

Georgia Institute of Technology

School of Architecture, College of Architecture

George B. Johnston, Ph.D., A.I.A., Professor and Chair

Last Accreditation Visit in **2008**

Part II (Narrative Report)

Georgia Tech submitted a Special Focused Evaluation Program Report in June 2010 as required by NAAB's 2008 accreditation decision. Based NAAB's letter of October 22, 2010 finding satisfactory resolution of deficiencies in the areas of Human Resources and Financial Resources, this Annual Report focuses only upon the remaining deficiencies cited in the 2008 Visiting Team Report. These include previous findings of deficiencies in the area of Physical Resources and with regard to three Student Performance Criteria.

1.4. Conditions/Criteria Not Met

8. Physical Resources

Team Comments:

The Visiting Team notes that relative to physical resources, the issues identified in the 2002 VTR and in 1997 relative to adequate studio space and dedicated faculty offices still exist today without significant remedy and remain a concern. While some new studio space in the Hinman Building was made available to the Program, forming the basis for the cancellation of the 2005 Focused Visit, large recent increases in undergraduate enrollment have eroded or even reversed the impact of these modest spatial gains. Additional space anticipated in the Special Report has been a victim of a line-item veto by the State Legislature. While the Program has been resourceful in space utilization, there is no guarantee that necessary improvements will be realized. The Team is informed that the Governor's current budget includes a \$6.4 million earmark for the Program's physical improvements, and that it is likely to be signed shortly, but the shortage, if not addressed will sustain lower than acceptable conditions affecting both faculty and student performance. Phasing Plans for future improvements are not clearly articulated.

In addition to studio space, student storage, pin-up areas, and acoustics remain as concerns. Exclusive office space is not available for each full-time tenured or tenure-track member of the faculty. Part-time faculty complain of not having a dedicated space for student conferences. Exhibition space remains largely unsecured.

Program Response:

Graduate and PhD Space:

The Hinman Building continues to effectively meet the space needs of the M.Arch., M.S., M.S.U.D. and Ph.D. programs in the School of Architecture. Studio workspaces for each graduate student include a minimum of 5 lineal feet of desk area, 10 s.f. of pin-up space above the desk, and 5 lineal feet of bookshelf/model storage space. Desks are supplied with ethernet cable, electrical outlets and wireless internet. Additional spaces include: work areas for 30 PhD students; one large computer lab, sub-dividable with workspace for 30 students; office and meeting space the Digital Building Laboratory; research/computer lab space for the Spatial Innovations Group (formerly the Imagine Lab); 6 additional review spaces of various sizes with a total of 520 lineal feet of pin-up space; 9 additional faculty offices – including 1 collective part-time office space; printing and laser cutting facilities; as well as a number of support spaces.

In the Summer of 2012, the SoA provided the funds to construct an additional 30 desks, purchase an additional 60 chairs for review spaces and break out areas, and finished out a student lounge in the “hammock” in the main high bay space of Hinman.

The impact of the quantity and quality of the space continues to exceed everyone’s expectations. More so than last year, studio instructors are tapping into the buildings didactic potential, using the space, structure, enclosure system and restoration strategy as a teaching tool for undergraduates and graduate students alike.

Hinman continues to receive national recognition. Since its completion in early 2011, the building has captured top prizes.

The 2012 portfolio of commendations include:

- American Institute of Architects 2012 Committee on Arch for Education, Educational Facility Design Awards, Merit Award
- American Institute of Architects - New York Chapter Design Awards 2012, Honor Award, Interiors Category
- Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation, 2012 Excellence in Rehabilitation Award
- *Building Design & Construction Magazine* 28th Annual Reconstruction Awards - Platinum Award

- American Institute of Architects Committee on the Environment - Atlanta Chapter, Showcase Winner for the 2012 Greenprints Conference

60th Anniversary of the East Architecture Building: Dedicated/Secured Exhibition Space for the College of Architecture

In the fall semester of 2012, an ambitious renovation and restoration plan was completed for the original library and exhibition space in the east architecture building, designed and built in the early 1950's by the firm of Harold Bush-Brown, J. Herbert "Doc" Gailey and P. M. Heffernan, and known as the first modern architectural school building in the nation. Two events marked the 60th anniversary celebration: the unveiling of a restored library, hidden from view for thirty years, the first stage in what will be a thorough restoration of the building; and secondly, erected in the newly renovated 3,000 s.f. foot gallery/exhibition space, an exact recreation of the exhibition A Half Century of Architectural Education, which vividly displays the range and ambition of Georgia Tech graduates from the first half of the 20th century. The original library space is now used for administrative offices and conference space. The 60th anniversary celebration continues into 2013, culminating in a curated show of new work by School of Architecture Alums.

13.25 Construction Cost Control

Team Comments:

While construction estimating is briefly addressed in the Professional Practice required class, no evidence was found that any student in the Program produced even a superficial cost evaluation or estimate of any project.

Program Response:

While the Architecture Program accepts NAAB's judgment of its deficiency in this area to the level of *ability*—as suggested in the Visiting Team's comments above—it nonetheless is attempting to address any question of deficiency in student performance with regard to *understanding*. First, we have noted the change in scope of this Student Performance Criterion (SPC) between 2004 and 2009:

2004 Conditions

25. Construction Cost Control *Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating.*

2009 Conditions

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.

The graduate studio faculty continues to make enhancements to the construction technology sequence, the professional practice sequence, and the relationship between several courses in the 'professional year' of the M.Arch program. Following on the improvements outlined last year in the professional practice course, changes in the relationship between two required courses – the Options II graduate level studio and the Construction Technology II course, and now the creation of additional Practice of Architecture course, the SoA continues to see improvement on how cost control is understood by our graduate students.

The Options II studio, Construction Technology II, and the Practice of Architecture sequence place more emphasis on Construction Cost Control.

Students are presented with a number of specific references throughout the Construction Technology II course, with specific homework and exam questions as evidence of this requirement.

The Professional Practice course continues to include life cycle cost considerations, and our other in our technical courses— specifically structures and environmental systems, construction cost metrics are discussed.

The Construction Tech II syllabus includes Item 3 from the list of student learning outcomes in the syllabus is as follows:

3. to develop a working knowledge of job site protocols, monetary values associated with site procurement, professional fees and construction costs.

13.26 Technical Documentation

Team Comments:

While specifications are briefly covered in the Professional Practice class, no evidence was found that any student in the Program was required to produce an outline specification.

Program Response:

As reported last year, School of Architecture faculty agreed through curriculum reviews and discussions that this deficiency should be addressed through inclusion of outline specification writing in our Construction Technology II course. During spring 2011, that course was reformatted to directly interface

with our Options II Studio, the two together forming the basis of our key demonstrable efforts in Comprehensive Design (see below). This approach is being further refined in Spring 2013.

Specification Outlines are now presented in a lecture format in the Practice of Architecture 2 course.

13.28 Comprehensive Design

Team Comments:

The Program has focused on large scale projects which evaluate macro scale contextual impacts, programming issues, and responsiveness to sustainable design concerns, and students have exhibited an ability to produce plans, sections, and elevations. But this commendable work has been at the expense of clearly integrating the various building systems required under this specific Criterion. Structural and environmental systems are only superficially indicated in the comprehensive design studio work, and building envelope systems, assemblies, and some aspects of life-safety are not well demonstrated at an Ability level.

Program Response:

We continue to refine our efforts in relation to Comprehensive Design documentation via the creation of the Options II Building Workshop – a studio based, capstone, comprehensive design studio with three additional, concurrently taught, courses intertwined into the studio agenda – Construction Technology II, Structures II, and Environmental Systems II.

In 2012, the SoA hired the second Portman Visiting Critic to support technical development of all Options II Building Workshop studio projects. Created with a generous \$25,000 annual gift by John Portman's office "*in order to encourage student accomplishment and excellence in the integration of technical considerations as a key constituent of the design process*" the Portman Prize was awarded as a first, second and third prize to the students participating in the workshop. 56 students in four studios participated, with \$6,000 and a summer internship going to the winner. Mary Ann Thompson, FAIA of Cambridge, MA was the second Portman Visiting Critic, and worked with the students throughout the semester on the spatial and technical resolution of their projects. The Portman Prize and the Options II Building Workshop with continue in spring 2013, with the engineer Jane Wernick of London, England named as the third PVC.

We continue to work through significant restructuring of course content delivery. Students now focus on preparing Construction Document quality drawings of their studio projects in the Construction Technology II course. Students work on reasonably constrained urban sites, along Peachtree Street or on the edge of our urban campus, with building programs in the 30,000 s.f. range. Students are required to be through schematic design by the midterm threshold review and then begin developing detailed drawings of building envelop, site, and structure. Students are introduced to the International Building Code as well as local zoning documents in the Construction Tech II course, and are tested in the first and second exam on issues related to codes, zoning and life safety. Student's final problem in Structures II is to calculate all of the loads associated with one section of their studio project, and size all of the columns and beams accordingly. We've continued to include a structures tutor (an individual trained as both an architect and engineer and involved in delivery of our structures coursework) as part of the design studio instructional team in our Core III and Options II studio levels.

Students review the impact of mechanical system choices on their studio projects in Environmental Systems II. We are at this moment continuing to work through stronger connections between this course and the studio course in 2013.

Other studios, namely Options I and Core III, likewise address issues related to comprehensive design: life safety, site design, structure, and building envelop.

Changes in Program since last NAAB visit

- Changes to the Curriculum
 - After a decade of experimental and ad hoc approaches to integrating digital modalities of design and fabrication within existing foundational studios, new workshops in architecture modeling and media have now been systematically structured to support design inquiry: first, by providing students with a platform of crucial knowledge and necessary skills; and then, by sketching a framework to accommodate the constant revolutionizing of generative and representational media. In the field of architecture, aesthetic sensibility and technical capability must walk hand in hand.
 - With the aim to organize discourse and further debate about the social, political, and economic grounds of disciplinary and professional knowledge, revamped courses in the theory and practice of architecture have been developed. Theory of Architecture is unfolded around four thematic topics— program and function, context and site, rhetoric and representation,

tectonics and style—each seam of thought offered from distinct and varying faculty perspectives.

- Similarly, Practice of Architecture was expanded into two courses, now extending to address the dynamic social, historical, and ethical contexts of architectural practice, the demands for and characteristics of enterprise and leadership, office organization and project processes, and importantly, the rising role of research in the generation of emergent, alternative models of practice.
- Where so many of these initiatives overlap and intersect is in the School of Architecture's new Design and Research Studios. Topics of enduring and emerging professional concern in urban design, digital design and fabrication, building performance, and health and design among others, are here framed and illuminated by domains of research expertise from among School faculty and adjacent design and engineering disciplines, from leading practitioners and local firms. The collaborative ferment and creative tension cultivated in this architecture innovation factory will over time come to define, we expect, the sort of enlightened, performance-oriented and research-driven architectural practices against whose work the terms of social progress will again be known.
- Budgetary Changes
 - The School of Architecture administered a State-mandated budgetary reduction of 1.2% during fiscal year 2012.
- Changes in Faculty
 - Dean Alan Balfour is set to retire in June of 2013. A Dean search is underway.
 - Associate Professor Richard Dagenhart retired after 35 years of leadership in urban design and service as seminar, studio and foreign studies instructor and continues as a part-time instructor.
 - Two current faculty members departed:

Assistant Professor Minjung Maing, tenure track, transferred to Chinese Hong Kong University
Professor Mario Carpo, tenured, currently at Yale University
 - Transfers:
Professor Ellen Do transferred to the College's School of Industrial Design

- The 4rd Thomas W. Ventulett Distinguished Chair in Architectural Design, Marc Simmons, of the firm FRONT, Inc. was appointed in June of 2012.
- Two TVSDesign Distinguished Studio Critics were appointed for the 2012-13 academic year:
Jennifer Bonner of Woodbury University
Volkan Alkanoglu, SCI-ARC
- A new Harrison Design Visiting Critic was appointed in the Area of Preservation/Renovation and Restoration:
Jack Pybrun, FAIA/ Lord, Aeck and Sargent
- Three Professors of the Practice of Architecture were appointed with annual renewable terms for academic year 2012-13:
Stuart Romm, Architect/Praxis 3
David Yocum, Architect/BLDGS
Brian Bell, Architect/BLDGS

All three positions are non-tenured, one year appointments

- Faculty searches are currently underway during academic year 2012-13 for two or more tenure-track positions in the areas of Urban Design and Architectural Design, Technology, and Innovation..

NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report

SECTION A. INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Program Contact Information:

Name	Georgia Institute of Technology
Title	College of Architecture
Office Phone Number	404/894-4885
Fax Number	404/894-0572
Email	program.office@arch.gatech.edu

2. Institution Type:

Public

3. Carnegie Classification:

a. Basic Classification: research activity)	RU/VH: Research Universities (very high
b. Undergraduate Instructional Program: sciences, high graduate coexistence	Prof+A&S/HGC: Professions plus arts &
c. Graduate Instructional Program: (no medical/veterinary)	CompDoc/NMedVet: Comprehensive doctoral
d. Size and Setting:	L4/HR: Large four-year, highly residential

4. Which regional accreditation agency accredits your institution?

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)

5. In which ACSA region is the institution located?

Southeast

6. Who has direct administrative responsibility for the architecture program?

Name	George B. Johnston, Ph.D.
Title	Chair
Office Phone Number	404-894-4885
Fax Number	404-894-0572
Email	george.johnston@coa.gatech.edu

7. To whom should inquiries regarding this questionnaire to be addressed?

Name	Lucie Andre
Title	Assistant Director of Administrative Operations
Office Phone Number	404-894-1095
Fax Number	404-894-0572
Email	Lucie.Andre@coa.gatech.edu

8. Who is the university administrator responsible for verifying data (and completing IPEDS reports) at your institution?

Name	Sandra J. Bramblett
Title	Director of Institutional Research and Planning
Office Phone Number	404-894-8874
Fax Number	404-894-0032
Email	sandi@gatech.edu

9. Institutional Test Scores

a. SAT

Critical Reading

25th percentile SAT score: 600

75th percentile SAT score: 690

Mathematics

25th percentile SAT score: 660

NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report

75th percentile SAT score: 760

Writing

25th percentile SAT score: 8

75th percentile SAT score: 9

b. ACT

25th percentile ACT score: 28

75th percentile ACT score: 34

c. Graduate Record Examination (GRE)

Verbal: 519 (200-800)

Quantitative: 748 (200-800)

Analytical: 3.6 (0.0 – 6.0)

SECTION B – NAAB-ACCREDITED ARCHITECTURE PROGRAMS

1. DEGREE PROGRAMS

a. Which NAAB accredited / candidate degree programs were offered during the last fiscal year? (B. Arch, M. Arch, D. Arch)

Accredited

M. Architecture

Candidate

N/A

b. Did your institution offer any pre-professional architecture degree programs during the last fiscal year? Yes

Degree Type	Available?	Full Degree Title
Bachelor of Architectural Studies	No	
Bachelor of Arts	No	
Bachelor of Design	No	
Bachelor of Environmental Design	No	
Bachelor of Fine Arts	No	
Bachelor of Science	Yes	Bachelor of Science in Architecture
Other	No	

c. Did your institution offer any post-professional architecture degree programs during the last fiscal year?

Full Degree Title
Master of Science
Master of Science in Urban Design
Doctor of Philosophy

2. Does your institution have plans to initiate any new NAAB-accredited degree programs?

No

3. Does your institution have plans to discontinue any of its NAAB-accredited degree programs?

No

4. What academic year calendar type does your institution have?

2 Semesters or Trimester

5. Credit Hours for Completion for each program:

NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report

- a. Indicate the total number of credit hours taken at your institution to earn each NAAB accredited/candidate degree program offered by your institution:
 - a. M. Architecture undergraduate (five years, no baccalaureate degree awarded prior): 0
 - b. M. Architecture Pre-Professional (degree designed for candidates who have a pre-professional degree in architecture): 60
 - c. M. Architecture Non-Pre-Professional (degree designed for candidates who have an undergraduate degree in a discipline other than architecture): 108
 - d.
- b. By degree, what is the distribution of credit hours in the following: General Education, Professional, and Electives?
 - a. M. Architecture undergraduate:
 - b. General Education: 0
 - c. Professional: 0
 - d. Electives: 0
 - e. M. Architecture Pre-Professional:
 - f. General Education: 0
 - g. Professional: 39
 - h. Electives: 21
 - i. M. Architecture Non-Pre-Professional:
 - j. General Education: 0
 - k. Professional: 87
 - l. Electives: 21
 - m.

6. Average credit hours per student per term by degree program?

M. Architecture undergraduate: 0

M. Architecture Pre-Professional: 16

M. Architecture Non-Pre-Professional: 17

7. Is your degree program(s) offered in whole, or in part, at more than one campus or location?
[no response needed in ARS print out]

SECTION C – TUITION, FEES AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN NAAB-ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

1. Tuition is defined as “the amount of tuition and required fees covering a full academic year most frequently charged to students for instructional services.”
 - a. What were the tuition and fees for the institution for the last fiscal year?

M. Architecture: Full-Time Student (In-State) \$6988.00 (Tuition), \$1185.00 (Fees); Full-Time Student (Out-of-State) \$15425.00 (Tuition), \$1185.00 (Fees); Part-Time Student (In-State) \$583.00 (Tuition), \$727.00 (Fees); Part-Time Student (Out-of-State) \$1286.00 (Tuition), \$727.00 (Fees)
 - b. Does the institution offer discounted or differential tuition for a NAAB-accredited degree program? Yes
 - c. Is a summer session required for any portion of your accredited degree program(s)? If yes, what is the additional tuition and fees for the summer program?

NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report

d. Does the institution offer discounted or differential tuition for summer courses for a NAAB accredited degree program? Yes

2. Financial Aid: What was the percent of students financial aid at both the institutional and architecture program levels (grants, loans, assistantships, scholarships, fellowships, tuition waivers, tuition discounts, veteran’s benefits, employer aid [tuition reimbursement] and other monies [other than from relatives/friends] provided to students to meet expenses? *This includes Title IV subsidized and unsubsidized loans provided directly to student) provided by the institution to students enrolled in each program(s) leading to a NAAB accredited degree during the last fiscal year.*

Grant Type	% Students Receiving Aid	Average Amount by Types of Aid
a. Institution Federal Grants	1%	414604
a. Institution State/Local Grants	0%	0
a. Institution Institutional Grants	77%	74708846
a. Institution Student Loans	15%	13305466
b. Architecture Program Federal Grants	0%	0
b. Architecture Program State/Local Grants	0%	0
b. Architecture Program Institutional Grants	83%	458490
b. Architecture Program Student Loans	73%	2782035

3. Graduate Assistantships (What was the total number of graduate-level students employed on a part-time basis for the primary purpose of assisting in classroom or laboratory instruction or in the conduct of research during the last fiscal year (Jul 1 – Jun 30) within the NAAB-accredited programs offered by your institution? *Please include: graduate assistant, teaching assistant, teaching associate, teaching fellow or research assistant in your calculation.* **26**

SECTION D – STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS FOR NAAB-ACCREDITED AND PREPROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

1. Entering Students:

M. Architecture: 50

Race	Male Full Time	Male Part Time	Female Full Time	Female Part Time	TOTAL Full Time	TOTAL Part Time	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	3	0	6	0	9	0	9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
White	19	0	20	0	39	0	39
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report

TOTAL	22	0	28	0	50	0	50
-------	----	---	----	---	----	---	----

Pre-Professional: 95

Race	Male Full Time	Male Part Time	Female Full Time	Female Part Time	TOTAL Full Time	TOTAL Part Time	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	10	0	8	0	18	0	18
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	5	0	4	0	9	0	9
Hispanic/Latino	4	0	7	0	11	0	11
White	23	0	32	0	55	0	55
Two or more races	1	0	1	0	2	0	2
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	43	0	52	0	95	0	95

2. Total undergraduate/graduate architecture enrollment in NAAB accredited program by race/ethnicity.

M. Architecture 134

Race	Male Full Time	Male Part Time	Female Full Time	Female Part Time	TOTAL Full Time	TOTAL Part Time	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Asian	5	0	13	0	18	0	18
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	4	0	7	0	11	0	11
Hispanic/Latino	2	0	1	0	3	0	3
White	51	0	49	0	100	0	100
Two or more races	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	0	71	0	134	0	134

Pre-Professional 265

Race	Male Full Time	Male Part Time	Female Full Time	Female Part Time	TOTAL Full Time	TOTAL Part Time	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	20	0	26	0	46	0	46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Black or African American	9	0	7	0	16	0	16
Hispanic/Latino	7	0	19	0	26	0	26
White	82	0	88	0	170	0	170
Two or more races	3	0	3	0	6	0	6
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report

TOTAL	121	0	144	0	265	0	265
-------	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----

SECTION E -- DEGREES AWARDED

1. What is the total number of NAAB-accredited degrees that were awarded in the last fiscal year?

M. Architecture:

Race	Male	Female	TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0
Asian	1	4	5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Black or African American	2	3	5
Hispanic/Latino	2	0	2
White	14	10	24
Two or more races	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	2	0	2
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0
TOTAL	21	17	38

Pre-Professional:

Race	Male	Female	TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0	1
Asian	4	3	7
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	1	1
Black or African American	1	1	2
Hispanic/Latino	1	5	6
White	20	19	39
Two or more races	0	1	1
Nonresident alien	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0
TOTAL	27	30	57

2. Time to Completion/Graduation

a. Time to completion equals the total number of semesters/quarters to complete the degree:

M. Architecture UG 0, M. Architecture Pre-Professional 4, M. Architecture Non-Pre-Professional 7

b. Percentage of students that graduate in “normal time to completion”:

M. Architecture UG 0%, M. Architecture Pre-Professional 97%, M. Architecture Non-Pre-Professional 97%

3. Graduation rate for B. Arch programs:

SECTION F -- RESOURCES FOR NAAB-ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

1. Total number of catalogued titles in the architecture library collection within the institutional library system (Main Campus; Other locations – links from B8). 48203

2. Total number of catalogued titles that have Library of Congress NA or Dewey 720-729 (Main Campus; Other locations – links from B8). 23386

3. What is the total number of permanent workstations (studio desks) that can be assigned to students enrolled in design studios? 458

4. Please indicate which of the following: labs, shop, and other learning resources available to

NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report

Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part Time Associate Professor

Race	Tenured Male	Tenured Female	Tenure-Track Male	Tenure-Track Female	Non-Tenure-Track Male	Non-Tenure-Track Female	TOTAL Male	TOTAL Female	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part Time Assistant Professor

Race	Tenured Male	Tenured Female	Tenure-Track Male	Tenure-Track Female	Non-Tenure-Track Male	Non-Tenure-Track Female	TOTAL Male	TOTAL Female	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part Time Instructor

Race	Tenured Male	Tenured Female	Tenure-Track Male	Tenure-Track Female	Non-Tenure-Track Male	Non-Tenure-Track Female	TOTAL Male	TOTAL Female	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0	4	14	14	4	18
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	7	14	14	7	21

NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report

c. Adjunct Faculty Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor):

Race	Professor Male	Professor Female	Associate Professor Male	Associate Professor Female	Assistant Professor Male	Assistant Professor Female	Instructor Male	Instructor Female	TOTAL Male	TOTAL Female	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5

3. Faculty Credentials:

Highest Degree Achieved	Professor Male	Professor Female	Associate Professor Male	Associate Professor Female	Assistant Professor Male	Assistant Professor Female	TOTAL Male	TOTAL Female	GRAND TOTAL
D. Arch. (accredited)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M. Arch. (accredited)	2	1	6	0	3	1	11	2	13
B. Arch. (accredited)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ph.D. in architecture	2	0	3	1	1	0	6	1	7
Ph.D. in other discipline	2	0	2	1	0	0	4	1	5
Post-professional graduate degree in architecture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other degrees	2	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	4
Registered in U.S. Jurisdiction	2	1	4	0	1	0	7	1	8

4. Salaries

Instructional Faculty Type	Number	Minimum	Average	Maximum	University Average
Professor	9	86328	113566	136871	141000
Assoc. Prof.	14	63939	78161	99549	95500
Assist. Prof.	4	54385	61481	65000	85800
Instructor	0	0	0	0	43000