project clearly hits all the marks, and success in the COTE awards program indicates that success is not an outlier. However, the project that was randomly selected by NAAB for review of SC.5 did not demonstrate the ability to integrate the required research and analysis into the design.

The team considered several factors in considering this condition as “met”: this condition calls for integrating site “conditions” into design but does not require site planning and design; there were very few projects on which to base a judgment; and the work we were considering was completed in the strained educational conditions of the pandemic. Furthermore, since it was an urban site, the need for a mid-scale site plan may not have been considered. However, evidence of competency for site design was found in design development (seen in a Miro board) of the ARCH 601 projects submitted for SC.6.

Evidence for both programs:

Faculty surveys as well as student course evaluations and annual faculty reviews will provide assessment metrics going forward. Documentation of faculty deliberation on integration strategies and success will be a necessary element as well. Student performance as measured by internal and external reviewers can indicate whether expected outcomes are met, and the faculty can in turn modify numerous factors of course design to address any downturns.

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.

B.Arch. [X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: This criterion is met by the ARCH 401 studio in coordination with specific assignments in the technology co-requisite, ARCH 445. The studio requires the integration of knowledge previously conveyed in the technology course sequence. Studios have different projects but use the same learning objectives. Projects provide students with variety in terms of structural requirements, mixed user groups, and mixed occupancies. All studios work towards five fundamental themes: site and program analysis, circulation, structure, environmental response, and building envelope. Site analysis is

comprehensive, and the site zoning and site decision making can be found in the materials for the concurrent ARCH 348L course.

Assessment of ARCH 401 is done in tandem with assessment of the graduate studio, ARCH 603. This allows a wider group of faculty to compare and to identify strengths and weaknesses. Changes made as a result of ongoing holistic assessment of the studio include adding a requirement for a technical report and evaluating the building program type to assure that design necessitates substantial egress requirements, and challenging structural and acoustical requirements.

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: This criterion is met by the ARCH 603 studio. The studios use a public urban building with complex program requirements, differing spatial types, and public/private interfaces. There are 5 criteria for evaluation presented in a technical report: site and program analysis, circulation, structure, environmental response, and building envelope detailing. Building performance is considered by modeling solar conditions, structural calculations, thermal performance, also occupant loads for egress.

Assessment of ARCH 603 is done in tandem with assessment of the UG Integration Studio conducted by faculty. Changes made as a result of ongoing holistic assessment of the studio include adding a requirement for a technical report and evaluating the building program type to assure that design necessitates substantial egress requirements, and challenging structural and acoustical requirements.

The syllabus and other course materials generally support the APR narrative. The tech report was divided into: Program + Site Analysis and Massing; Circulation and Structure; Cladding and Environmental; and Design Development. The syllabus required metrics for: Ventilation strategy development, Daylighting strategy development, Envelope Material Construction (a full detailed section), Window / Wall / Floor area ratio / Volume studies, and energy use intensity (EUI). Parts of these requirements were seen in studies but not as comprehensive strategies.

No single project met every requirement, but the projects had a strong engagement with the required analyses and design responses. There is room for improvement in the connections between the coordinated technology courses and the application to projects, but the sum of the evidence was strong.

Evidence for both programs:

Faculty surveys as well as student course evaluations and annual faculty reviews will provide assessment metrics going forward. Documentation of faculty deliberation on integration strategies and success will be a necessary element as well. Student performance as measured by internal and external reviewers can indicate whether expected outcomes are met, and the faculty can in turn modify numerous factors of course design to address any downturns.

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)

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: [The 2.12.16 letter from the Higher Learning Commission was found by link to the HLC website. The letter affirms accreditation of Iowa State University until the next review in 2025-26.](#)

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.

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

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

- 4.2.4 **Bachelor of Architecture.** The B.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 150 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in general studies, professional studies, and optional studies, all of which are delivered or accounted for (either by transfer or articulation) by the institution that will grant the degree. Programs must document the required professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.
- 4.2.5 **Master of Architecture.** The M.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate coursework and a minimum of 30 semester credits of graduate coursework. Programs must document the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for both the undergraduate and graduate degrees.
- 4.2.6 **Doctor of Architecture.** The D.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 210 credits, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate and graduate coursework. The D.Arch. requires a minimum of 90 graduate-level semester credit hours, or the graduate-level 135 quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in professional studies and optional studies. Programs must document, for both undergraduate and graduate degrees, the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: The B.Arch. program requires 168 credits, exceeding the 150-credit requirement. There are 40 credits of required general education, 18 credits of non-professional design, 93 credits of professional studies, and 27 credits of electives. A slight discrepancy between the APR and the University general catalog is the result of a program change submitted after the completion of the APR (APR, 68).

M.Arch.
[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: The M.Arch. program requires 102 credits, of which 24 are electives and the remainder are professional studies (APR, 69). Advanced standing students in the program must complete 62 credits. This exceeds the minimum of 30 credit hours at the graduate level.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: The program provided a description of the two pathways used to admit students into the B.Arch. program, and the policies used for each (APR, 70). In the first pathway, students complete the core year of preparatory studies, and then get admitted into the program either through meeting a minimum GPA threshold or through a review of student selected exhibition work. The second pathway, transfer admissions, involves a review process conducted by the Department Chair and Undergraduate Coordinator. The process, described on the Admissions page of the department website, includes a review of GPA, portfolio, and prior coursework.

The team was able to verify the fairness of the review processes in a review of digital files provided by the department chair. Very few applicants are admitted by the second pathway, which is more individualized. Most transfer or AA degree applicants are required to take the entire program due to a blended curricular design.

M.Arch.

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Applicants to the M.Arch. program are evaluated first at the University level through the Graduate College. This process verifies that undergraduate courses meet the standards of the Higher Learning Commission. The Director of Graduate Education is then responsible for assessing individual student's backgrounds and determining both advanced standing and any remedial requirements. This includes a thorough review of prior coursework, transcripts, and portfolio. Due to the logic and rigor of the technology course sequence, advanced standing is not considered for domestic applicants with a pre-professional degree. Advanced standing is considered an option only for international students that have already achieved professional standing in another country.

The team was able to verify the fairness of the review processes in a review of digital files provided by the department chair.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Described

M.Arch.

[X] Described

2022 Team Assessment: 5.1.1. The APR included a description of the administrative structure of the university and the college. Evidence provided included a university-level organizational chart, a publicly available listing of staff roles, and links to web pages of administrators at the university and college levels. A description of department-level administrative roles as well as the department's governance structure was also provided and supported by a publicly available department governance document that lists all standing and ad hoc committees.

5.1.2. The APR describes processes for formal and informal procedures for policy making, monitoring, protection, and collegiality. Evidence of processes used include college and department governance documents and listing of committees including faculty, staff, and students.

The team discussed governance and decision-making with faculty, students, and staff and was satisfied that they understand their context and know the pathways for participation in decisions affecting them.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

2022 Team Assessment: These comments relate to both the B.Arch. and the new and relatively small Master's program.

5.2.1: The program provided evidence of multiyear strategic objective planning which includes semester faculty retreats, monthly or bi-monthly faculty meetings, and quarterly curriculum meetings. Undergraduate and graduate committees meet quarterly, and year-level or studio coordinators meet at the start of Fall and Spring semesters (or as needed). Post-semester surveys provide program evaluations twice annually. Multiyear strategic objectives are based on long-range plans framed within the University, found in the 2017-2020 strategic plan (currently under revision.) Objectives from the previous planning efforts include alignment with the 2020 NAAB accreditation standards and shifts in teaching practices due to the pandemic. The program has provided a visual flowchart of how NAAB criteria have been woven throughout the curriculum and syllabi which directly addresses NAAB conditions to be taught as learning objectives.

5.2.2: Rather than relying on data sets, the program has no minimum pass rate. Instead, this program primarily uses other formative assessment standards that rely on the efforts of substantive area chairs, year-level coordinators, and individual instructors to develop learning objectives, assessment questions or activities, evidence of learning, rubrics, and other external and more nuanced metrics. These rubrics, including grade indicators, self-assessment and instructor surveys of studio course work and the collection of anecdotal input from evaluation forms were evident in the curricular review and are the basis for changes to the curriculum. Post-semester surveys provide program evaluations twice annually.

5.2.3: The Department's Strategic Plan 2016-2020 identifies areas for development and clearly outlines leadership and stakeholders, target actions, and measures of progress. Achievements in these goals are evidenced in student work, changes in faculty, new hires, syllabi, equipment, and facilities. The College of Design's Strategic Plan 2022-2030 identifies goals, measures, and actions to be taken for successful growth. The program demonstrated how it responded to the most recent faculty survey by developing more faculty and teaching assistant training, a peer-review process, clearer communications between classes, and mandatory meetings among studio groups. To bolster research initiatives and in response to strategic planning, the program added more non-tenure track positions and converted titles for senior lecturers to ranked titles, such as Professor of Practice or Professor of Teaching.

5.2.4: One of the main strengths of this program includes the attraction of quality faculty to this highly rated Research 1 University. Improvements to facilities include a new CCL lab and robotics lab. The college provides interdisciplinary opportunities in preservation, cultural heritage, and technology. The program submitted evidence that included syllabi, lecture topics, and student work that demonstrated a strong focus on research. This focus provides opportunities for studies with enriched theoretical content, evidenced by the annual Masterclass which provides access and input to globally recognized theoreticians/practicing architects and lecturers. New facilities and access to technologies support the technology sequence. Extensive travel opportunities enhance the exposure of students from a Midwest campus to other cultures and societies.

Adapting to the pandemic provided both challenges and opportunities that required a re-allocation of spaces. This included the addition of temporary (now permanent) space in the Communications Building, providing hot desks in the fabrication and maker space for students. New ways of teaching online and mentorships to off – campus students were developed, and the program supplied a list of online lecturers who provide national and international perspectives on architecture throughout the pandemic. Ongoing challenges include limited administrative support, a dated and crowded facility along with a growing admission, bureaucracy, budget constraints, and a new university policy that limits 15 credits per semester for students. As a response to this new requirement, the program has hired a new faculty

member to focus on this reorganizational effort. The program sees opportunities in the development of new self-evaluation assessments, increasing interdisciplinary minors, and the new Robotics Lab in the Student Innovation Center.

5.2.5: Ongoing outside input to this department include peer institution visits, fellowship exchanges, and external recognition as evidenced in student competition awards, research, presentations, exhibits and feedback from visiting national and international critics. At a non-curricular level, the Architecture Advisory Committee (AAC) offers regular input to the Chair and faculty.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

2022 Team Assessment: The processes of curricular assessment and development are described in section 5.3, and the relationships are found in a chart in section 5.1.2, Governance. The goals of these processes are to ensure that the program “remains contemporary, healthy, and vibrant” (APR, 85).

The program relies to some degree on faculty initiative for updating course content and objectives within a broadly defined topic area. Thus, by changing faculty assignments or by introducing new faculty to existing courses, the chair can strategically produce refreshed courses. Faculty research can itself result in new course offerings, first as special topics courses, and then through an official course proposal process with curriculum committee and faculty approval processes.

There are two formal routes for evaluating existing courses and sequences and recommending adjustments and improvements. The administrative responsibility for oversight lies with program directors that chair program committees with faculty representing major subject areas. Changes that arise from this structure are then channeled into the Chair’s Cabinet for decisions and actions. The faculty can also organize for assessing and improving through voluntary “substantive area” committees chaired by members of the Curriculum Committee. Recommendations flowing from this structure are formalized by the full Curriculum Committee and then brought to the faculty for a vote. All departmental curricular changes are also referred upward to a college curriculum committee before they can be implemented.

External involvement in curricular development is sought by the chair through discussions with the Architectural Advisory Committee, which meets 2-3 times per year.

The department has begun a comprehensive accounting of curricular assessment using visual flowcharts customized for each NAAB criterion. These were extremely helpful to reach a more nuanced understanding of efforts and outcomes. The chair has committed to fortifying these charts with the addition of metrics and aggregated data.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

2022 Team Assessment: 5.4.1: The distribution of effort between teaching and other responsibilities varies by individual faculty member interests and initiatives. A Position Responsibility Statement (PRS), signed by the faculty member and the chair, outlines expectations for teaching, advising, research & creative activity, and institutional service. Full-time faculty members typically teach two courses a semester (6- 9 credits), serve on department, college, and university committees, advise students, and supervise independent study projects (APR, 89). The visiting team meeting with faculty suggested a heavy service load due to layered processes for evaluation and planning. They are also burdened with administrative tasks associated with grants that might be more efficiently managed by support staff.

5.3.2: Currently Rob Whitehead serves as the AXP advisor. He participates in all duties and trainings associated with the position (see also PC.1 above). The team had the opportunity to hear his enthusiasm and the many ways that he builds connections for students to professional contexts.

5.3.3: Professional development for faculty follows typical academic frameworks of the tenure system, including evaluations and reviews. There are university resources for training. Staff professional development resources are provided at the college and university levels (APR, 89-93).

5.3.4: Departmental advising and mentoring strategies are robust, and there are professional health and mental health services serving the campus. (APR, 93-94). The graduate students noted that the lack of an orientation at the beginning of the program created some initial confusion. The pandemic disruptions may have played a part, but it is nevertheless an item that could be improved.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

2022 Team Assessment: 5.5.1: *“Architecture is imbued with values and ideas that both reflect and exert tremendous influence over our built environment, our communities, and our daily lives. Therefore, diversity, equity, and inclusion are subjects essential to an architectural education at Iowa State University.”* This statement is prominently displayed on the department's page where diversity, equity and inclusion statements are provided, along with links to a variety of student groups, programs and University resources including campus reporting systems. Evidence of this commitment to diversity was supplied both through curricular and non-curricular materials. Evidence embedded in non-curricular materials include programs, lectures, travel opportunities, and featured electives demonstrate the programs commitments to diversity and social equity.

5.5.2: The program complies with all University statements on Equal Opportunity. The program faculty currently includes a diverse array of nationalities, including German, Slovenian, Chinese, Turkish, Canadian, British, Korean, Puerto Rican, French, Nigerian, Indian and Mexican individuals. The program chair is committed to increasing faculty and staff diversity as much as possible while working within the boundaries of University policies on search and hiring procedures and state law. The Annual Reports to the NAAB posted on the department website provide detailed demographic data. By comparing the 2013 report with the 2020, some progress was made in diversifying the Tenured/Tenure track faculty; white representation dropped from 82% to 77%. Part-time faculty is more amenable to change over this timeframe, but the lack of uniformity in reporting categories confuse the picture.

5.5.3: The program states concern and awareness for the need for diversity and is actively recruiting international students to increase the diversity of its population particularly in the Master's program. As in

the case of faculty and staff recruitment, student admissions are governed by University policies and state law. The Annual Reports to the NAAB posted on the department website provide detailed demographic data. By comparing the 2013 report with the 2020, progress was made in diversifying the B.Arch. student body; the entering class went from 72% white to 41% white. The trend went the other way for the M.Arch., largely due to a drop in international applicants after 2016 and visa difficulties with the pandemic. The entering cohort went from 58% white to 69% white.

The program is now developing an assessment based on graduation rates and recruitment statistics. Sample present and future outcomes include the integration of non-western materials and diversity related options in studios, a Women and Robotics symposium, tracking public speakers, involvement of NOMAS in recruitment efforts, additional scholarships, a new worship space, required faculty diversity training, reviews of diversity and land acknowledgement statements, and new hires with a focus on diversity, equity, and social issues.

5.5.4: Links to the Office of Equal Opportunity are accessible through the University web portal <https://www.eoc.iastate.edu/>. The university office of Multicultural Student Affairs provides supportive services to all student who self-identify as African American, Asian American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Latinx, Native American/Alaskan Native and/or Multiracial, and to advocate for their holistic development across the University. The department's George A. Jackson Award provides financial assistance for masters and doctoral students who identify as African American, American Indian, Hispanic/Latinx, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.

In June of 2021, the Governor of Iowa signed into law House File 802, an act establishing specific requirements related to racism and sexism trainings and diversity and inclusion efforts by state governmental entities, including Iowa's public postsecondary educational institutions. As yet, there is no direct impact to the program, but it has produced anxiety among some current faculty members and could affect efforts to recruit in the future.

5.5.5: ISU's Office of Equal Opportunity provides policies and procedures through outreach, education, training, and complaint resolution to support faculty staff and students with different physical and/or mental abilities. The office works to assist those in need with accommodation arrangements and resources for disability and illness, information on assistive technology resources, and multiple forms of guidance and information.

Statements regarding access to student accommodations in course syllabi demonstrated evidence of the program's commitment to supporting students with different physical and/or mental abilities. Over twenty-five links to supportive programs including student groups, university resources, multicultural services, financial resources, and international resources are listed on the Department of Architecture website.

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.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

2022 Team Assessment: The College of Design has engaged a professional consultant, Cannon Design, to assess the overall space needs of the department. Several design schemes have been presented to the College over the last 2 years but continuing work on the design of a potential building addition is still in progress.

Needs that have been identified by the department and faculty include:

- Additional storage and pin-up space for department and studio uses.
- Specialized studio space for experimental and design/build projects
- "Creative" desk space and environment for studios
- Specialized lab space needs at the innovation center
- "Hot" desks vs. "cold" desks

While this ongoing study acknowledges the need for facilities upgrades and additional space, implementation will rely on fundraising. In the meanwhile, even if additional existing College space could be re-allocated to the department, the Resource Management budgeting model means that it would strain the department budget.

5.6.1: B.Arch. studios (all years) are taught in the College of Design / King Pavilion addition (CoD/KP). All studios are taught at Cold Desks except for the First Year/Core students located on the Lower Level utilizing Hot Desk stations. Studio reviews are held in many public spaces throughout CoD/KP.

M.Arch. studios (all years) are taught in the College of Design / King Pavilion addition (COD/CP) – 5th floor Cold Desk studio space. Studio reviews are held in many public spaces throughout COD/KP.

5.6.2: Seminars/Lecture: There are several classroom and seminar spaces located in CoD/KP, including Kocimski Auditorium, a large lecture hall hosting lectures and public events. Large events are also regularly held in the College's Atrium Space or Forum, and in the Gallery Space which can be converted for lecture use. For large courses not held in Kocimski, the department has access to a number of spaces across campus and in nearby buildings. The College of Design and King Pavilion are the only spaces on campus accessible 24 hours per day by students and faculty.

Casual and Retail Spaces: The atrium space in the college has recently been enhanced to include more casual seating and study spaces. The atrium is also the location of The Design Café and Cyber Café. On the second floor, just off the atrium is the ISU Bookstore Outlet.

Labs and Shops: Lab spaces include the Robotics and Computational spaces. Within CoD/KP are the Fabrication and Model Building shops.

5.6.3: All tenured and tenure-track faculty have access to private office space within the CoD. Some have elected to share office space. All Term faculty have access to shared office space. Student advising services are located on the second floor, recently enhanced with the addition of a break-out meeting area for students. The Department Chair's office and administrative offices are accessed from the Atrium Space. Facilities in use by the department meet requirements for accessibility as required by the American with Disabilities Act. Additional Research space is now housed in the Student Innovation Center.

5.6.4: ISU continues a tradition of implementing experimental technology. Via VMware, the college can offer remote access to its equipment. Azure Virtual Desktop is now providing remote computing options to all students in the College of Design. This means that students who do not own the necessary software or an have an incompatible operating system can easily connect and run the software from anywhere.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

2022 Team Assessment: The University and College commitments to the program remain steady, with allocations being determined using a Resource Management Model process. Although there have been substantial cuts in state funding, the loss has been offset by a combination of growth and tuition increases. There has also been a successful decade-long capital campaign by the University. Budget Table #1 (APR, 105) shows general stability across the seven-year timespan from 2014-2021.

Since the last accreditation, annual scholarship distribution has increased from \$20,000 to \$50,000, and is supplemented by \$30,000 in annual awards.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

2022 Team Assessment: Architecture-specific library resources are housed in the Design Reading Room, located conveniently by the main atrium of the College of Design building. It is managed by Tim Panages, the full-time supervisor of the Design Reading Room, and by Jeff Alger, a subject librarian from the university's main Parks Library. The Design Reading Room offers students access to a sufficiently wide range of materials, including books and electronic databases.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: The Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees with the exact language found in the NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*, Appendix 2 is found on the program's website: <https://www.design.iastate.edu/architecture/professional-pathways/naab-accreditation/accreditation-careers-licensure/>

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)

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: The *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition; Procedures for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*; as well as the *2009 Conditions* and *2012 Procedures* that were in effect at the time of the previous visit in 2013, are available on the program's website:

<https://www.design.iastate.edu/architecture/professional-pathways/naab-accreditation/accreditation-careers-licensure/>

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: The architecture department demonstrates a commitment to help students find positions in the profession. The College of Design hosts its own annual career fair to connect students with potential employers. Associate professor Rob Whitehead, AIA, is the department's designated AXP advisor, helping students get acquainted with starting the licensure process. A large percentage of M.Arch. students have begun their AXP record with NCARB.

The department actively partners with AIA Iowa to offer professional development programs relevant to students at their annual chapter gatherings. ISU's career services department provides students with a number of virtual career search tools, in addition to one-on-one counseling and a career library. Finally, the architecture department offers a number of online, architecture-specific resources available to students on their website:

<https://www.design.iastate.edu/architecture/professional-pathways/naab-accreditation/accreditation-careers-licensure/>

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

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

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: All applicable documents related to the accreditation process are easily accessible on the department website: <https://www.design.iastate.edu/architecture/professional-pathways/naab-accreditation/accreditation-careers-licensure/>

The statement on teaching and learning culture: <https://www.design.iastate.edu/architecture/policy-governance/statement-on-teaching-learning-culture/>

The statement on diversity, equity and inclusion:

<https://www.design.iastate.edu/architecture/policy-governance/department-of-architecture-diversity-equity-inclusion-statement/>

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
- e) Explanation of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: Application forms and instructions:

B.Arch.: <https://www.admissions.iastate.edu/freshman/requirements>

M.Arch.: <https://www.admissions.iastate.edu/graduate>

Evaluation processes for transcripts for freshman admissions are handled by the university admissions office. For the M.Arch., the Graduate College evaluates transcripts for admission to the university, and the department then evaluates portfolios, essays, and letters of recommendation using multiple reviewers and point systems. Content of non-accredited degrees is not evaluated; all applicants with non-accredited degrees are admitted to the three-year program.

Financial aid and scholarships for undergraduates have a single application:
<https://www.financialaid.iastate.edu/scholarships/>

Financial aid and scholarships for graduate students:
<https://www.grad-college.iastate.edu/finance/>

To enhance diversity among the applicant pool there are targeted recruitment efforts and mentorship in the application process. There are also two design-specific awards and several targeted university scholarship programs.

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.

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

2022 Team Assessment: 6.6.1: ISU's financial aid department provides current resources and advice to help students make decisions about financial aid, including a cost-of-attendance estimating tool. Students have access to both in-person and virtual financial aid advising. The architecture department website provides a list of relevant scholarships to students on their financial guidance and resources page: <https://www.design.iastate.edu/architecture/choose-isu/financial-guidance/>

6.6.2: An initial estimate of tuition, fees, and supplies for B.Arch. and M.Arch. students is made available through a document on the registrar's website.
<https://www.registrar.iastate.edu/fees>

The spreadsheets include cost breakdowns for state residents, out-of-state residents, and international students. The architecture department's website also discusses specific program costs (laptops, optional study abroad, and model supplies) in greater detail.

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

Shared Values of the Discipline and the Profession

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility
Equity, Diversity and Inclusion
Knowledge and Innovation

Program Criteria

PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility
PC.8 Social equity and inclusion

Student Criteria

SC.3 Regulatory Context
SC.4 Technical Knowledge

Appendix 2. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator Representative

Ann Marie Borys, PhD, AIA
Associate Professor
Department of Architecture
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195
(206) 543-4180
amborys@uw.edu

Educator Representative

Hazem Rashed-Ali, PhD
Associate Professor
Associate Dean of Research and Innovation
College of Architecture
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX
(806) 834-5741
hazem.rashedali@ttu.edu

Practitioner Representative

Celeste Novak
Celeste Allen Novak Architect, PLLC
1066 Knight Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103
(734) 846-3903 (c) 734 747-7407 (o)
celestenov@aol.com

Regulator Representative

Gary E. Demele, FAIA, NCARB
Vice President, **BUSCH** Architects, Inc.
Flour Exchange Building
310 Fourth Avenue South, Suite 1000
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1012
(612) 333-2279
gary.demele@gmail.com

Student Representative

Tiffany Chang, AIAS, NOMA
Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago, IL
(425) 761-5986
tchang14@hawk.iit.edu

V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Ann Marie Borys

**Ann Marie Borys, PhD, AIA
Team Chair**

Hazem Rashed-Ali

**Hazem Rashed-Ali, PhD
Team Member**

Celeste Novak

**Celeste Novak
Team Member**

Gary Demele

**Gary Demele, FAIA
Team Member**

T. Chang

**Tiffany Chang, AIAS, NOMA
Team Member**