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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The Visiting Team would like to acknowledge the many persons who received the team warmly and shared honest thoughts with us about the state of the NC State architecture program. Materials from every course in the curriculum were made available to the team. An exceptional exhibit of student work from every level of design studio and every degree program was prepared for our review. Those responsible for administering the program—from school to college to chancellor’s office—were uniformly generous with their time, allowing us to understand the program from a variety of important perspectives.

We found at North Carolina State a program of enthusiastic students and committed faculty that was weathering the recent storm of budget cutbacks and economic recession without compromising its commitment to quality student education.

Much has changed since NAAB’s last visit to the program six years ago, with a number of respected faculty retiring and a large group of new faculty (almost two-thirds of all full-time faculty) arriving. Through thoughtful management and a generous spirit, this transition has enabled the department to grow in ways that are beneficial to students and the program. New hires have brought with them new research interests, which have enriched curricular offerings, brought new financial resources to the department, and enhanced the prestige of the college in a university that focuses on research production.

This ability to thrive in hard times is the best possible indication that the school will continue to serve students well in the years ahead.

2. Conditions Not Met

SPC B.7 Financial Considerations

No evidence was found that “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” were addressed in the classroom setting or in required student assignments.

3. Causes of Concern

Transfer credit procedures

The school of architecture is not asked to assess more than a handful of students for transfer credit each year. When asked to do so, they have a system in place through which the program head reviews transcripts, course descriptions, and portfolios as appropriate. Student files, however, do not document transfer decisions and evidence in detail. In order to meet NAAB’s new emphasis on rigor in course transfer policy, student files will need to be upgraded concerning future transfers. For NAAB purposes, what is being transferred is SPCs, not course credits, so files should document this aspect of transfers as well.

Financial uncertainties

Even though the college has done an admirable job addressing funding reductions from the state without affecting the educational experience of architecture students, further reductions could have a significant negative impact. Cost savings from administrative reorganization and special
allocations from the chancellor’s office cannot be counted on as future strategies to overcome additional reductions in public funding. With the unknown political commitment for ongoing public funding of higher education at the current level, there is concern of what additional impacts funding reductions would have.

Diversity

Since the previous 2006 visit, considerable strides have been made in achieving gender diversity among faculty and student bodies. Recent tenure-track teaching and research hires have also contributed to an intellectually balanced and increasingly diverse faculty. However, efforts to increase ethnic and racial diversity are lacking, particularly among the student demographic of the accredited programs.

In 2007 the School of Architecture adopted a Plan for Diversity with a primary goal of achieving a critical mass of historically underrepresented minority faculty and students. The plan lists several areas for affecting change that can be summarized as the following: diversity of philosophies; faculty and student recruitment; admissions procedures; scholarships and financial support; advising and mentoring; and visiting faculty. The APR states that in response to the Plan for Diversity for the School of Architecture, efforts made to date include: a careful screening of student applicants to diversify the freshman pool, a three-year commitment of department head as a University ADVANCE Scholar, a mentoring program pairing minority students with professional mentors to improve retention, and proactive recruitment of minority faculty. Aside from participation in ADVANCE, little progress has been made on these efforts. While the goals of the Plan for Diversity are comprehensive, implementation has been insufficient.

Given that the 2006 NAAB visiting team identified Social Equity as a “not met” condition, the team finds that more specific measures are necessary to fulfill the program’s goals for diversity.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2006)

2004 Condition 4, 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 an educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. The school 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. Faculty, staff, and students must also have equitable opportunities to participate in program governance.

Previous Team Report (2006): Although the School of Architecture has created a plan for diversity that clearly outlines the diversity issues plaguing the teaching and practice of architecture, there still remain areas of concern in terms of creating equitable opportunities for women and minorities who teach or study within the school environment. Attempts have been made but progress has been limited. This continues to be a significant challenge within the school.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Since the previous 2006 visit, considerable strides have been made in achieving gender diversity among the faculty and student bodies. Recent tenure-track teaching and research hires have also contributed to an intellectually balanced and increasingly diverse faculty. Efforts to increase ethnic and racial diversity are lacking, however, as evidenced particularly by the student demographics within the accredited programs.
2004 Criterion 13.7, Collaborative Skills: Ability to recognize the varied talent found in interdisciplinary design project teams in professional practice and work in collaboration with other students as members of a design team

Previous Team Report (2006): While collaborative exercises are required in both studio and technology courses, there is little evidence of the use of interdisciplinary design project teams.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: While specific examples of collaboration were not shown, evidence of collaboration was seen in the various work displayed in the Team Room; in addition, discussions with faculty and students indicated that there is an atmosphere of collaboration in the studio work.

2004 Criterion 13.25, Construction Cost Control: Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

Previous Team Report (2006): There is no evidence that the program provides coverage of life-cycle cost issues or construction estimating at the level of understanding.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: SPC B.7 No evidence was found that “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” were addressed in the classroom setting or in required student assignments.
II. Compliance with the 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: The program must describe its history, mission and culture and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context.

The accredited degree program must describe and then provide evidence of the relationship between the program, the administrative unit that supports it (e.g., school or college) and the institution. This includes an explanation of the program’s benefits to the institutional setting, how the institution benefits from the program, any unique synergies, events, or activities occurring as a result, etc.

Finally, the program must describe and then demonstrate how the course of study and learning experiences encourage the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects.

[X] The programs have fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: The APR describes a program with a proud history of accomplishment as an architecture school. Since its founding in 1948 the school has grown in degree offerings while continuing to honor historic commitments to community outreach, engagement with the real world of architectural practice, and design excellence.

The school’s mission statement is strong. It includes a forthright summary statement, but also specific commitments to contemporary values such as stewardship of scarce resources, promotion of livability in cities, and research and development of ecologically responsive building materials.

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 programs have demonstrated that they provide a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The programs have demonstrated that they provide a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Learning Culture: A positive and respectful learning culture is evident among faculty, students, and staff of the School of Architecture. These shared values are embodied by “The Right of Inquiry” policy for the College of Design, which clearly provides a statement of expectations for all members within the College of Design’s community regarding learning culture. A host of activities and meetings are used to cultivate awareness and model appropriate engagement and interaction. A spirit of collaboration and optimism permeates the culture of the school.

Social Equity: Social Equity is marked as “met,” but remains a “cause of concern.” While there is substantial evidence supporting equitable conditions among faculty, staff, and students within the School of Architecture, homogeneity in the ethnic demographic of the student body persists. Evidence of policies and instruments to respond to a desire to ensure equity and create diversity include: NCSU policy statements regarding diversity and inclusion found on course syllabi, various campus-wide initiatives, and the 2007 Plan for Diversity for the School of Architecture. However, inconsistent and incomplete implementation of the 2007 Plan for Diversity threatens the program’s ability to provide a culturally rich educational environment.

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.

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.¹ 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 programs are responsive to this perspective.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Grounded in design thinking, community design, and interdisciplinary studies, the NCSU School of Architecture stands as a strong and unique program within the spectrum of architecture education. Its emphasis on design thinking is complemented by strong roots in architecture practice. With licensed architects involved in almost every design studio, dividing lines between the academy and the profession are minimized. Mentorship programs through organizations like YAF and the cosponsored AIA-NCSU School of Architecture lecture series are among opportunities that provide further interaction. In addition to the steadfast support of the local professional community, the program provides education beyond the classroom through multiple opportunities at various scales of involvement. The Community Design Initiative, the Contemporary Art Museum, and the downtown and affordable housing studios foster the value of architectural design as a legitimate vehicle for problem-solving and positive change. Outward-looking inclusive practice is cultivated by the collaborative and interdisciplinary structure of the program itself. The First Year Experience introduces students from a number of design disciplines to a common history, culture, and way of design thinking, which allows them to work in

collaboration. "Swing" studios, the ULI competition, the downtown studio, and advanced topical design studios all allow for a network of interdisciplinary educational experiences throughout the program.

While many of these attributes may be trends popular in architecture education, the NCSU School of Architecture has had a solid footing in each of them for many years.

In response to why she chose this major, a NCSU School of Architecture student told us, “In architecture school, no knowledge is wasted.” Her brief statement summarizes an attitude toward an unbiased, inclusive inquiry that is rigorous, effective, and creative.

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 programs are responsive to this perspective.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Architecture students at North Carolina State are extremely capable and conscientious in their studies. Faculty, both full time and adjunct, uniformly praised their students and mentioned the pleasure it was to teach them. Students are collegial and authentic in their interactions with each other and have created a family-like collaborative learning environment. They take full advantage of the educational opportunities available to them and have an enthusiastic attitude toward the program, its leadership, and their faculty.

Students have opportunities to enrich their leadership skills through student organizations in and out of the College of Design including AIAS, the Architecture Graduate Student Association, Design Council, USGBC, University Senate, and AIA Young Architects Forum. Student representatives from AIAS and AGSA attend every faculty meeting, where their input is asked for and valued. Student organizations organize many events for students and often collaborate with one another and with professional organizations.

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 programs are responsive to this perspective.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Based on interviews with faculty, students, and administration, as well as information provided in the documents in the Team Room, this perspective is met. Due to a change in faculty, the IDP coordinator’s position has been in flux but a plan is in place to address the situation. Students are aware of IDP and are involved with the program.

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 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 programs are responsive to this perspective.
2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Strong connection to the profession is a hallmark of the North Carolina State architecture program. Support from local firms, investment by the local AIA chapter, and broad participation by professors of practice all contribute to this connection.

The School of Architecture provides specific opportunities for student engagement with practicing professionals through detailed case studies of built projects (ARC 561). Each case study involves a regional firm with whom the students conduct project research through interviews with the Architect of Record. Uniquely, after vetting by student and firm, these case studies are made publically available. Additionally, the recent creation of immersion studios has also provided students with an opportunity to interact directly with local practitioners (ARC 503). These office studio settings create a professional atmosphere for students whereby practicing professionals participate directly in studio teaching and critique.

The AIA Triangle Chapter’s direct support of the School of Architecture indicates the profession’s ongoing commitment to the program. Most notably, AIA Triangle splits the cost of the program’s lecture series. Other connections with AIA Triangle include participation by the director of graduate studies on the chapter’s board of directors and recent appointments of the dean and program head to the board of AIA North Carolina.

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 programs are responsive to this perspective.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: As a land-grant university, NC State has a unique research, service, and educational mission. The School of Architecture’s outreach has focused on affordable housing and the creation of economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable communities. Studios often tackle issues in real communities, working with nonprofit housing and community development organizations as well as municipalities and communities across the state. In these studios, students engage in public outreach, create affordable housing models, prepare handbooks of design solutions and best practices, and present to the public in open workshops.

Two research efforts—Professor Bizio’s Home Environments Design Initiative in collaboration with the Native American Indian Lumbee Tribe, and Professor Barrie’s Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Outreach—have given architecture students the opportunity to participate in projects through studios, seminars, and final projects.

CAM Raleigh, a College of Design Initiative in partnership with a private nonprofit, is a contemporary art and design museum located in the warehouse district of downtown Raleigh. This facility gives the College of Design and the School of Architecture a significant physical presence in the central business district of the capital city. Its educational programs and installations have, in its first year of existence, established a venue for interaction with the public around creativity and critical thinking. It is also home to the very successful Design Camp, a summer program that helps early high school students experience and learn about design. Design Camp has become an important source for future College of Design students.

Other examples of engagement for the public good include designing, fundraising, and constructing a storage shed for a nonprofit organization in eastern North Carolina; establishing an organization called New Sense Studios, which engages, supports, and inspires area youth through artistic expression; and working with students at Haven House, a local sheltered home for troubled youth, on a variety of design
challenges. A group of architecture students were leaders in establishing the NC State chapter of the U.S. Green Building Council.

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 programs processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: Long range planning is evident at the department, college and university levels. In 2011 the University completed a Strategic Plan initiated by the new Chancellor, Randy Woodson. A Compact Plan developed in 2007 guides decision making at the college level. The School of Architecture engaged students, faculty and administrators in a process that led to a Compact Plan for the School which included such action items as:

- Enhancement of Place and operating resources
- Design for inclusion
- Design for sustainability
- Design for integrated technology/ design for humanistic technology
- Design for inquiry

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, 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.

[X] The programs processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: The visiting team found a robust series of self-assessment structures and accomplishments. Undergraduate programs are required to undergo a regular program of self-assessment and review, including annual program evaluation reports from the director to the provost. Graduate programs undergo an External Program Review every 8 years. Data related to outcomes is presented to the university in a biennial report.

Concerning faculty evaluation, the head of the school reviews each faculty member’s student evaluations for every course and walks through every review, including final reviews.
The best evidence of a continuous process of self-assessment within the program is a series of recent curricular changes, including

- Enhancing the site and energy focus of design studios
- Increasing the fit of technology courses and design studio
- The removal of ARC 450 and 251 from the academic year for M.Arch. 3 students, and
- Inclusion of professional practice learning within design studio
Part One (I): Section 2 – Resources

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

Faculty & 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\(^2\). 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 & Staff) are adequate for the programs

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Despite recent budgetary challenges, tremendous effort has been put forth by the administration, faculty, and staff to increase efficiencies and maximize expertise. Throughout these challenges, the College of Design and School of Architecture have prioritized maintaining the educational experience of the students by preserving faculty lines while consolidating administrative staffing structure. The visiting team felt, however, that further reductions in funded support of the program could result in decreases of educational staff and resources, which would be a critical detriment to the program.

Supplementary funding from research grants and donors is limited when compared against other schools within the institution.

All required policies were documented and available to the visiting team.

The visiting team finds the faculty workload to be consistent with peer institutions and not a source of faculty focus or discontent.

The majority of students appear to be aware of the IDP program, despite a recent transition in IDP coordinators. With the retirement of Assistant Professor Paul Battaglia, Assistant Professor Jianxin Hu, a licensed architect in Maryland, has volunteered to be the next coordinator. The visiting team finds that the planned transition is having no impact on the students’ awareness of and participation in IDP.

Support of teaching release for full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty appears to be adequate. These releases have allowed faculty to complete manuscripts, reinvigorate research, and complete grant writing.

\(^2\) A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
Continual professional development is available to all faculty through participation in the events offered by AIA Triangle, funded travel to conferences, and numerous institutional resources. Worthy of note is the formalized mentoring between junior and senior faculty.

Search committee composition and procedures for open positions are consistent with programs of similar size and mission. As confirmed by comments from faculty, the program has a clearly articulated set of criteria for determining rank, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The criteria were developed at the college level and speak to the unique modes of scholarship, creative practice, research and service that occur within the design discipline.

One unique component of the rank, reappointment, and tenure and promotion process is the establishment of a "Statement of Mutual Expectation" (SME) for each faculty member. Once mutually agreed to by the faculty member and school, this document serves as the basis for tenure review.

**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 freshman, 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 programs**

**2012 Visiting Team Assessment:** Documentation for policies and procedures are in place to support student needs and goals. Admission policies and procedures were clearly outlined and accessible, differing slightly between the undergraduate and graduate programs. At the undergraduate level the School of Architecture makes final admission decisions, whereas at the graduate level the school offers advisement to the Graduate School, which makes the final admission decision.

The College of Design’s student services office is a great resource for students in the School of Architecture. Located within Brooks Hall, this office provides academic advising, career services and personal counseling to students. Direct access to these services for design students further emphasizes the community nature of the program.

Student achievement outside of the classroom is supported through an active international studies program, student organizations funded by the School of Architecture, and active student engagement in research.

**I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:**

**Administrative Structure:** An accredited degree program must demonstrate that 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 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 programs**

**2012 Team Assessment:** The architecture school has an administrative structure that provides it appropriate independence to make curricular, hiring, and budgetary decisions. While the architecture program must negotiate on budgetary and facilities decisions with other departments in the College of Design, the college structure insulates it from interference by more distant university divisions.
Support staff for the architecture school was reorganized three years ago in response to a university-wide budget crisis. At that time, the one departmental administrative assistant was removed from the department in favor of centralizing all support in a smaller staff at the college level. This reorganization was approved by all of the departments in a participatory planning process involving all the affected parties. The new structure is working well, but it has left the department with less support for specifically departmental initiatives desired by staff and faculty. It is hoped that this reduction will be temporary.

**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 programs

**2012 Visiting Team Assessment:** The visiting team found active participation by students, faculty, and staff in governance. Full-time faculty meet once each week to discuss and resolve departmental initiatives, crises, and curricular issues. Student organizations are strong. Adjunct faculty feels valued by students and full-time faculty in their contribution to education at the school but asked for deeper involvement in curricular development and departmental governance.

1.2.3 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 programs

**2012 Visiting Team Assessment:** The multiple building complex that makes up the College of Design (Brooks Hall with its north and south wing, Kamphoefner Hall, and Leazar Hall) functions as an academic village. The interior public spaces, while not generous, provide many opportunities to display student work, present exhibitions, and house gatherings. The exterior courtyards and terraces that connect the buildings allow for a range of activities, events, and student interaction.

Having a branch of the campus library focused on design-related resources housed in Brooks Hall is a significant asset. Burns Auditorium is not only a high-quality teaching space but serves as a public lecture hall for the visiting lecture series. The Materials Laboratory is a well-equipped shop that gives architecture students access to a broad range of equipment and tools not often found in traditional single discipline architecture schools. Two large computer labs, as well as clusters of computers located throughout the complex, supplement the laptop required of each student and provide printing and plotting support. Because of the other degree programs in the college, architecture students have access to physical resources customary to those disciplines such as the Advanced Media Lab and the textile lab but not traditionally available to architecture programs.

Architecture studios are housed in various locations within the complex. The studio environments are typical of architecture programs with individual desk space for students and small gathering spaces for classes. Classrooms, seminar rooms, critique spaces, and a small lecture hall are located throughout the complex. Off-campus facilities include the Daylighting Lab, the Downtown Design Studio, the Contemporary Art Museum, and the Prague Institute.

Generally the facility is well maintained and functional. The recent budget cuts in state funding have not adversely affected maintenance, although response times have increased. Because the complex is fully
utilized with no current plans for expansion, there is little opportunity for the College of Architecture to increase their enrollment.

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 programs

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: With the significant reduction in public funding over the past two years, one would expect to see obvious impacts in the facility, the tools needed for architectural education, reduction in total faculty, and loss of morale. After essentially level funding for the previous five years, the last two fiscal years saw significant reductions in revenue. By making the commitment to not have this reduction in financial resources affect the quality of the student educational experience, the school embarked on a conscious plan to rethink how to utilize available funds.

A total reorganization of the administration of the college was implemented with involvement and agreement by all the department heads and student representation. Centralization of a variety of services on a college rather than a departmental basis increased efficiency, so that some administrative positions were able to be eliminated. Studying the historic demand for seminar courses allowed them to be offered at the appropriate frequency rather than be eliminated. Combining teaching of course work common to all disciplines produced additional efficiencies. Centralizing Information Technology and Digital Technology reduced costs and resulted in greater capabilities. Increasing the use of distance learning reduced costs and generated additional revenue.

The fortunate timing of the retirement of several senior faculty resulted in cost reductions when junior faculty were hired as replacements. Continuation of focused development activity resulted in several new significant gifts.

The faculty expressed pride in addressing this crisis without sacrificing student education. The college has been successful in getting special allocations from the university for purchasing equipment, faculty positions, and facility improvements. Unspent department allocations are being reclaimed by the college to redirect for improvements not funded by other sources. The External Relations Office has created and maintained strong connections to the professional alumni community by expanding its traditional fund-raising/development role with continuing education, alumni relations, and professional development. This has resulted in additional endowments and donations.

Overall, the college has addressed the budget challenges responsibly, minimizing their impact on the students.

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 programs

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Many of the information resources available to School of Architecture faculty and students are housed within the Harrye B. Lyons Design Library, a branch of the NCSU Libraries, located in Brooks Hall. Additional resources are also located at the university main library, the
D.H. Hill Library, and through interlibrary loan among all member institutions of the Triangle Research Libraries Network. The Design Library’s location in Brooks Hall makes it readily accessible to the school. In addition, its web presence keeps students and faculty aware of newly available resources. Strong access to digital image databases is accomplished through an “in-house” digital image collection and ARTstor. The range in the collection of journals and periodicals is appropriate; however, due to space constraints, over 20,000 volumes are housed at a satellite shelving facility. This creates a 24-hour delay in checking out or receiving requested materials; however, the new campus library currently under construction in Centennial Park should resolve this issue by January 2013. Also, in the recent budget cycle, the acquisitions budget was reduced by 50%. To alleviate the impact on students and faculty, acquisitions were focused on faculty and student requests, rather than building the monograph collection. It is expected that current budget reductions are temporary.
Part I: Section 3 – Reports

1.3.1 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 & 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 & 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

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence was provided in the APR that fulfilled the required demographic information requested. Information was provided in the APR indicating that the SoA is in parity with university-wide ratios for gender but is still lacking in minority diversity. The number of students who have completed the program within the “normal” time frame has increased slightly with the graduate student completion rate increasing to 41%. There are somewhat fewer tenured faculty positions since the last visit. A number of professors have retired and new faculty members have not reached the required milestone for tenure consideration. The SoA has held the number of licensed faculty constant with new hires that replaced retiring or leaving faculty.

3 In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
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.

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

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: The information required to meet this element of the review was provided in the APR on pages 108 through 114. The Deficiencies referenced in the previous responses are still of some concern regarding Social Equity, Collaboration and Cost Control, which will be discussed elsewhere in this report.

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 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.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Review of faculty résumés and a strong faculty exhibit validate the faculty’s credentials for instruction.

---

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

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: The required documents shown in Appendix 3 were provided in the Team Room to supplement information provided in the APR.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

Part Two (II): Section 1 – Student Performance – Educational Realms & Student Performance Criteria

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the criteria set out below. The knowledge and skills are the minimum for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice.

The school must provide evidence that its graduates have satisfied each criterion through required coursework. If credits are granted for courses taken at other institutions or online, evidence must be provided that the courses are comparable to those offered in the accredited degree program.

The criteria encompass two levels of accomplishment:

Understanding—The capacity to classify, compare, summarize, explain and/or interpret information.

Ability—Proficiency in using specific information to accomplish a task, correctly selecting the appropriate information, and accurately applying it to the solution of a specific problem, while also distinguishing the effects of its implementation.

The NAAB establishes performance criteria to help accredited degree programs prepare students for the profession while encouraging educational practices suited to the individual degree program. In addition to assessing whether student performance meets the professional criteria, the visiting team will assess performance in relation to the school’s stated curricular goals and content. While the NAAB stipulates the student performance criteria that must be met, it specifies neither the educational format nor the form of student work that may serve as evidence of having met these criteria. Programs are encouraged to develop unique learning and teaching strategies, methods, and materials to satisfy these criteria. The NAAB encourages innovative methods for satisfying the criteria, provided the school has a formal evaluation process for assessing student achievement of these criteria and documenting the results.

For the purpose of accreditation, graduating students must demonstrate understanding or ability as defined below for each of the Student Performance Criteria (SPC):

Finally, in addition to assessing each SPC as met or not-met, the team must assess whether the realm overall is met or not-met.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: B.Arch. evidence found in 241, 441 essay responses in tests and written papers. M. Arch. evidence found in 241, 441 essay responses in tests and written papers. M. Arch. Track 3 evidence found in 241, 441 essay responses in tests and written papers.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: B. Arch. evidence found in 201, 501 design studio work. M. Arch. evidence found in 201, 500 design studio work. M.Arch. Track 3 evidence found in 403, 500 design studio 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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: B. Arch. evidence found in 251, 201 studio projects and digital representation course work. M. Arch evidence found in 500, 503 studio projects and digital representation course work.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: B. Arch evidence found in 432, 501 case study and studio projects.
M. Arch evidence found in 503, 500 studio projects. M.Arch Track 3 evidence found in 432, 500 case studies/studio projects

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

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met


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

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: B. Arch evidence found in 201, 202, 301, 302–studio work. M. Arch evidence found in 403, 404–studio work.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: B. Arch evidence found in 202, 501–studio work (not 201). M. Arch evidence found in 500–studio work. M. Arch Track 3 evidence found in 500–studio 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.

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: B. Arch evidence found in 202 design studio and precedent work. M. Arch evidence found in 202 design studio.
A. 9. **Historical Traditions and Global Culture:** *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.

**B. Arch**  
[X] Met

**M. Arch**  
[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** B. Arch evidence found in 241 test materials for Global Culture; 401 studio work for historical traditions (490 is not required for all students yet); M. Arch. evidence found in 401, 503 studio project; M. Arch Track 3 evidence found in 241, 503 studio project

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.

**B. Arch**  
[X] Met

**M. Arch**  
[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** B. Arch evidence found in 241 test materials for Global Culture.  
M. Arch evidence found in 241, 503 test materials for Global Culture/studio work.  
M. Arch Track 3 evidence found in 241, 503 test materials for Global Culture/studio work

A.11. **Applied Research:** *Understanding* the role of applied research in determining function, form, and systems and their impact on human conditions and behavior.

**B. Arch**  
[X] Met

**M. Arch**  
[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** B. Arch. evidence found in 302/331 studio work/structures projects.  
M. Arch. evidence found in 500/503 studio work/structures projects; M. Arch Track 3 evidence found in 500/503 studio work/structures projects

**Realm A. General Team Commentary:** The team found student communication, representation, and critical thinking skills exemplary. Many factors contribute to this quality: the selectivity of admissions to the program, the culture of hard work and genuine engagement created by students, excellent instruction on the part of full-time and adjunct faculty, and a sound curricular structure.
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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Strong evidence was found in ARC 581. Acceptable evidence was found in ARC 500.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARC 501.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Acceptable work was evidenced in Arch 212, Arch 302, and Arch 402.
B. 4. Site Design: *Ability* to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.

B. Arch [X] Met  

M. Arch [X] Met  

**2012 Team Assessment:** Evidence was found in ARC 211, ARC 301, and ARC 403.

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

B. Arch [X] Met  

M. Arch [X] Met  

**2012 Team Assessment:** Evidence was found in ARC 501.

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.7. Environmental Systems  
B.9. Structural Systems  
B.5. Life Safety

B. Arch [X] Met  

M. Arch [X] Met  

**2012 Team Assessment:** Evidence was found in ARC 500 and ARC 501.

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.
B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: No evidence was found that “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” were addressed in the classroom setting or in required student assignments.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARC 211 and ARC 414.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARC 232, ARC 331, and ARC 332.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARC 302 and ARC 500.
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

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** Evidence was found in ARC 414.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** Evidence was found in ARC 232.

**Realm B. General Team Commentary:** Student work evidenced a sound foundation in the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials. The art of “making” through visual media and models was well balanced against the analytical processes of research and application of legal and other constraints. It was noted that design projects could benefit from an increased application of sustainable techniques.

**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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** Evidence was provided in the course notebook for ARC 561 “The Practice of
Architecture” that this SPC had been attained.

C. 2. Human Behavior: Understanding of the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment and the design of the built environment.

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was provided in the work on exhibit and the information from ARC 202, ARC 302, and ARC 403 in the team room that this SPC was met.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This SPC was met indicated by the work shown in the ARC 561 notebook and the projects documented in ARC 581.

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

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in several sections of the course work documented in the notebook of ARC 561.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of meeting this SPC was found in the Case Studies from the ARC 561 notebook in Tab 4 and Tab 7
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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was shown in the notebook provided from ARC 561 in the handouts and the final exams and Tab 5 and in the Tab 6 Case Studies.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the ARC 561 notebook, Tab 4 and 6, and the course work from ARC 500 and 501.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the ARC 561 notebook under lecture 2 titled “Ethics of Practice.”

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met
2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the course work of ARC 501 and 401 and other examples are shown in the work exhibited in the team room in ARC 598.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: Based upon the team’s review of the documents provided in the exhibit of work in the team room and a review of the documents exhibited by the students and the examinations from ARC 561, the SPCs required in Realm C have been met. The work that was reviewed showed that the students in this program understood the requirements expressed in Realm C, including the capability to collaborate with and manage other professionals, understand the legal aspects and requirements of the profession, and discern the different roles architects play throughout the building process.
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).

Met [X]

2012 Team Assessment: The institution is a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and was reaffirmed accreditation in January 2005.

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.

Met [X]

2012 Team Assessment: N. Carolina State’s B.Arch. and M.Arch. degrees are in compliance with NAAB’s requirements for number of credits.

The requirement for 45 credits of General Education is met but with several caveats. Recent changes to the NAAB Conditions require that every student have completed 45 credits of general education courses “without architectural content.” The team did not agree with the school’s approach to counting Gen Ed credits, which seemed to include as Gen Ed the entire 18 credits of the First Year Design Curriculum (First Year Studios, plus Design Thinking courses, plus Design Culture and Context courses).

First Year Studios Because first year studio courses constitute the initial required studios in the architecture sequence, they were felt to be an integral part of the professional sequence, not liberal studies, even though they contain material from a variety of disciplines.

Design Thinking Courses The Design thinking course was seen to fall into the category of professional courses as well because it is a required course in the professional sequence, and it concerns the design process.

Design Culture and Context Courses The courses on Design Culture and Context, however, were deemed to qualify as Gen Ed because they deal not with design process but with the relationship of design to classical Gen Ed concerns such as culture, economics, and history. These 6 credits, when added to the 39 credits of the university’s Gen Ed requirement, meet the 45 Gen Ed credits required by NAAB.

It is important that the school adjust its policy regarding general education credits. While the university will allow students to take courses with an architectural content within their Gen Ed electives, architecture students must not be allowed to take courses with architectural content within the 45 credits of Gen Ed required by NAAB.

Prague Institute
Created by the College of Design in 2005 primarily to serve architecture students, the Prague Institute was the first Study Abroad permanent program facility for the entire University of North Carolina system. To accomplish that, the College had to develop unique leases, contracts, foreign employee agreements and procedures, some of which had to be approved by the governor and the Council of State. It has now become an initiative of the college used by programs across NC State University. The Institute has a director with a Czech background who holds two degrees from the college and employs Czech faculty and staff. The School of Architecture is in the process of requiring all undergraduate students in the BEDA program to spend one semester in an international setting, while the Master of Architecture students are encouraged to do so. Typically, architecture students attend in the fall semester and have the opportunity to participate in a wide range of courses in addition to the required urban design studio and seminar. Often, landscape architecture students make up part of the fall enrollment, providing a multidisciplinary studio experience. Two field trips to other European countries are included in the cost of the semester as well as cultural experiences such as the opera and ballet.

The program is extremely cost effective, charging in-state fees for all students regardless of residency. It is highly thought of by the students, giving them the opportunity for international experience as part of their NC State education.

**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.*

**Met**

**2012 Team Assessment:** The curricular review and development process provides an efficient means for oversight and modification of the curriculum. Typically, the School of Architecture Curriculum Committee meets to monitor the professional program curricula, develop changes, and bring action items to the faculty body for recommendation. Curricular changes are voted on by faculty and then must be approved by a curriculum committee and dean at the college level before being sent on for consideration by the graduate school dean. In more recent times, economic pressures have created a need to reduce redundancies and inefficiencies within the curriculum, thus affecting the typical rotational schedule of the school Curriculum Committee.

The curricular review and development structure allows for input from licensed architects in at least three ways: (1) alumni and members of the Advisory Committee (composed of licensed architects from North Carolina) are allowed to raise curriculum issues for consideration; (2) licensed architects on the faculty participate in the curriculum committee, faculty discussions, and vote; and (3) the Advisory Committee is presented with a review of changes at its meeting; the committee’s input and commentary is sought yearly.
Part Two (II) : Section 3 – Evaluation of Preparatory/Pre-Professional 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 pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

In the event a program relies on the preparatory/pre-professional 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.

Met
[X]

2012 Team Assessment: The school of architecture is not asked to assess more than a handful of students for transfer credit each year. When asked to do so, they have a system in place through which the program head reviews transcripts, course descriptions, and portfolios as appropriate. Student files, however, do not document decisions and evidence in detail. In order to meet NAAB’s new emphasis on rigor in course transfer policy, student files will need to be upgraded in the future.
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.

Met [X]

2012 Team Assessment: The above listed statement can be found on the School of Architecture website at this location: http://design.ncsu.edu/academic-programs/architecture/links-resources. It is also available in the Graduate School Catalogue at http://www.grad.ncsu.edu/catalog/prg.asp?id=ARC.

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)

Met [X]


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

Met [X]

2012 Team Assessment: The program offers career services, as well as access to the above listed documentation and websites at http://design.ncsu.edu/academic-programs/architecture/links-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.

Met

[X]

2012 Team Assessment: The above listed documents can be found at http://design.ncsu.edu/academic-programs/architecture/links-resources on the School of Architecture 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.

Met

[X]

2012 Team Assessment: The link for the above listed information can be found at http://design.ncsu.edu/academic-programs/architecture/links-resources on the School of Architecture website.
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 North Carolina State University, APR, pp 3-4.
(Note: Pg. numbering off in APR submission)

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

Reference North Carolina State University, APR, pp.4-9.
(Note: Pg. numbering off in APR submission)

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference North Carolina State University, APR, pp. 18-22.
(Note: Pg. numbering off in APR submission)

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference North Carolina State University, APR, pp. 22-26.
(Note: Pg. numbering off in APR submission)
2. Conditions Met with Distinction

I.1.3 Architectural Education and the Public Good

Excellence in community involvement

Given the long tradition of community involvement at the College of Design, it is easy to overlook the significant ongoing commitment to this effort in a number of realms.

The College of Architecture’s outreach in the form of community design studios continues to focus on affordable housing and the creation of economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable communities.

As part of the unique mission of a land-grant university, the college has successfully partnered with the County Agricultural Extension Agent network by demonstrating that North Carolina is in transition from a rural, agricultural economy to a development base. The challenges now facing communities across the state are housing, brownfield redevelopment, and urban revitalization—issues that benefit from School of Architecture involvement rather than traditional agricultural assistance.

Also significant is the college’s commitment to engage the urban design issues of downtown Raleigh. The Downtown Design Studio has a permanent presence in a leased historic building since 2005 and conducts two design studios each semester focused on the unique challenges facing the capital city. CAM Raleigh, an initiative of the College of Design in partnership with a nonprofit, is a contemporary art and design museum located in a historic warehouse in downtown Raleigh. Its educational programming and installations have in its first year of existence established a venue for interaction with the public to engage creativity and critical thinking. It is also the home to the very successful Design Camp, a summer program for early high school students to experience and learn about design, and has become an important source of future College of Design students.

I.2.1 Faculty

The quality and collegiality of the program’s faculty is a great asset to the program. The team found the faculty, both full-time and adjunct, to embody mutual support and a positive view of the School of Architecture’s direction. This distinction is of special note given the many recent transitions within the faculty and the need for difficult decision making in the wake of budgetary constraints. Adjuncts make a strong contribution to the quality and practice relevance of education at the school. We found a real commitment on the part of program administrators and faculty to the value of adjuncts to the program. This commitment should be actualized in enhanced efforts to provide adjuncts with appropriate compensation and increased involvement in school policy and curricular decision making.

SPC A.3 Visual Communication Skills

The visiting team regards the visual communication of student work as an area of distinction. The exhibit of studio work we reviewed displays an impressive range in both media and mode of representation. We evidenced an equal balance of models and drawings involving hand crafted and digital techniques. A wide variety of drawing types could be found that ranged from expressive and abstract to technical and detailed. Stellar craftsmanship of drawings and models demonstrates a commitment to “making” consistent with the founding principles of the program.
This diversity remained a consistent feature in undergraduate and graduate work from beginning to later studios. The depth of these skills suggests that for most students visual communication transcends representation as a means to an end, and rises to a form of thinking in its own right.

I.1.3 Student Body

Architecture students at North Carolina State are extremely capable and conscientious in their studies. Faculty, both full-time and adjunct, uniformly praised their students and mentioned what a pleasure it was to teach them. Students are collegial and authentic in their interactions with each other and have created a family-like collaborative learning environment. They take full advantage of the educational opportunities available to them and have an enthusiastic attitude toward the program, its administrative leadership, and faculty.

I.2.2 Participation in a Larger College of Design

The School of Architecture enjoys many benefits as a member of the College of Design. A variety of cross-disciplinary collaborations in instruction and research are enabled through this relationship. Expanded physical facilities are made possible as well, including generous wood and metal shops, ample library resources, and advanced computer labs. Recent budget constraints have reduced the net support available to the School of Architecture, but it is hoped that this reduction will be temporary.

Synergy with the college is expressed directly in the First Year Experience. The collaboration that begins in the first year leads to a greater sense of “family” with fellow design students. By working together, students from the college’s six programs learn to “think critically and act creatively,” igniting an early passion for design learning.
3. **The Visiting Team**

   Team Chair, Representing the ACSA  
   Curt Lamb, Ph.D., M.Arch.  
   Vice President of Education  
   Boston Architectural College  
   320 Newbury Street  
   Boston, MA 02115  
   (617) 585-0224  
   (617) 965-3727 fax  
   lamb@the-bac.edu

   Representing the AIA  
   Kenneth E. Crabiel, AIA, CDT, LEED® AP  
   Associate  
   Cannon Design  
   1100 Clark Avenue  
   St. Louis, MO 63102  
   (314) 425-8701  
   kcrabiel@cannondesign.com

   Representing the AIAS  
   Ji Eun "Jenny" Kim  
   23320 Landmark Way  
   Valencia, CA 91354  
   (661) 480-8535  
   jieun.kim90@gmail.com

   Representing the NCARB  
   John P. Ehrig, FAIA, LEED BD+C  
   Vice President  
   Helman Hurley Charvat Peacock Architects, Inc.  
   222 West Maitland Boulevard  
   Maitland, Florida 32751  
   (407) 644-2656  
   (407) 628-3269 fax  
   jehrig@hhcp.com

   Representing the ACSA  
   Daisy-O'Lice Ida Williams  
   Assistant Professor  
   Department of Architecture, A&AA  
   University of Oregon  
   Eugene, OR 97403  
   (541) 443-8486  
   daisyoli@uoregon.edu
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Curt Lamb, Ph.D.  
Team Chair  
Representing the ACSA

Kenneth E. Crable, AIA, CDT, LEED®AP  
Team member  
Representing the AIA

Justin "Jenny" Kim  
Team member  
Representing the AIAS

John P. Ehrig, FAIA, LEED BD+C  
Team member  
Representing the NCARB

Daisy O'Loney da Williams  
Team member  
Representing the ACSA