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I. Summary of Team Findings

The team would like to thank Dean Sabine O'Hara, Department Chair Susan Kliman, and the UDC faculty and staff for their hard work in preparing for the visit. The team room was well organized. The hospitality afforded to us by all was very much appreciated.

It was apparent that the entire university community is energized and in full support of the establishment of a graduate level, accredited program in architecture. Based on a review of the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation, we found that the school is well positioned for the next step in the accreditation process.

The faculty is very much engaged and enthusiastic. The team was impressed by the faculty’s dedication to the needs of the students. The mutual respect between the students and faculty was obvious and was brought to our attention in many ways.

The university’s commitment to the renovation of the architecture program’s spaces is commended. It will provide the physical resources necessary for the program to thrive.

The team found the architecture program at the University of the District of Columbia to be a small but lively environment devoted to the mission of the program and university: it is devoted to solutions to urban habitation issues and has a faculty that serves every student need. The mission is quite defined as to the architect’s role in serving the community, with a focus on sustainability and the urban land grant, outreach, and the public resource role of the university. This serves the local populace well, and the program collaborates with city and federal agencies to great advantage.

The students are studying in a commuter, after-work-hours situation (since many of them work and have other obligations stemming from being older than the average college student), and they have the energy and will to achieve this balancing act in their lives. Student organizations, as well as feedback to the program and the university, are strong, and students understand quite clearly how their education will help their professional advancement.

The university has made a strong commitment to the need for the program to be established as a professional degree program. The central administration (the dean of the College of Agriculture, Urban Sustainability and Environmental Sciences (CAUSES), where the program is located, the provost, and the university president) wants this program to be a center of excellence. There are land grant-based initiatives that bring the architecture program’s expertise and knowledge to the wider CAUSES focus on urban agriculture, sustainability, and community health.

The administrative structure of the program is appropriate, with growth being evidenced in recent hires for full-time faculty and a program chair who best addresses the need for resources, curriculum, and student satisfaction.

The team wholeheartedly supports the distinctive difference that this program’s mission brings to our profession. This program is active in providing greater access to a career in architecture. Everyone involved in the program seems eager to strike a balance between the program’s mission and professional standards, with good progress in this regard since the last visit.

1. Team Comments and Visit Summary

The visit proceeded smoothly, with easy access to information and great support from the staff. The program head/chair is quite engaged in the goal of establishing the program as a professional degree program, and the faculty are focused on what needs to be done to that end. Student satisfaction seems high.
Having an urban land-grant university in our nation’s capital is fairly unique. It succeeds with support from both the District municipality and the federal government. It attends closely to the needs of the local populace, while also enjoying a rich setting of international agencies and embassies, national civic debate, and a city that is growing and thriving. Though the program is currently small, all these attributes speak well to the potential of the program.
2. **Conditions and SPC Not Yet Met/Applicable**

   A.1. Communication Skills
   A.2. Design Thinking Skills
   A.7. Use of Precedents
   A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture
   A.10. Cultural Diversity
   B.1. Pre-Design
   B.2. Accessibility
   B.4. Site Design
   B.6. Comprehensive Design
   B.8. Environmental Systems
   B.11. Building Service Systems Integration

3. **Causes of Concern**

   **Design Thinking**

   The team finds that design skills and conceptual thinking, cited as weaknesses in the last visit, continue to be a concern. The cogent presentation and graphic and written representation of ideas used to determine a design direction are so central to the basic skills of an architect. We understand that there has been additional emphasis on design skills in the Basic Design and Communication courses; however, that effort has not yet been realized in subsequent courses/studios.

   **Diversity**

   While the programs are housed in a Historically Black University, the global and cultural diversity criteria in the SPC are not sufficiently introduced. The advantage of being located in the nation’s capital brings added richness to the programs through the city’s abundance of embassies.

   **Range of “High Pass” to “Low Pass”**

   The distinction between “high pass” and “low pass” was often difficult to discern. The team felt that the faculty should review its criteria for determining these designations.

   **Integrated Building Practices**

   The programs have placed emphasis on the acquisition of technical skills to provide students with
the means and opportunity to apply their knowledge in the marketplace. The team was concerned that, while the students were introduced to the principles of and criteria for integrated building practices, there was decidedly less ability for them to translate that knowledge into a design problem. Skills introduced at the lower levels did not find their way to the visual and graphic representation of projects at the upper levels. Inconsistent application of accessibility, site design and analysis, construction materials, spatial quality and organization, and basic information such as scale and orientation made them difficult to identify, or they were absent in the materials presented.

Digital and Three-Dimensional Representation

The programs are restricted in their ability to represent their work through the construction of three-dimensional models. The lack of modeling capabilities has limited the students’ ability to explore site conditions, design alternatives, structural typologies, and project representation. Without shop equipment, laser cutters, or the possibility of using CNC applications, the students are forced to work with cardboard, balsa wood, and foam core models, with little variation in scale and without the option of producing multiple site, structural, or formal studies.

The widespread exploration of parametric design has introduced the potential for “mass-produced” architectural elements, 3-D printed plug-ins, and the use of robotics in the construction industry. The inability to introduce students to the ramifications of these technologies leaves a gap in their knowledge base.

Expectation of Scholarship

The lack of engagement of the faculty in scholarship and research and/or reflective practice was mentioned in the 2013 VTR. While new faculty have been added to the program since then, there is no evidence that the activity level of the faculty has changed or evolved in this regard. It is acknowledged that the faculty members are dedicated and that they have devoted themselves to teaching.

Institutional Support

The students and the faculty noted the impact of operational weaknesses within the university. Financial aid, admissions, and information technology are areas that have created difficulties for the programs. It is noted that the new president and the newly appointed executive vice president have acknowledged these deficiencies in institutional support.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2013)

2009 Condition I.1.3. A., Architectural Education and the Academic Community: That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching. In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

Previous Team Report (2013):

- The team found no evidence of scholarly production from the faculty—neither full time nor part time. Though there is a culture and expectation of scholarship within the university, this culture is yet to be developed among either the senior or junior faculty.
• Liberal arts-based education—program meets the university’s standards for general education.

• Rather than “holistic,” the architecture curriculum is clearly focused on building skills and knowledge base for traditional practice.

2015 Team Assessment: Once again, the team found no evidence of scholarly production from the faculty—neither full time nor part time. Though there is a culture and expectation of scholarship within the university, this culture has yet to be developed among either the senior or junior faculty. There was some discussion of faculty members “attending” conferences, but not “presenting papers” at these conferences. There was also little evidence that the professional work of the faculty yielded either a research direction or a pedagogical stance contributing to the overall reputation of the programs or contributing to the collective knowledge of the profession.

The college is unique, drawing from six “centers” of research. This is a huge resource for the faculty and for the students beyond the offering of internships and provides the opportunity for the students and faculty to engage in the development of new knowledge.

The department declares itself to be technically oriented, but the team felt that this self-proclaimed strength was not embedded in the projects throughout the programs.

The team appreciates the faculty’s notable activity in the realms of community engagement, service, and teaching.

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

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

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

Previous Team Report (2013):
• The team found no evidence of a process or schedule of assessment activities—including student course evaluations, institutional review, or other periodic, established processes. It is not clear that the views of junior and adjunct faculty and students are sought by the administration in a systematic way. Within this small academic staff, self-assessment and planning appear to be tacit, not active.
• New CAUSES structure (and new dean) may develop systems for assessment and strategic planning, which will be essential as the program grows.
**2015 Team Assessment:** Formal means of assessment are in place, such as course evaluations. Students are satisfied with the feedback process, and faculty are of a unified mind regarding curriculum and program direction and improvement. Faculty are reviewed annually for academic and research contributions to the university.

The department chair indicated that the faculty have held annual assessment reviews of the work in the programs. The team room had evidence of assessment activities required by the university, and that assessment activity has been taken seriously. The new department chair meets with the students on a regular basis, and the students feel that she has been responsive to their needs and requests.

The faculty members hold regular faculty meetings, and the minutes from those meetings were available. College-level meetings are also conducted on a regular basis so that the program is aware of its standing within the college framework.

There were no course evaluations available for review.

**2009 Condition I.3.1, Statistical Reports:** Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

- **Program student characteristics**
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity and gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.
  - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
    - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
  - Time to graduation.
    - Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.
    - Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.

- **Program faculty characteristics**
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity and gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.
  - Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.

**Previous Team Report (2013):**
- Statistics not provided in the APR; some stats delivered on day 3 of the visit.
• Reports on enrollment and characteristics of faculty and students, but not on inputs or outcomes (admissions, graduation, time to completion, etc.)
• The program is a small, Historically Black University setting, with approximately 60 students (grad and undergrad), two tenured faculty (black, registered, male), and two tenure-track faculty (black, registered, female). Many students are career-change, representing an older profile and working 40 hours per week to support themselves (all classes are held at night). The programs examined for Initial Candidacy were the M. Arch I and M. Arch II, and only a dozen students are currently enrolled in these programs. Meetings with students included undergraduates (primarily) along with graduate students.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found the statistical reporting to be appropriate and informative.

2009 Criterion A.2., Design Thinking Skills: *Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.*

Previous Team Report (2013): The program focuses on technical and conventional/traditional professional skills, with very little engagement in more conceptual or theoretical exercises.

2015 Team Assessment: At this visit, the students in both M. Arch. program tracks have not successfully developed strong design thinking skills. It is important at the graduate level that students develop their verbal, visual, and writing skills. A focus on technical and professional skills does not mitigate a need for clear and well-reasoned conclusions and the ability to express concepts.

2009 Criterion A.10., Cultural Diversity: *Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects.*

Previous Team Report (2013): The program points to the *History and Theory of Architecture* as the source for this SPC, but the evidence provided does not meet this standard.

2015 Team Assessment: The program still remains challenged with respect to moving the focus out from its local context.

The programs have relied on the diversity of the student body to provide the students’ exposure to cultural diversity. While this adds to a rich learning environment, the understanding of cultural diversity comes from the curricula.

The M. Arch. I program is more restricted. Students seem to be local, and there is little opportunity for them to be exposed to other cultures through travel and exchange programs.

The projects exhibited in the team room tended to be designed for sites within the District, and new mechanisms for introducing cultural diversity have not been developed since the 2013 visit. There was little evidence in the syllabi of the History and Theory course(s) and academic reports/papers that indicated this condition was understood.
2009 Criterion B.2., Accessibility: 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): The ability to integrate accessibility systems and components is not demonstrated in the matrix or in the artifacts.

2015 Team Assessment: This remains a challenge. This ability is not demonstrated in the student work to the satisfaction of the team. Please see comments under Criterion B.2.

2009 Criterion C.4., Project Management: Understanding of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods.

Previous Team Report (2013): We could find no evidence of understanding of this SPC. We could not see evidence of instruction of the SPC in the only course identified as including the SPC: ARAC-518 – Contract Administration and ARCP-501 – Professional Studio Lab VII.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion has been successfully addressed.

2009 Criterion C.5., Practice Management: Understanding of the basic principles of architectural practice management such as financial management and business planning, time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.

Previous Team Report (2013): We could find no evidence of understanding of this SPC. We could not see evidence of instruction of the SPC in the only course identified as including the SPC: ARAC-518 – Contract Administration.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion has been addressed.

2009 Criterion C.6., Leadership: Understanding of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.

Previous Team Report (2013): We could find no evidence of understanding of this SPC. We could not see evidence of instruction of the SPC in the only course identified as including the SPC: ARAC-518 – Contract Administration.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion has been successfully addressed.

2009 Criterion C.8., Ethics and Professional Judgment: Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues, and responsibility in architectural design and practice.

Previous Team Report (2013): We could find no evidence of understanding of this SPC. We could not see evidence of instruction of the SPC in the only course identified as including the SPC: ARAC-518 – Contract Administration.

2015 Team Assessment: This has been successfully addressed.
II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

I.1.1 History and Mission:

[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence.

2015 Team Assessment: As indicated in the APR, in conversations with program participants, and in program literature and output (research), the program clearly understands, embraces, and supports its mission.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

  Further, the program must demonstrate that it encourages students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers, and it addresses health-related issues, such as time management.

  Finally, the program must document, through narrative and artifacts, its efforts to ensure that all members of the learning community: faculty, staff, and students are aware of these objectives and are advised as to the expectations for ensuring they are met in all elements of the learning culture.

- **Social Equity:** The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2015 Team Assessment: The team was impressed with the small and close academic community of the program. There is great optimism and a culture of mutual respect. The faculty pay very close attention to students’ progress and professional development. However, smallness and the program’s mission and institutional setting, given the university’s focus on the needs of its local context, may mean that students are less aware of, and less exposed to, a more global perspective. The program is aware of the need for focus beyond the District, and positive discussions were held regarding how to address this in the future in order to prepare for accreditation expectations.
I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives: Programs must demonstrate, through narrative and artifacts, how they respond to the following perspectives on architecture education. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently within the context of its history, mission, and culture and to further identify as part of its long-range planning activities how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community. That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching. In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: There are opportunities to address this perspective through project-based research, which some students participate in. However, the program remains more practice-focused than engaged in scholarly or research output. However, a thriving learning environment exists for the sake of the students. There is admirable concentration on the needs of the local community and the architecture department’s engagement in the cross-disciplinary make-up of CAUSES.

B. Architectural Education and Students. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to live and work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured and respected; to emerge as leaders in the academic setting and the profession; to understand the breadth of professional opportunities; to make thoughtful, deliberate, informed choices; and to develop the habit of lifelong learning.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: Almost all of these goals are in place in the program’s perspective; however, whether students aspire to the same leadership modes as those of other schools remains to be seen, given the infancy of this program and its ambitions.

C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located; and, prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: There was universal awareness on the part of students regarding the path to licensure, as well as the desire to pursue it.

D. Architectural Education and the Profession. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to practice in a global economy; to recognize the impact of design on the environment; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to the multiple

---

1 See Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1990.
needs of a diversity of clients and diverse populations, as well as the needs of communities; and to contribute to the growth and development of the profession.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: The student’s work and conversations with the students and faculty show interest in all these concerns; however, the focus on the global economy may not be as strong.

E. Architectural Education and the Public Good. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to be active, engaged citizens; to be responsive to the needs of a changing world; to acquire the knowledge needed to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges through design, conservation and responsible professional practice; to understand the ethical implications of their decisions; to reconcile differences between the architect’s obligation to his/her client and the public; and to nurture a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service and leadership.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: In all areas of operations, the school is focused on the needs of its client community.

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

[X] The program's processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2015 Team Assessment: The program has a clear vision for its development, as seen in its resource planning, university relations, and increased outreach and collaboration in its academic setting. Notable progress has been made in the development of facilities and the faculty cohort. CAUSES, the newly formed college, works well, with a clear mission and a developed vision for the future. The central administration understands the value of the architecture department.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How the program is progressing towards its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.
- Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:
  - Solicitation of faculty’s, students’ and graduates’ views on the teaching, learning, and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
  - Individual course evaluations.
  - Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.
  - Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.

The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.
The program's processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2015 Team Assessment: There is substantive examination of the program’s mission and progress among students, among faculty, and college wide, if not university wide. Structures are in place for having the dialogue and feedback effect incremental changes in strengthening the program's curriculum and resources.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

- Faculty and Staff:
  - An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include, but are not limited to, faculty and staff position descriptions.
  - Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
  - Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.

[X] Human resources (faculty and staff) are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: For the most part, this condition has been met. However, the team is concerned that the reliance on centrally based university services does not yet serve the program’s information technology, financial aid, and admissions recruitment needs adequately.

- Students:
  - An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This documentation may include, but is not limited to, application forms and instructions, admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshmen, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.

[X] Human resources (students) are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: Students are especially appreciative of the attention paid by the faculty to their needs and professional development. The CAUSES staff is well organized for providing academic support, operations clarity and response, and chances for research collaboration to students.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance:

- Administrative Structure:
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate it has a measure of administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm the program's ability to conform to the conditions for accreditation. Accredited programs are required to maintain an

---

2 A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
organizational chart describing the administrative structure of the program and position
descriptions describing the responsibilities of the administrative staff.

[X] Administrative structure is adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The administrative structure is clear, effective, and supported well by the
college and university. All of the administrative staff seem to be aware of one another’s
responsibilities.

  ▪ Governance: The program must demonstrate that all faculty, staff, and students have
equitable opportunities to participate in program and institutional governance.

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: Opportunities for participation in academic governance are in place for
faculty and staff. Architecture students are also active in university governance.

I.2.3 Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that
promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This
includes, but is not limited to the following:
  ▪ Space to support and encourage studio-based learning
  ▪ Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.
  ▪ Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including
    preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

[X] Physical resources are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The facilities and all physical resources are adequate for the program;
however, as the team has noted, there is essentially no model shop, which is a real detriment to the
students’ development of the skills necessary for an architect. The university has made substantial
upgrades to the studio and classroom spaces, each faculty member has an office, and a third phase of
enhancements to the administrative wing is coming soon. The program has a materials library, which is
still under development. The architecture books are in the central library, but this library is only a short
walk across the plaza.

I.2.4 Financial Resources: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to
appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Financial resources are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The program’s budget is adequate for its needs, and the university has
invested substantial funds toward the upgrade of facilities. However, the program lacks funding for
development of a model shop to support the students’ professional preparation. In addition, though the
university is supported by the District and the federal government, the program does not have its own
fundraising and outreach to enhance programming.

I.2.5 Information Resources: The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and
staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support
professional education in the field of architecture.

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

[X] Information resources are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: Information resources are adequate for a professional program, with recent improvements to the computer laboratory. The collection of architecture books in the library is not extensive enough.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 3 – INSTITUTIONAL AND PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports\(^3\): Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

- **Program student characteristics**
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity and gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.
  - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
    - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
  - Time to graduation.
    - Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.
    - Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.

- **Program faculty characteristics**
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity and gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.
  - Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.

[X] Statistical Reports were provided and provide the appropriate information.

**2015 Team Assessment:** These reports were provided in the APR and in the team room, and they contained the appropriate program information. Institutional characteristics were provided through links to the relevant university reports.

**I.3.2. Annual Reports:** The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2009 NAAB Procedures. Beginning in 2008, these reports are submitted electronically to the NAAB. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the NAAB will provide to the visiting team all annual reports submitted since 2008. The NAAB will also provide the NAAB Responses to the annual reports.

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

---

\(^3\) In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

[X] Annual Reports and NAAB Responses were provided and provide the appropriate information

2015 Team Assessment: The Annual Reports were available and typical for a professional program.

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials: The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty are adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history and context of the institution.

In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit\(^4\) that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

[X] Faculty credentials were provided and demonstrate the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement.

2015 Team Assessment: The faculty credentials were in the APR and were also posted for the students’ orientation.

---

\(^4\) The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team’s ability to view and evaluate student work.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

[X] The policy documents in the team room met the requirements of Appendix 3.

2015 Team Assessment: All policies were present in the team room. Many were included in the APR through web-based links.
II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria: The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:
Architects must have the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. This ability includes facility with the wider range of media used to think about architecture, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making. Students’ learning aspirations include:

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

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: Students know how to communicate verbally. Digital production is not strong enough, and the program has devoted new faculty talent toward addressing this. Writing skills are not strong, and they are not in evidence throughout the curriculum.

A. 2. Design Thinking Skills: Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: Design thinking was barely adequate in student work and was not strong enough (see Causes of Concern above). There was no evidence of programming or pre-design/design process work.

A. 3. Visual Communication Skills: Ability to use appropriate representational media, such as traditional graphic and digital technology skills, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion was barely met, with the skills acquired being adequate to get students hired in the field. However, there was no evidence of programming or pre-design process (the student’s design process) work. Visual communication skills are introduced in ARCP-101/ARC-601 and ARCP-123/ARAC-623.
A. 4. Technical Documentation: Ability to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion was covered in the Materials and Methods course, and was seen in the Thesis work of the last design studio. The ability to produce technical documentation was well developed for technically clear drawings in ARCP-202/ARAC-601, as was the ability to conduct materials research and develop outline specifications. However, the lack of a good model shop prevents the development of models identifying and illustrating the assembly of materials, systems, and components.

A. 5. Investigative Skills: Ability to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: There was evidence of this skill in the studio work and in other courses such as Built Environment and Professional Ethics and Practice.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The program has strengthened the first-year studio curriculum in this regard, and subsequent studios indicate that these skills are being taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: While precedents were introduced in some courses, there was little evidence of this criterion in the design work.

A. 8. Ordering Systems Skills: Understanding of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Work in the first-year studio indicated that students were studying ordering systems.
A. 9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including X 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.

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: As noted in Causes of Concern, there was little attention paid to global culture, and awareness of historical traditions seemed thin.

A. 10. Cultural Diversity: Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects.

[X] Met – for the ARAC/M. Arch. II
[X] Not Yet Met – for the ARCP/M. Arch. I

2015 Team Assessment: The graduate degree-path students, the Track II students, were of a more diverse population and had studio work to support an awareness of cultural diversity; however, the undergraduate Track I students remained primarily focused on their immediate context/population, and, given the mission of the university, scant opportunity was provided through coursework or projects to reinforce this criterion. The program is not drawing enough on its proximity to embassies and international NGOs to strengthen this learning.


[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Evidence of this being met came from the Thesis studio and from other types of studio projects that involve working with the local community. Students also have opportunities to participate in the research projects of CAUSES.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: As more fully described in Causes of Concern, there is not enough attention being paid to critical thinking and representation. The faculty is aware of this.

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally, they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students’ learning aspirations include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Incorporating life safety systems.
- Integrating accessibility.
- Applying principles of sustainable design.
B. 1. Pre-Design: Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: The team found no evidence of programming ability in the student work. In discussions with the faculty, it appeared that this might be an oversight in preparation of the team room, as the faculty members say that this criterion is covered in the Professional Ethics and Practice course and in the Materials and Methods course. However, the team would expect to see evidence of it in the studio projects.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: The student work showed that a focus on accessibility was lacking. Accessibility is considered in ARCP-201/ARAC-602, but the ability to design for accessibility is incomplete. Bathrooms shown are not fully accessible, nor is any consideration of site issues and level changes demonstrated. Evidence of solutions incorporating accessibility is lacking throughout the studio work.

B. 3. Sustainability: Ability to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction and operations on future generations through means such as carbon-neutral design, bioclimatic design, and energy efficiency.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The program’s focus on this ability throughout the curriculum is notable. This is strengthened through the college-wide attention to this need. Both the college and the program have an overall focus on sustainability in urban settings. Evidence of this ability is found in ARCP-505, 506, and 501. However, the work in these classes centers around meeting various rating systems, such as LEED, and, with the majority of design problems based in the urban DC setting, there is little opportunity to explore wider issues of building orientation and site accommodation. An ability to relate the building envelope to energy usage was not demonstrated.

B. 4. Site Design: Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: There was little evidence of site plans in the design work, and the courses did not address this ability, based on what was in the course notebooks. The ability to conduct site analysis was well demonstrated, particularly in ARCP-506 and 502. The ability to manipulate a site
and respond to issues such as soils, building orientation, topography, and site drainage was inadequately demonstrated.

B. 5. Life Safety: *Ability* to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The studio designs showed knowledge of egress and building codes.

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

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: The studio designs lacked design thinking skills, an awareness of and the use of precedents, a broad global focus, and an ability to assess and design the sites of the projects. In addition, there was no evidence of the ability to use universal design. There was no evidence of integrated building systems and environmental systems in the designs.

B. 7. Financial Considerations: *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: This understanding is a strength of the program traditionally, and it was seen in studio work and in the course materials covering professional practice and building construction. It was particularly evident in ARAC-604, ARCP-502, and ARCP-414/ARAC-614.

B. 8. Environmental Systems: *Understanding* the principles of environmental systems' design such as embodied energy, active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar orientation, daylighting and artificial illumination, and acoustics, including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools.

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: This understanding was not shown either in the coursework or the studio designs. An introduction to environmental systems in buildings was evident in ARCP-246/ARAC-646.
However, student work in this area was mostly missing, making it difficult to access student understanding. Environmental systems appeared to be studied at the city-wide level, resulting in a clearer understanding of the impact of building activity on the city. Unfortunately, the impact of these systems on building design was not reflected in the studio work.

B. 9. Structural Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The students showed an understanding of this criterion in the studio work and the courses on structural systems. Students clearly gained an understanding of the basic principles of structural behavior through coursework in ARCP-231/ARAC-631, ARCP-331/ARAC-631, ARCP-332/ARAC-632, and ARCP-432/ARAC-634. Application of structural systems was demonstrated in ARCP-501 and ARCP-502. Application of structural systems to inform and influence building design was weak.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: This skill was covered well in courses such as Materials and Methods, and in the second-year and upper-level studio work. An introduction to and understanding of building envelope systems was evident in ARCP-246/ARAC-646, ARACP, and ARCP-201/ARAC-602.

B. 11. Building Service Systems Integration: *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: There was little evidence of an understanding of building service systems integration in the studio work and in the relevant courses that introduce this emphasis. Some introduction to building systems and their integration was evident in ARCP-246/ARAC-646. However, the amount of work presented was inadequate to evaluate student learning. Little understanding of the appropriate integration of these systems and their potential impact on the design of a building was evident in the studio work.

B. 12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration: *Understanding* of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met
2015 Team Assessment: The second-year studio work and the Thesis projects showed this understanding. However, the evidence seemed limited to brick assembly, and there were no wall sections or other details of building assembly in the work.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The team was impressed with the program’s attention to technical knowledge for the developing architect. However, the more progressive developments in our field, such as integrated systems, are not adequately covered by the program yet. Also, the team was disappointed to not see a course notebook for Preservation Rehab. Tech I, which is an admirable element in the curriculum.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

- Knowing societal and professional responsibilities.
- Comprehending the business of building.
- Collaborating and negotiating with clients and consultants in the design process.
- Discerning the diverse roles of architects and those in related disciplines.
- Integrating community service into the practice of architecture.

C. 1. Collaboration: Ability to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is a strength of the program’s mission and learning processes. Not seeing more development of this skill in the studio work was a concern.


[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Through the studio work, students are attuned to this perspective and actively engaged in understanding the human behavior of building users and how it affects building design. However, in the studio work, there is a lack of adequate attention focused on the design process and concept development. The research agenda of CAUSES strongly addresses this understanding.

C. 3. Client Role in Architecture: Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and reconcile the needs of the client, owner, user groups, and the public and community domains.

[X] Met
2015 Team Assessment: In their studio work, students are attuned to this perspective and actively engaged in understanding the human behavior of their clients and the community. The research agenda of CAUSES strongly addresses this understanding, as well.

C. 4. Project Management: Understanding of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The program teaches this understanding in the second-year studio and the Practice Management course. In addition, the faculty have strong abilities in this area and are great role models. Students very much desire to have this as a skill.

C. 5. Practice Management: Understanding of the basic principles of architectural practice management such as financial management and business planning, time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The course on Professional Ethics and Practice addresses this understanding, and students are eager to gain this knowledge. Many are working in the field while pursuing their studies, so they are very aware of the need for this skill set.

C. 6. Leadership: Understanding of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The course on Professional Ethics and Practice addresses this understanding, and students are eager to gain this knowledge. In addition, the faculty’s professional offices and practices serve as strong role models to encourage students to develop this skill.

C. 7. Legal Responsibilities: Understanding of the architect’s responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The course on Professional Ethics and Practice addresses this understanding. Many students are working in the field while pursuing their studies, and they see this responsibility respected in their offices.
C. 8. Ethics and Professional Judgment: Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues, and responsibility in architectural design and practice.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The course on Professional Ethics and Practice addresses this understanding. In addition, the general focus of the program’s mission reinforces this understanding.

C. 9. Community and Social Responsibility: Understanding of the architect's responsibility to work in the public interest, to respect historic resources, and to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: This is pervasive in the curriculum due to the program’s mission. The only proviso is whether the students are exposed to issues beyond those of their immediate context/community.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: Given the program’s history and the faculty’s perspective and practices, this is a well-addressed realm of architectural skills. Students take seriously the need to have these skills, and they see through their own employers the need to address this skill set.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Regional Accreditation: The institution offering the accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: This is documented in the APR.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: 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 electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The program uses the M. Arch. degree name for both the undergraduate plus one and a half years of graduate study path, and for the graduate path. Thus, the degree nomenclature conforms to the NAAB requirements.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development: The program must describe the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications (e.g., changes or additions) are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Further, the NAAB expects that programs are evaluating curricula with a view toward the advancement of the discipline and toward ensuring that students are exposed to current issues in practice. Therefore, the program must demonstrate that licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The program has a good understanding of and accepts all the NAAB criteria for curriculum and professional preparation. It has put a great deal of energy into preparing the degree programs to meet all the expectations for accreditation. There is an active process for constant curriculum review with respect to content, methods, and developments in our field. There is evidence that the review process leads to positive revisions in the program’s offerings.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PREPROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

In the event a program relies on the preparatory/preprofessional educational experience to ensure that students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist. Likewise, the program must demonstrate it has determined how any gaps will be addressed during each student’s progress through the accredited degree program. This assessment should be documented in a student’s admission and advising files.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Evidence of the evaluation process was in the APR and was shown during the visit. The program head reviews every application for readiness with respect to the NAAB requirements or to previously satisfying these requirements. Students also confirmed that their placement was appropriate to their backgrounds.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees: In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: This is available through the program’s website and catalogue, and is covered at the annual beginning-of-the-year student orientation meeting, which is required of all students.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures: In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents, and faculty:

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: These documents are made available to students through the administration office and links on the website, and they were posted during the team’s visit.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information: In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:

www.ARCHCareers.org
The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
The Emerging Professional’s Companion
www.NCARB.org
www.aia.org
www.aias.org
www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Access to these resources is reinforced in the curriculum regarding professional practice, and is encouraged through the faculty’s attention and the students’ exposure to them through their work in the field. Students showed an awareness of these resources.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs: In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:

All Annual Reports, including the narrative
All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
The final decision letter from the NAAB
The most recent APR
The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda
These documents must be housed together and accessible to all. Programs are encouraged to make these documents available electronically from their websites.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: These documents are available through the administration office and are made available through the website.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates: Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: This does not yet apply to the program, as it needs to be accredited before its students can pursue licensure.
III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

[Taken from the Architecture Program Report, responses to Part One: Section 1 Identity and Self-Assessment]

A. History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)

Reference University of the District of Columbia, APR, pp. 1-5

B. History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)

Reference University of the District of Columbia, APR, pp. 5-6

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference University of the District of Columbia, APR, pp. 17-19

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference University of the District of Columbia, APR, pp. 19-21
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