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I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations
The Visiting Team would like to thank the administration, faculty, staff, students, and alumni at the Georgia Institute of Technology School of Architecture for the thorough preparations completed in advance of the virtual program review; the gracious collegiality of each of their interactions and engagements with the team; and the responsiveness the team encountered throughout the visit. The university, college, and school communities made it easy to understand, review, and assess the Master of Architecture program at the Georgia Institute of Technology.

b. Conditions with a Team Recommendation to the Board as Not Achieved (list number and title)
The Visiting Team found the following Condition Not Achieved:
• PC.7: Learning and Teaching Culture

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2014 Conditions Not Met

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.

Previous Team Report (2014): The SOA provides a positive and respectful learning environment. However, the program continues to suffer from a systemic lack of representation in minority and women faculty. Previous NAAB visiting teams, in 2002 and 2008, made the same observation.
Females make up 54% of the current student enrollment in the SOA, while the percentage of females in tenured or tenure-track positions is 14% (percentages were provided on page 8 of the APR). During the visit the students, faculty and administration directly noted the disparity in female and minority representation.

**2020 Board IPR Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by Georgia Institute of Technology, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated progress toward addressing some deficiencies, but is required to provide additional student evidence at the Ability level for the following SPC: A.2 Design Thinking Skills, A.7 Use of Precedents, and A.8 Ordering System Skills. The program is required to submit a narrative in its next APR outlining how these deficiencies have been addressed, and provide evidence of such at the next accreditation visit.

**2023 Team Analysis:**

2014 Condition I.1.2: Learning Culture and Social Equity does not form part of the 2020 NAAB Conditions and Procedures. It was replaced by two new standards: Condition 3: Program and Student Criteria | PC.7: Learning and Teaching Culture and Condition 5: Resources | 5.5: Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion.

In data supplied by the program and through meetings during the site visit, the 2023 team found evidence of progress in addressing the social equity and demographic imbalances identified in 2014. However, the team also found evidence that accomplishment in the preservation of a supportive and respectful learning and teaching culture has not been achieved (See Summary of Visit above and PC.7, below).

**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 (2014):** Insufficient evidence was found in regard to the ability to consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards, specifically in low-pass work.

**2020 Board IPR Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by Georgia Institute of Technology, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated progress toward addressing some deficiencies, but is required to provide additional student evidence at the Ability level for the following SPC: A.2 Design Thinking Skills, A.7 Use of Precedents, and A.8 Ordering System Skills. The program is required to submit a narrative in its next APR outlining how these deficiencies have been addressed, and provide evidence of such at the next accreditation visit.

**2023 Team Analysis:** Although the specific student learning criteria cited do not form part of the 2020 NAAB Conditions and Procedures, the 2023 team found evidence that the program has addressed the deficiencies identified in the IPR through student work provided in the team room in response to the current Program and Student criteria.

**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.

**Previous Team Report (2014):** Evidence of an ability to write an outline specification was not found in any course work. Technically clear drawings and models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems and components appropriate for a building design are covered in ARCH 6230 Construction Technology 2 and upper-level studios.
2020 Board IPR Review: After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by Georgia Institute of Technology, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated progress toward addressing some deficiencies, but is required to provide additional student evidence at the Ability level for the following SPC: A.2 Design Thinking Skills, A.7 Use of Precedents, and A.8 Ordering System Skills. The program is required to submit a narrative in its next APR outlining how these deficiencies have been addressed, and provide evidence of such at the next accreditation visit.

2023 Team Analysis:
Although the specific student learning criteria cited do not form part of the 2020 NAAB Conditions and Procedures, the 2023 team found evidence that the program has addressed the deficiencies identified in the IPR through student work provided in the team room in response to the current Program and Student criteria.

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.

Previous Team Report (2014): No evidence of the ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles of precedents was found in low-pass work across the curriculum.

2020 Board IPR Review: After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by Georgia Institute of Technology, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated progress toward addressing some deficiencies, but is required to provide additional student evidence at the Ability level for the following SPC: A.2 Design Thinking Skills, A.7 Use of Precedents, and A.8 Ordering System Skills. The program is required to submit a narrative in its next APR outlining how these deficiencies have been addressed, and provide evidence of such at the next accreditation visit.

2023 Team Analysis:
Although the specific student learning criteria cited do not form part of the 2020 NAAB Conditions and Procedures, the 2023 team found evidence that the program has addressed the deficiencies identified in the IPR through student work provided in the team room in response to the current Program and Student criteria.

2014 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): No evidence of an understanding of the fundamentals of natural ordering systems (e.g., ordering systems in materials such as wood, metal, concrete etc.) was found in ARCH 6470 Architecture, Media and Modeling I and ARCH 6474 Architecture, Media and Modeling III. Limited evidence of an understanding of the fundamentals of formal ordering systems was found.

2020 Board IPR Review: After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by Georgia Institute of Technology, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated progress toward addressing some deficiencies, but is required to provide additional student evidence at the Ability level for the following SPC: A.2 Design Thinking Skills, A.7 Use of Precedents, and A.8 Ordering System Skills. The program is required to submit a narrative in its next APR outlining how these deficiencies have been addressed, and provide evidence of such at the next accreditation visit.

2023 Team Analysis:
Although the specific student learning criteria cited do not form part of the 2020 NAAB Conditions and Procedures, the 2023 team found evidence that the program has addressed the deficiencies identified in the IPR through student work provided in the team room in response to the current Program and Student criteria.

2014 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): Evidence was not found in the course work for ARCH 3231 Environmental Systems 1. There was one assignment dedicated to sustainability in which students demonstrated an understanding of sustainability principles as outlined in the criterion, but an ability to apply these principles is not evident.

2020 Board IPR Review: After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by Georgia Institute of Technology, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated progress toward addressing some deficiencies, but is required to provide additional student evidence at the Ability level for the following SPC: A.2 Design Thinking Skills, A.7 Use of Precedents, and A.8 Ordering System Skills. The program is required to submit a narrative in its next APR outlining how these deficiencies have been addressed, and provide evidence of such at the next accreditation visit.

2023 Team Analysis:
Although the specific student learning criteria cited do not form part of the 2020 NAAB Conditions and Procedures, the 2023 team found evidence that the program has addressed the deficiencies identified in the IPR through student work provided in the team room in response to the current Program and Student criteria.

III. Program Changes

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

2023 Team Analysis:
In response to the 2020 Accreditation Conditions, the program has made changes to its curriculum. These are summarized in Section III of the APR (pp. 4-5), supported by student evidence provided in the virtual team room, and discussed in meetings with program administration, faculty, and students. Those changes include a renewed emphasis on building systems integration; coursework addressing responses to climate change; changes in theory coursework to address contemporary concerns; studio emphases on social equity and climate; and an expansion of opportunities for optional studies.

IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

1—Context and Mission (Guidelines, p. 5)
To help the NAAB and the visiting team understand the specific circumstances of the school, the program must describe the following:

- The institutional context and geographic setting (public or private, urban or rural, size, etc.), and how the program’s mission and culture influence its architecture pedagogy and impact its development. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the mission of the college or university and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program’s role in and relationship to its academic context and university community, including how the program benefits—and benefits from—its institutional setting and how the
program as a unit and/or its individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university’s academic plan. Also describe how the program, as a unit, develops multidisciplinary relationships and leverages unique opportunities in the institution and the community.

- The ways in which the program encourages students and faculty to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective opportunities (e.g., field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities).

**Described**

**Program Response:**
Georgia Tech is a research-driven community that fosters collaborations between undergraduate and graduate programs within the school, as well as those across the Institute. Field studies, locally and globally, are instrumental to the program’s identify, cultivating service-learning opportunities as well as deep community connections that ground the practice of architecture in participatory action.

The School of Architecture is driven by the following values: **Design** and the synthesis of creativity with science, culture, and technology; **Community, Diversity and Inclusion** with a respect for, and curiosity about, differences conveyed through the culture of our school and what we instill in our students; **Connection** to establish meaningful relationships between people, disciplines, and the ideas in pursuit of new opportunities; **Entrepreneurship** and the ability to see gaps within existing processes and solutions and to create novel and innovative alternatives; **Technology** and the practical application of knowledge to expand creativity; **Learning & Knowledge** as the driver for the cyclical process of acquiring skills or knowledge to learn more.

The SoA mission is to prepare students with an entrepreneurial spirit who want to combine design, research, and technology to affect the built environment. The SoA embraces inclusion and if defined by the diversity of our students who are actively engaged in shaping their education, the profession, and the world around them. The SoA connects our students to the Institute, Atlanta, and the global architectural community by preparing them with the vision, skills, and agility to leverage the opportunities in the ever-changing future.

**2023 Team Analysis:**
Georgia Institute of Technology (GT) is an urban, public, R1 university and institute of technology in Atlanta, GA founded in 1885 with a mission/commitment of “…developing leaders who advance technology and improve the human condition (p.7).” Its 45,000 graduate and undergraduate students; 1,200 instructional and 2,300 research faculty; and 4,300 staff members are organized in six colleges and 30 schools, including the School of Architecture (SoA)—one of five schools in the College of Design. Architecture was established as a GT program in 1908. In its current iteration, the STEM-designated M.Arch. professional degree program is one of five academic programs in the GT SoA. The SoA is positioned to advance the institution’s Vision 2030 Plan for Inclusive Innovation.

Members of the faculty serve on institutional, college, school and program committees, advisory boards and governance bodies. Through a range of interdisciplinary initiatives and funding opportunities, the SoA has expanded its cross-campus research engagements and academic collaborations. Beyond the classroom and studio, student organizations offer graduate and undergraduates opportunities for academic leadership, as well as professional and community engagement. The team found evidence in the APR, confirmed through conversations with the Georgia Tech community (university, college and school administration, program faculty, and alumni), to support the conditions described above.

**2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession** ([Guidelines, p. 6])
The program must report on how it responds to the following values, all of which affect the education and development of architects. The response to each value must also identify how the program will continue to address these values as part of its long-range planning. These values are foundational, not exhaustive.

**Design:** Architects design better, safer, more equitable, resilient, and sustainable built environments. Design thinking and integrated design solutions are hallmarks of architecture education, the discipline, and the profession. (p.7)

**Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility:** Architects are responsible for the impact of their work on the natural world and on public health, safety, and welfare. As professionals and designers of the built environment, we embrace these responsibilities and act ethically to accomplish them. (p.7)

**Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion:** Architects commit to equity and inclusion in the environments we design, the policies we adopt, the words we speak, the actions we take, and the respectful learning, teaching, and working environments we create. Architects seek fairness, diversity, and social justice in the profession and in society and support a range of pathways for students seeking access to an architecture education. (p.7)

**Knowledge and Innovation:** Architects create and disseminate knowledge focused on design and the built environment in response to ever-changing conditions. New knowledge advances architecture as a cultural force, drives innovation, and prompts the continuous improvement of the discipline. (p.8)

**Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement:** Architects practice design as a collaborative, inclusive, creative, and empathetic enterprise with other disciplines, the communities we serve, and the clients for whom we work. (p.8)

**Lifelong Learning:** Architects value educational breadth and depth, including a thorough understanding of the discipline’s body of knowledge, histories and theories, and architecture’s role in cultural, social, environmental, economic, and built contexts. The practice of architecture demands lifelong learning, which is a shared responsibility between academic and practice settings. (p.8)

☒ Described

**2023 Team Analysis:**
The team found strong evidence of each of the shared values of the discipline and profession within the program’s APR response (pp. 14-25). The narrative was confirmed by required and elective student work included in the virtual team room (Design, Environmental Stewardship/Responsibility, Knowledge/Innovation and Engagement). A focus on shared values was reinforced by a review of institutional assessment processes, and through conversations with the College Dean, the GT Provost, as well as program administration, faculty, staff, alumni and students. Of particular note, the program has several student-led initiatives that include Student Advisory Councils, Student Ambassadors, the student chapter of Equity in Architecture (EQiA) and ECO. During the team’s meeting with “Hiring Architects” and Alumni, participants noted specific objectives and accomplishments furthering achievement of the program’s leadership, collaboration, and community engagement goals (see APR pp. 20-24).

3—Program and Student Criteria *(Guidelines, p. 9)*
These criteria seek to evaluate the outcomes of architecture programs and student work within their unique institutional, regional, national, international, and professional contexts, while encouraging innovative approaches to architecture education and professional preparation.

3.1 Program Criteria (PC) *(Guidelines, p. 9)*
A program must demonstrate how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address the following criteria.
PC.1 Career Paths—How the program ensures that students understand the paths to becoming licensed as an architect in the United States and the range of available career opportunities that utilize the discipline’s skills and knowledge. (p.9)

Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The APR (pp 27-29) outlined --and the team confirmed through conversations with students, alumni, and administrators-- several ways the program meets this requirement. These include the presence of an AXP Advisor/ Liaison on the faculty; the required Professional Practice course (ARCH 6315, taught by the AXP Advisor); an annual Career Fair attended by numerous professional practices; and a Practicum Program where students have the opportunity, over Spring Break, to shadow professionals in an architectural practice at cities in and outside Atlanta. While students appreciated the practicum opportunities, they also noted the need for better coordination between the SoA and Practicum firms to ensure greater clarity of expectations and goals for all involved.

The program identifies discrete SLOs for PC-1, principally through the syllabus of the required ARCH 6315. These are assessed through course assignments. The course addresses paths to licensure as well as alternative career paths. The APR notes that assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were all met/achieved.

Courses and Activities cited for PC1 include:
- ARCH 6315 Professional Practice Courses (Required)
- Career Fair
- Practicum Program
- Engagement with Local, National and International Practices

PC.2 Design—How the program instills in students the role of the design process in shaping the built environment and conveys the methods by which design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities. (p.9)

Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The program provides numerous studios that contribute to the student’s understanding of the role design plays in shaping the built environment. Most notably, there are a series of advanced studios that incorporate research on current issues such as sustainability and courses in Integrated Building Systems. The series of Integrated Building Systems (I, II, III) courses culminates in the design of a small project where students must take into consideration HVAC and structural needs and concerns. The program also conducts regular portfolio reviews as part of its extra-curricular activities. The program identifies SLOs for PC-2, principally through the syllabi of the required studio and lecture/IBS courses. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The subject coursework addresses methods by which design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities. The APR notes that most assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were met or exceeded, and the school outlined a plan for continued improvement.

Courses and Activities cited include:
- ARCH 6028,6029,6230: M. Arch Core Studios (1st Year for Non-Arch Grads)
- ARCH 6039,6040: M. Arch Advanced Studios (1st Year for pre-professional Arch Grads, 2nd Year for Non-Arch Grads)
- ARCH 6049,6050 M. Arch Design & Research Studios (2nd Year for pre-professional Arch Grads, 3rd Year for Non-Arch Grads)
- ARCH 7101, 7102, 7103: Integrated Building Systems
- Portfolio Competition and Celebration
- Final Graduation Portfolios
PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility—How the program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities. (p.9)

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The school points to several studio-based programs as meeting the criteria, including an advanced endowed studio that explicitly focuses on climate change and social equity and several that address the impact architecture has on the climate and ecology. Additionally, there is an endowed lecture series that addresses how design impacts climate change in cities. The program also conducts a required course that uses a campus building that is certified under the Living Building Challenge as a resource. The program identifies SLOs for PC-3, principally through the syllabi of the required studio and technical/lecture courses. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The subject coursework focuses on ways that design addresses the dynamic between built and natural environments, and on climate change mitigation strategies that leverage ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles. The APR notes that assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were met.

Courses and Activities cited include:
- ARCH 6040: Advanced Studio II (Portman Prize Studio) (Required Course)
- ARCH 7360: Design and Climate Change (Required Course)
- ARCH 6227: Architecture & Ecology
- The Douglas C. Allen Lecture
- ECO Student Organization/Material Recycling Program

PC.4 History and Theory—How the program ensures that students understand the histories and theories of architecture and urbanism, framed by diverse social, cultural, economic, and political forces, nationally and globally. (p.9)

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found strong evidence of program achievement within the APR (pp. 36-37) as well as the syllabi and student work. The program identifies clear SLOs for PC.4, principally through the syllabi of the required and elective studio and lecture courses. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The subject coursework addresses ways that the histories and theories of architecture and urbanism are framed by diverse social, cultural, economic, and political forces, nationally and globally. The APR notes that assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were met/achieved.

Courses cited and documented include:
- ARCH 6105: Architectural History I (Required)
- ARCH 610: Architectural History II (Required)
- ARCH 7151: History of Urban Form (Required)
- ARCH 7350: Foundations of Architectural Theory (Required)

PC.5 Research and Innovation—How the program prepares students to engage and participate in architectural research to test and evaluate innovations in the field. (p.9)

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
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Georgia Tech is a Carnegie R1 institution and prides itself on its research focus. There are a total of eight research labs that support the M.Arch. program, all led by full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty. As confirmed through conversations with faculty, staff, and students, students have access to the work being done in the labs as well as the faculty who are engaged with that work in their advanced studio settings. Leadership stressed, and alumni confirmed, that the school is known for its commitment to research and how it can be applied to the profession. The program identifies clear SLOs for PC-5, principally through the syllabi of the required and elective studios and technical/lecture courses. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The subject coursework addresses ways that students can engage and participate in architectural research in order to test and evaluate disciplinary innovation. The APR notes that assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were met/achieved.

Courses and Activities cited and documented include:
ARCH 6040: Advanced Studio II (Portman Prize Studio) (Required Course)
ARCH 6049 and 6050: Design & Research Studios (required/Directed)
Research Labs
Research Seminars

**PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration**—How the program ensures that students understand approaches to leadership in multidisciplinary teams, diverse stakeholder constituents, and dynamic physical and social contexts, and learn how to apply effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems. (p.9)

☒ Met

**2023 Team Analysis:**
Leadership and collaboration among students can be observed in the numerous student organizations that exist within the SoA. These organizations allow students to take leadership roles among their peers and execute on initiatives that benefit the entirety of the SoA. Through site visit conversations and work included in the team room, cross-collaboration was also confirmed among students in various post-professional degrees, such as the M.S. in Architecture, M.S. Urban Design, MS City and Regional Planning, MRED, and MBA – all participate in the annual ULI Hines Competition. The GT M.Arch. program received honorable mentions in the most recent entry.

Additionally, the team found strong evidence of program achievement within the APR (pp. 51-52) as well as the syllabus and student work for ARCH 6315, Professional Practice I.

The course is designed to ensure that, “students understand the foundation of professional ethics, the regulatory requirements, and the fundamental business processes relevant to architecture practice through lectures, exams, and a combination of individual and team student projects culminating in role-playing simulations for start-up business interviews and RFQ marketing interviews.” (APR, p. 51).

Students who take elective course ARCH 6313, Traditions in Architectural Practice, receive additional related instruction.

Both courses include lectures and materials on leadership of a firm and team collaboration required to achieve successful project outcomes. The program identifies clear SLOs for PC-6, principally through the syllabi of the required and elective studios and lecture courses. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The subject coursework addresses student understanding of approaches to leadership in multidisciplinary teams, including diverse stakeholder constituents, and dynamic physical and social contexts. Focus is on developing effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems. The APR notes that assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were met/achieved.

**PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture**—How the program fosters and ensures a positive and respectful environment that encourages optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation among its faculty, students, administration, and staff. (p.9)

☒ Not Met
2023 Team Analysis:
Although the APR lists multiple events and measures created to support an “exciting, respectful and inclusive school culture for all faculty, staff and students” (pp. 43-44) the team found evidence, through conversations across the academic unit community, that such a culture has yet to be consistently achieved. The team was made aware of inconsistent adherence, on the part of faculty and students, to the aspirations embodied in its studio/program culture guidelines. A finely targeted set of outcomes and assessment processes did not appear to be in evidence.

PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion—How the program furthers and deepens students' understanding of diverse cultural and social contexts and helps them translate that understanding into built environments that equitably support and include people of different backgrounds, resources, and abilities.  (p.9)

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The main co-curricular program response to PC-8 was the 2021 creation of the SoA’s Equity, Justice, and Inclusion (EJI) task force that resulted in a permanent SoA committee. The committee meets regularly with school leadership and the college’s Diversity and Inclusion Council. In addition to the committee, two of the student organizations, NOMAS (National Organization of Minority Architecture Students) and Equity in Architecture (EQiA), have adopted objectives related to social equity and inclusion.

In recent years, the program curriculum has addressed issues related to social equity and inclusion through its Portman Prize Studio (ARCH 6040). Other courses such as Design + Research Studio I & II (ARCH 6049 & ARCH 6050) focus on community-based briefs that benefit residents, most notably designing model communities in Rwanda. The program identifies clear SLOs for PC-8, principally through the syllabi of the required and elective studios. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The subject coursework focuses on deepening students’ understanding of diverse cultural and social contexts and helping them translate that understanding into built environments that equitably support and include people of different backgrounds, resources, and abilities. The APR notes that assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were met/ achieved.

3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes  (Guidelines, p. 10)
A program must demonstrate how it addresses the following criteria through program curricula and other experiences, with an emphasis on the articulation of learning objectives and assessment.

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment—How the program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.  (p.10)

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found sufficient evidence of student achievement within the APR (pp. 51-52) as well as the syllabi and student work submitted for the following required courses:

- ARCH 6040, Advanced Studio II (Portman Prize Studio)
- ARCH 6315, Professional Practice I
- ARCH 6531, Environmental Systems I

These courses include critical elements of facility health, safety, and welfare elements such as regulatory requirements, structural systems, life safety systems, site conditions, ecological concerns, and accessible (universal) design. Within the Advanced Studio II (Portman Prize Studio), students integrate design and construction elements to create a final building solution. The program identifies clear SLOs for SC-1, principally through the syllabi of the required studios and technical/lecture courses. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The subject coursework focuses on developing
student understanding of the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities. The APR notes that assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were met/achieved.

**SC.2 Professional Practice**—How the program ensures that students understand professional ethics, the regulatory requirements, the fundamental business processes relevant to architecture practice in the United States, and the forces influencing change in these subjects. (p.10)

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found evidence of student achievement within the APR (pp. 51-52) as well as the syllabi and student work for ARCH 6315, Professional Practice I. This course provides students with the core, “understanding of the path to becoming a licensed architect in the U.S. and the type of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities this requires” (APR, p. 51). The course is taught by “Professors of the Practice” from both the School of Architecture and the School of Building Construction, which provides students with access to expertise in both disciplines, reinforcing the critical relationship between design and construction. Specifically, the course is taught by the NCARB AXP Liaison, Professor of the Practice Stuart Romm. The program identifies clear SLOs for SC-2, principally through the syllabus for the required course. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The subject coursework focuses on understanding professional ethics, regulatory requirements, business processes relevant to architecture practice in the United States, and the forces influencing change in these. As noted in the APR, assessment benchmarks for this course in AY 2021-22 were met/achieved.

**SC.3 Regulatory Context**—How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project. (p.10)

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The program identifies clear SLOs for SC-3, principally through the syllabi of the required studios and technical/lecture courses. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The team found strong evidence in the APR (pp. 52-54), in student class work and examinations, and through the visit interviews, that the following required courses provide students with an understanding of the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project:

- ARCH 6315 – Professional Practice
- ARCH 7103 – Integrated Building Systems III
- ARCH 6040 – Advanced Studio II (Portman Prize Studio)

In its materials, the program reports that it utilizes exam questions related to life safety and land use to assess students, with an average grade of 85% as a baseline. In addition, they expect students to demonstrate an understanding of the fundamental understanding of building code and life safety regulations applied to a design project. The assessment is a part of the final jury and is performed through a quantitative survey of the jury. The APR notes that assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were met/achieved.

**SC.4 Technical Knowledge**—How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects. (p.10)
Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The program identifies clear SLOs for SC-4, principally through the syllabi of the required technical/lecture courses. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The team found strong evidence within the APR (p. 54); and in student work and class examinations that the following required courses enable students to develop an understanding of established/emerging systems, technologies, assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects.

ARCH 6229 – Construction Technology
ARCH 6015 – Structures I
ARCH 7102 – Integrated Building Systems II

Students' technical knowledge is specifically demonstrated through their work in ARCH7102 - Integrated Building Systems II. The APR notes that assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were met/achieved.

SC.5 Design Synthesis—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions. (p. 12)

Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The program identifies clear SLOs for SC-5, principally through the syllabi of the required technical/lecture courses. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The team found strong evidence within the APR (p. 56), and in student work and class examinations that the following courses enable students to develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while synthesizing user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and a consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of those design decisions. The APR notes that assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were met/achieved.

Cited required coursework includes:

ARCH 6040 – Advanced Studio II (Portman Prize Studio)
ARCH 7103 - Integrated Building Systems III

SC.6 Building Integration—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance. (p. 12)

Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The program identifies clear SLOs for SC-5, principally through the syllabi of the required technical/lecture courses. These are assessed through student performance on course assignments. The team found strong evidence within the APR (p. 58), and in student work and class examinations that the following courses enable students to develop sufficient ability to make design decisions related to the successful integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance. The APR notes that assessment benchmarks for student accomplishment in AY 2021-22 were met/achieved.

Cited required coursework includes:

ARCH 7101 – Integrated Building Systems I
ARCH 7102 - Integrated Building Systems II

4—Curricular Framework (Guidelines, p. 13)
This condition addresses the institution’s regional accreditation and the program’s degree nomenclature, credit-hour and curricular requirements, and the process used to evaluate student preparatory work.

4.1 Institutional Accreditation (Guidelines, p. 13)
For the NAAB to accredit a professional degree program in architecture, the program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education:

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

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The Georgia Institute of Technology is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). The Institute’s website confirms the APR’s description that the last reaffirmation occurred in 2015. The next decennial reaffirmation of accreditation is scheduled for 2025.

4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum (Guidelines, p. 13)
The NAAB accredits professional degree programs with the following titles: the Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M.Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D.Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and optional studies.

4.2.1 Professional Studies. Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program are the core of a professional degree program that leads to licensure. Knowledge from these courses is used to satisfy Condition 3—Program and Student Criteria. The degree program has the flexibility to add additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. In its documentation, the program must clearly indicate which professional courses are required for all students. (p.13)

4.2.2 General Studies. An important component of architecture education, general studies provide basic knowledge and methodologies of the humanities, fine arts, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences. Programs must document how students earning an accredited degree achieve a broad, interdisciplinary understanding of human knowledge. In most cases, the general studies requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution’s baccalaureate degree. Graduate programs must describe and document the criteria and process used to evaluate applicants’ prior academic experience relative to this requirement. Programs accepting transfers from other institutions must document the criteria and process used to ensure that the general education requirement was covered at another institution. (p.14)

4.2.3 Optional Studies. All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum to allow students to develop additional expertise, either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking courses offered within the department offering the accredited program but outside the required professional studies curriculum. These courses may be configured in a variety of curricular structures, including elective offerings, concentrations, certificate programs, and minors. (p.14)

NAAB-accredited professional degree programs have the exclusive right to use the B.Arch., M.Arch., and/or D.Arch. titles, which are recognized by the public as accredited degrees and therefore may not be used by non-accredited programs.
The number of credit hours for each degree is outlined below. All accredited programs must conform to minimum credit-hour requirements established by the institution’s regional accreditor.

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

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

4.2.6 **Doctor of Architecture.** The D.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 210 credits, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate and graduate coursework. The D.Arch. requires a minimum of 90 graduate-level semester credit hours, or the graduate-level 135 quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in professional studies and optional studies. Programs must document, for both undergraduate and graduate degrees, the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.

☒ Met

**2023 Team Analysis:**
The team found sufficient evidence for compliance with this condition in the APR (pp. 63-65) and related material in the team room documents discussing the Master of Architecture program at the Georgia Institute of Technology. See below for courses and credits:

4.2.1 The required professional studies courses for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5-Year Track</th>
<th>Master of Architecture</th>
<th>2-Year Track</th>
<th>Master of Architecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course</strong></td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td><strong>Course</strong></td>
<td>Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 6028 – Core Studio I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ARCH 6039 – Advanced Studio I</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 6029 – Core Studio II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ARCH 6040 – Advanced Studio II (Portman)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 6030 – Core Studio III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ARCH 6049 – Design + Research Studio I</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 6010 – Media &amp; Modeling I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARCH 6050 – Design + Research Studio II</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 6020 – Media &amp; Modeling II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARCH 7530 – Theory I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 6105 – History of Architecture I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARCH 7030 – Media &amp; Modeling III</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 6106 – History of Architecture II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARCH 7101 – Integrated Bldg Systems I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 6229 – Construction Technology I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARCH 7102 – Integrated Bldg Systems II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 6531 – Environmental Systems I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARCH 7103 – Integrated Bldg Systems III</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 6015 – Structures I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARCH 7360 – Design &amp; Climate Change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 6315 – Practice of Architecture I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 7151 – History of Urban Form</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 According to the APR (p. 64), “there are no requirements for general studies because this requirement has been met through earning a prior baccalaureate degree.”
4.2.3 According to the APR (p. 64):

- The 3.5-year Master of Architecture program includes six (6) professional electives (18 credit hours): one must be a theory-focused elective to fulfill Theory II requirement and one must be a practice-focused elective to fulfill the Practice II requirement.

- The 2-year Master of Architecture program includes four (4) professional electives (12 credit hours): one must be a theory-focused elective to fulfill Theory II requirement and one must be a practice-focused elective to fulfill the Practice II requirement.

4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education (Guidelines, p. 16)

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

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

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

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

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found strong evidence in the APR (pp. 69-72), confirmed during interviews with SoA administration and program staff, that a robust evaluation of preparatory education takes place which utilizes a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the work of incoming students, including documentation of the accreditation criteria it expects students to have mastered. In particular, the team was advised that student portfolios (especially for international students) are evaluated by a multi-person review panel. The process typically includes verification of authorship with the student’s undergraduate institution.

4.3.1 As noted in the APR (p. 69), incoming applicants are “reviewed by at least two faculty members and are evaluated based on academic records, portfolios, recommendation letters, statements of interest, and relevant experience.” Findings are documented and equivalencies (if required) entered on a “Course Equivalency Assessment Form” (APR, p. 71).

4.3.2 The APR (p. 69) indicates that “all incoming student transcripts are evaluated for possible advanced placement for those pre-professional and professional courses taken as an undergraduate that may satisfy requirements for the Master of Architecture degree.”

4.3.3 As noted in the APR (p. 71) and related documents, initial admission requirements are quantified by the Institute Graduate Admissions at https://catalog.gatech.edu/admissions/grad/general-information/School-of-Architecture-requirements-are-clearly-noted-in-the-following-sites-all-accessible-to-the-public:

- https://grad.gatech.edu/degree-programs/master-architecture-professional-program
- https://arch.gatech.edu/graduate-admissions
5—Resources

5.1 Structure and Governance (Guidelines, p. 18)
The program must describe the administrative and governance processes that provide for organizational
continuity, clarity, and fairness and allow for improvement and change.

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

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

☒ Described

2023 Team Analysis:
The APR details (pp. 73-78) and the team confirmed, through conversations across the academic
community, the administrative and governance structures that regulate the M.Arch. program.

5.1.1 Per the organizational chart provided in the APR (pp. 74, 76), and as confirmed by the team during
the visit, the M.Arch. program is led by a director (currently Interim/Acting), one of five program directors
reporting to (and appointed by) the school chair. The school chair, one of five in the college, reports to
and is appointed by the college dean. A similar structure follows for the college dean, one of six in the
institute, who reports to the institute provost. The provost reports to the institute president, who reports to
the Chancellor and Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

5.1.2 As noted in the APR, faculty governance follows the institutional Faculty Handbook and includes
opportunities for faculty participation and leadership, within the parameters of rank and appointment
terms, at institutional, college, school, and program levels. SoA faculty are represented at all institutional
governance levels. At the school and program levels, faculty are expected to participate in regular
meetings of the academic unit, in annual retreats, and on a range of standing committees and task forces.
As appropriate to their purpose, many school and program committees and task forces include students
and staff as well as faculty. Staff meet regularly with the school chair. Students have opportunities for
participation and leadership in student governance at the institute, college, and school levels. The
program supports a range of student organizations whose leadership interacts regularly with SoA and
program administration.

5.2 Planning and Assessment (Guidelines, p. 18)
The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies:

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

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

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

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

5.2.5 Ongoing outside input from others, including practitioners.

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

☒ Demonstrated
2023 Team Analysis:
The team found strong confirmation, during the meetings with the provost, college dean, school and program administration, program faculty and students that planning and assessment are an ongoing effort. The dean indicated that the strategic planning process had recently been “re-initiated/re-invigorated” by a new outside consultant enlisted to replace the one initially hired in 2019 (as documented in the APR) to develop a new 2023+ strategic plan for the College of Design.

5.2.1 As noted in the APR and confirmed in conversation with the university office of institutional effectiveness, the program has a clear understanding that it must identify its “…Response to the Future, Toward a Vision for the School of Architecture…” and that its goals should be, “…considered and aligned with many of the PC and SC requirements of the NAAB.” (APR, p. 79).

5.2.2 Throughout the visit and through the APR, the program conveyed its understanding of key performance indicators, highlighting those which are, “common between the SoA, College of Design, and the Institute…” (APR, p. 81).

5.2.3 The APR identified improvement in 11 areas (APR, pp. 81-82) to demonstrate its progress towards fulfilling its mission and stated multi-year goals. In particular, it noted its improvements in equity, justice and inclusion initiatives; in addressing climate through curricula; in expanding engagement and multidisciplinarity; and in a broad range of metrics addressing student performance, student support and program demographics. These were corroborated in conversations with the program community.

5.2.4 During her interview, the new dean of the College of Design indicated that she was laser-focused on continuous improvement and was therefore re-engaging in a strategic planning update intended to build upon existing strengths (APR pp. 82-84) while addressing both challenges and opportunities for growth.

5.2.5 During the visit with local practitioners “hiring architects” and alumni, it became clear that the program is the beneficiary of significant engagement and input from external entities.

5.3 Curricular Development (Guidelines, p. 19)
The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for assessing its curriculum and making adjustments based on the outcome of the assessment. The program must identify:

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

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

☒ Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
The APR notes (pp. 87-89), and the team confirmed through conversations with the GT Office of Academic Effectiveness, that the Master of Architecture program participates in annual institutional assessment processes that utilize direct and indirect evaluation measures while incorporating NAAB Program and Student Criteria (PC, SC).

5.3.1 Confirmed with program administrators and the Institutional Academic Effectiveness team, this is the annual assessment sequence followed by the program: setting goals; identifying assessment points and measures/ benchmarks; collecting and reviewing data; and creating improvement plans based on the data review. Goals and assessment points directly align with NAAB Program and Student Criteria. Moving forward, they will incorporate the articulated Values of the Profession. Academic faculty and the professional community participate in the annual assessment process. The results have prompted revisions to curricular and co-curricular program offerings.
5.3.2 The APR outlines a clear process to shepherd curricular changes in the program. In consultation with the school chair and program director, topic-specific task forces are appointed and charged with completing curricular reviews and bringing recommendations to the full faculty for discussion and approval. Degree modifications involve all full-time faculty and require review and approval at program, school, college, and institute levels. The team confirmed this process in conversation with program faculty and academic unit administration.

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development (Guidelines, p. 19)
The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate and adequately funded human resources to support student learning and achievement. Human resources include full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. The program must:

5.4.1 Demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty in a way that promotes student and faculty achievement.
5.4.2 Demonstrate that it has an Architect Licensing Advisor who is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. These duties include attending the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay up-to-date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.
5.4.3 Demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
5.4.4 Describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, mental well-being, career guidance, internship, and job placement.

☒ Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
5.4.1 Faculty are encouraged to teach, perform research, and take on service roles. Although not official, faculty assignment percentages are typically set at 40% for teaching, 40% for research, and 20% for service. These can vary depending on faculty interest and opportunities. The standard teaching load for full-time faculty in the program consists of two courses each semester, one of them a studio. Faculty CVs were provided in the APR in Appendix A.

5.4.2 Professor of the Practice Stuart Romm teaches the Professional Office Practice course and serves as the AXP advisor/liaison for the SoA. Providing guidance on professional practice and licensure, Professor Romm appeared to be a respected and well-known resource for the student group.

5.4.3 While Georgia Tech does not have a formal sabbatical/professional development leave policy, the APR notes (pp. 90-91) and faculty members confirmed, that the program supports faculty research and development through a range of avenues, including course releases, graduate assistantships, funds to present papers at research conferences/symposia, seed funding for new research, and university/college fellowships (Emerging Leaders, Teaching and Learning, Faculty Research). Staff are granted support to pursue professional development training and coursework in accordance with their interests and needs.

5.4.4 As noted in the APR and confirmed by the team in conversations with program staff, academic advising is available to all students within the program. Within the SoA, two designated advisors, both warmly praised by the student group, guide and provide resources for students. Additionally, the Georgia Tech Counseling Center offers a full range of professional counseling and psychological services. Institute-wide resources include Success at Tech, Career Center, Office of International Education, Office of the Dean of Students, Office of Disability Services, Office of Financial Aid, and STAR Services.
5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (Guidelines, p. 20)
The program must demonstrate its commitment to diversity and inclusion among current and prospective faculty, staff, and students. The program must:

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

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

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

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

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

☑ Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
As noted in the APR (pp. 92-98) and confirmed through conversations during the visit, the program has made some progress in demonstrating commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) among current and prospective faculty, staff and students.

5.5.1 DEI in the distribution of human, physical and financial resources are addressed by active committees and task forces, 2015 – present, charged with improving gender diversity in the SoA faculty, expanding programming and enacting curricular reforms in the SoA programs. Through hiring and admissions practices and supported by increased financial support for students and emerging faculty, the SoA community has grown more diverse. See below.

5.5.2 The SoA has introduced the successful NEXT Fellowship program, geared to emerging faculty, and source of faculty diversity. Four of seven new SoA full-time faculty are women, including one Asian American, and one Trinidadian. Among new part-time faculty, 10 of 22 are women, and five are persons of color. The three-person SoA staff team includes two women, one a person of color. Notwithstanding these improvements, the program faculty remains less diverse than its student body. In team conversations with faculty, students, and alumni, the desire to accelerate faculty diversity was evident.

5.5.3 To increase student diversity, the SoA focuses on recruitment and targeted outreach to HBCU students. This is coupled with an expanded capacity to offer financial support where possible. Currently, SoA students comprise a more diverse community than their counterparts across GT. Notwithstanding, students note that many of their new classmates of color are international students. In team conversations with faculty, students, and alumni, the desire to accelerate student diversity so that it might approximate the demographic makeup of the SoA’s Atlanta context was evident.

5.5.4 Links to a broad range of institutional, college, school and program policies and initiatives were provided in the APR.

5.5.5 All program facilities meet ADA Guidelines for access. Resources to provide adaptive environments and support for individuals of varied physical and neurological abilities reside primarily with GT Office of Disability Services. Reference is made to the office on all course syllabi.

5.6 Physical Resources (Guidelines, p. 21)
The program must describe its physical resources and demonstrate how they safely and equitably support the program’s pedagogical approach and student and faculty achievement. Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

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

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

☒ Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
The SoA occupies three buildings on campus. One is the primary home for M.Arch. program studios, as well as research labs. Currently, each M.Arch. student has their own workspace and shared pin-up space. In various conversations it was noted that increased enrollment and a return to in-person instruction are straining the available space. Floor plans of the space dedicated to the program were shared in the APR, and a video walk-through was provided in the virtual team room.

The team found strong evidence that the existing physical resources were adequate for program instruction and research. As noted in the APR (p. 83), supported by the virtual information (video) provided to the team, and confirmed through conversations with program faculty; staff; and students, the existing Hinman Research Building and Digital Fabrication Lab (DFL) facilities provide most of the physical resources for studio-based learning, lecture-based/interactive learning, fabrication labs, shops and staff space to adequately support the pedagogies of the program. Additionally, the APR notes that the program’s location in Atlanta “offers students many opportunities to experience and engage with the art culture of the city. Students benefit from their proximity to the High Museum of Art, the Museum of Design Atlanta, and the Goat Farm, among other venues.”

5.7 Financial Resources (Guidelines, p. 21)
The program must demonstrate that it has the appropriate institutional support and financial resources to support student learning and achievement during the next term of accreditation.

☒ Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
As noted in the APR, clarified in the requested addendum (dated February 1, 2023), and confirmed through conversations during the visit, the program currently has access to appropriate institutional support and financial resources to support student learning. With a commitment by the University System of Georgia and Georgia Tech to support growth, the program has increased enrollment. To date, such support includes the prospect of additional instructional space, searches to fill two TE and one Professor of Practice (.5 FTE) faculty position; equity salary increases for 12 core faculty; and the possible implementation of a new funding model that may benefit the program. Differential tuition per student remains largely with the program (95%), and the SoA benefits from 45 endowment funds to support its mission.
5.8 Information Resources *(Guidelines, p. 22)*
The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient and equitable access to architecture literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in architecture.

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

☒ Demonstrated

**2023 Team Analysis:**
As noted in the APR (pp. 106-107) and confirmed during the visit, the program has a library at the disposal of the SoA that provides onsite and offsite print and electronic resources and databases. In addition to providing over 1,100 subscriptions to electronic and print journals for the College of Design, the library grants access to such databases as the Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals, ArtStor, Architecture & Design Archive, Birkhäuser Building Types Online, BuildingGreen Suite, DETAIL, Ebsco Art & Architecture Complete, and Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps Online. A partnership between GT and Emory University expands the information resources accessible to the SoA community. Except during semester breaks, the library is open 24/7. Students and faculty may borrow books for a full term. Students can reserve quiet spaces as necessary for studying purposes. Electronic rentals are also available to students, faculty and staff.

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

6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees *(Guidelines, p. 23)*
All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the exact language found in the NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*, Appendix 2, in catalogs and promotional media, including the program’s website.

☒ Met

**2023 Team Analysis:**
As noted in the APR, and confirmed by the team, the required language is provided at: https://arch.gatech.edu/accreditation. The webpage notes that the accreditation visit was scheduled for 2022. Its subsequent postponement to 2023 is neither noted nor explained.

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures *(Guidelines, p. 23)*
The program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program’s website:

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

☒ Met
2023 Team Analysis:
Current and past NAAB Accreditation documents, as well as a link to the NAAB home page, can be found under the “About” tab of the school’s home page under “Accreditation” (https://arch.gatech.edu/accreditation). That link also contains links to the NAAB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation dating to 2009, as well as program-specific documents since 2010. These include the 2014 VTR, and the 2010 Focused Evaluation Report.

6.3 Access to Career Development Information (Guidelines, p. 23)
The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that help them develop, evaluate, and implement career, education, and employment plans.

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found that the APR links for career services in the SoA (https://arch.gatech.edu/career-services) and the Institute (https://career.gatech.edu/), while helpful, provide limited information. In conversation with the team, SoA students identified this as an area that would benefit from additional focus. The need for more extensive career development information was also noted during the team’s meeting with the Hiring Architects and Alumni. To address the immediate need, SoA faculty provide career advising and mentoring to SoA students by appointment. Additionally, interested students are encouraged to complete a Spring Break Practicum experience, and to attend the annual SoA Career Fair, a successful annual event that attracts many architecture firms from the Greater Atlanta area and beyond.

6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents (Guidelines, p. 23)
To promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program’s website:

a) All Interim Progress Reports and narratives of Program Annual Reports submitted since the last team visit
b) All NAAB responses to any Plan to Correct and any NAAB responses to the Program Annual Reports since the last team visit
c) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB
d) The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit
e) The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda
f) The program’s optional response to the Visiting Team Report
g) Plan to Correct (if applicable)
h) NCARB ARE pass rates
i) Statements and/or policies on learning and teaching culture
j) Statements and/or policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
As noted in the APR, The team found that the above data was provided at: https://arch.gatech.edu/accreditation. (The webpage notes that the accreditation visit was scheduled for 2022. The subsequent postponement to 2023 is neither noted nor explained.)

6.5 Admissions and Advising (Guidelines, p. 24)
The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern the evaluation of applicants for admission to the accredited program. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers from within and outside the institution. This documentation must include the following:

a) Application forms and instructions
b) Admissions requirements; admissions-decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (when required); and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing

c) Forms and a description of the process for evaluating the content of a non-accredited degree

d) Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships

e) Explanation of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures

Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The School of Architecture website contains a link for Future Students that has a tab for Graduate Admissions, including portfolio guidelines and preparing an application. There is also a link on that page to contact the school’s academic advisors. A link to “Apply Now” describes the application requirements, including test scores (though GRE is not currently required).

The primary website for the Institute contains a link for Prospective Students with a sub-link about Graduate Education, which includes Cost and Funding Information accessed from a tab. Under the Graduate Education tab, there is a second link to the application for Graduate Admission Application.

Information regarding admissions and advising can be found at the following links:
https://grad.gatech.edu/degree-programs/architecture
https://arch.gatech.edu/preparing-your-application
https://arch.gatech.edu/scholarships-financial-aid
https://diversity.gatech.edu/student-diversity-and-inclusion-1

6.6 Student Financial Information (Guidelines, p. 24)

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

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

Met

2023 Team Analysis:
As noted in the APR and confirmed by the team, information related to financial aid is available to all students at the following links: https://arch.gatech.edu/preparing-your-application
https://finaid.gatech.edu/graduate-types-aid

Information related to tuition and other costs is available to all students through the Georgia Tech website at the following links: https://finaid.gatech.edu/costs/graduate-costs
V. Appendices

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility
The team found evidence of substantive exposure to, and engagement with, the ways that design addresses the dynamic between built and natural environments and on climate change mitigation strategies that leverage ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles. Studio-based programs, including an advanced endowed studio that explicitly focuses on climate change and social equity, as well as an endowed lecture series that addresses how design impacts climate change in cities, are among the standout elements of the program.

5.2.5 Planning and Assessment
Throughout the site visit, the team found an exceptionally strong relationship and engagement with professionals, industry representatives, faculty from other schools within the college, and faculty outside Georgia Tech. As noted in the APR (p. 86), alumni and local practitioners have an on-going and long-term relationship with the M.Arch. program and are repeatedly invited to participate with various elements of the program such as classes (juries & co-teaching), local government, and the annual Career Fair.

6.5 Admissions and Advising
The program documents its processes thoroughly and as required. Additionally, it has assembled a widely lauded advising/mentorship team to support students in successfully navigating the institutional and departmental processes for academic progression.
Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix
### Shared Values

- Shared Values
  - Ethical
  - Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion
  - Knowledge & Innovation
  - Lifelong Learning

### Program Criteria

- PC. 1 Career Paths
- PC. 2 Design
- PC. 3 Ecological Knowledge & Responsibility
- PC. 4 History & Theory
- PC. 5 Research & Innovation
- PC. 6 Leadership & Collaboration
- PC. 7 Learning & Teaching Culture

### Student Criteria

- SC. 1 HSW in the Built Environment
- SC. 2 Professional Practice
- SC. 3 Regulatory Context
- SC. 4 Technical Knowledge
- SC. 5 Design Synthesis
- SC. 6 Building Recognition

### Career Fair
- Practicum Program
- Lecture + Events Series
- Portfolio Competition + Celebration
- Graduating Portfolios

### Non-Curricular Activity
- Awards Ceremony
- End of Year Exhibition
- Studio Culture + Resource Guide
- SoA Equity, Justice, Inclusion Committee
- International Education Programs
- Douglas C. Allen Lecture
- Student Organizations
- Research Labs
- Graduate Student Ambassadors
- Graduate Advisory Council
Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator Representative
Marilys Nepomechie, FAIA, DPACSA, NCARB
Associate Dean of Faculty and Program Development, Distinguished University Professor, Architect
Florida International University
Miami, FL
nepomech@fiu.edu

Practitioner Representative
Walter Hainsfurther, FAIA, NCARB
Assistant Director Project Management – Architecture
University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, IL
walter@designteamllc.com

Regulator Representative
Michael Merino, RA/NCARB, PMP, AICP, LEED
Project Manager/Senior Architect
US Department of State, Overseas Building Office
Alexandria, VA
mrmerino@aol.com

Student Representative
Adiel Quiteno, Assoc. AIA
Job Captain
Parette Somjen Architects
West New York, NJ
aq28@njit.edu
VI. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Marilys Nepomechie, FAIA, DPACSA, NCARB
Team Chair

Walter Hainsfurther, FAIA
Team Member

Michael Merino, RA/NCARB, PMP, AICP, LEED
Team Member

Adiel Quiteno, Assoc. AIA
Team Member