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I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgements and Observations
The visiting team wishes to thank Auburn University, the School of Architecture, Planning, and Landscape Architecture, and the school administration, faculty, staff, and students for their hospitality and assistance during its visit. In particular, the team wants to recognize the efforts of the former school head, David Hinson; the architecture program chair, Behzad Nakhjavan; and the architecture program associate chair, Rusty Smith, for being extremely helpful in organizing the team visit and the presentation of the APR, and for providing additional information when requested during the review. The team appreciated the school's courtesy and candor.

The architecture program is commended for its focus on creating opportunities for students to excel and explore their interests through hand-drawing, exploring technologies, and learning by doing. A primary distinguishing characteristic of the program is the option for students to participate in multiple, flexible learning environments, including the Rural Studio in Newbern and the Urban Studio in Birmingham. These programs benefit both the participants and the communities that the programs serve. Through the unique opportunities that these programs create, the programs and participants bring worldwide acclaim to the architecture program; the school; the College of Architecture, Design, and Construction (CADC), in which the school is found; and the university.

The architecture student body exhibits a strong sense of community by being a support network for one another, which includes the faculty and staff, throughout a student's years in the program. The students are a collaborative and respectful group, who have a robust belief in an ethic of hard work, which prepares them for a successful post-college life. This is clearly evident in their engagement in the full range of student professional organizations, such as the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS), National Organization of Minority Architects (NOMAS), and AIAS Freedom by Design. The student body exhibits exceptional pride in being affiliated with the school.

The faculty are highly committed to the many educational opportunities that the program offers both as part of, and outside, the regular fall/spring class schedules. Students praise the faculty for their accessibility and willingness to help them succeed. The team observed a positive, respectful, and collaborative environment among the faculty. The college dean is acknowledged by the faculty and administrators for her strong, engaging, and optimistic leadership and advocacy in the college, school, and program.

The CADC continues to work to be more inclusive. The architecture program was recently recognized by Metropolis magazine for actively seeking ways to increase diversity in its enrollment, faculty, and curriculum, thereby "setting a new precedent for more inclusive higher-education."

b. Conditions Not Achieved

B.2. Site Design
II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

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

Previous Team Report (2011): The team did not find sufficient evidence in student coursework of achieving the level of understanding for Global Culture. Although coursework for the ARCH 2110- Architectural History I - demonstrated understanding of Western historical traditions in architecture, landscape and urban design, student work in this course did not demonstrate sufficient understanding of non-western historical traditions or global culture.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: This item is now Met in SPC A.7 History and Culture. The team found evidence of an understanding of history and culture in research papers, student presentations, and quizzes in ARCH 2110 Architectural History I and ARCH 3110 Architectural History II, with the added study of Islamic and Middle Eastern cultures. Additional evidence was found in ARCH 3010 Studio III and ARCH 3020 Studio IV, where students have the option to work in a variety of locations and cultures, including the Rural Studio, Urban Studio, and Rome program.

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

Previous Team Report (2011): While the team found some evidence of the application of specific accessibility guidelines in the comprehensive design studio ARCH 4010/4020, it was unable to find examples of the consistent application of site and building accessibility principles and requirements in other studio and course work.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now part of SPC B.3, Codes and Regulations, and is now Met. The team found that evidence was demonstrated through student research and studio projects in ARCH 4010 Studio V, District Plan; ARCH 4010 Studio V, Urban Architecture; and ARCH 4020 Studio VI, Design Development, which illustrated the ability to design sites and buildings according to accessibility principles.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2011): While the team found the requirement for financial analysis in the course requirements in one studio*, it was unable to find any consistent evidence of student application of this understanding, and no evidence in course or studio work of the understanding of life-cycle cost accounting.

*In the 3rd year option at the Rural Studio, there is an acute awareness of projects' costs in such projects as the "$20K house." However, this studio option is not available to all students.
2017 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now Met as part of SPC B.10, Financial Considerations. The team found that an understanding of the fundamentals of this criterion was demonstrated through ARCH 4010 Studio V and ARCH 4020 Studio VI, which are taken by all students. Financial calculations were presented in binders and board presentations. In ARCH 4320 Materials and Methods II, materials are also compared to initial costs as well as life cycle costs.
III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation

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

Part One (I): Section 1 – Identity and Self-Assessment

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission, and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program's pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. This includes the program's benefits to the institutional setting, and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. This also includes how the program as a unit develops multi-disciplinary relationships and leverages opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.

2017 Analysis/Review: In the APR, the program describes its history, mission, and culture, and how they have shaped the program's pedagogy and development.

Auburn University, then named the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama, was the first land-grant institution in the South. Its mission is defined by its land-grant tradition of service and access. Central to its functions is the commitment of service to the citizens of Alabama through instructional, research, and outreach programs (APR, p. 5). The CADC celebrated its 100th anniversary in 2007. The CADC began with the establishment of a curriculum in architecture in 1907 in the Civil Engineering Department. Auburn was one of the first universities to grant autonomy to an architecture program originating in an engineering school. A distinctive achievement of Auburn's architecture program was the graduation of several women as early as the 1920s and 1930s.

A new program in Industrial Design was established in the Art Department in the 1930s. Landscape Architecture and Interior Design programs that were created in the 1930s became part of the Architecture Department, as did the newly formed program in Building Construction in 1942. In 1996, the Architecture Department became the CADC. Over the past century, the School of Architecture, Planning, and Landscape Architecture (APLA) has grown to include three allied degree programs: Architecture, Interior Architecture, and Landscape Architecture.

APLA is committed to a model of professional education that embraces design and planning creativity, social responsibility, historical perspective, technical competence, and global environmental consciousness. It prepares students for leadership in their respective disciplines and in their communities.

Examples of ongoing outreach initiatives within the program include the work of the Rural Studio, the Urban Studio, and the DESIGNHabitat program. The Rural Studio, founded in 1992, is dedicated to the design and construction of housing and community projects in the underserved Black Belt communities of Hale, Perry, and Marengo Counties in west Alabama. Auburn's architecture program continues to enjoy national and international acclaim for its success in integrating outreach and service-based learning in architectural education (APR, pp. 5-7).

The coalition of programs within APLA (and within the CADC) exemplifies interdisciplinary collaboration as a model of professional activity; ensures that students have an overview of the various components in
the design and building process; and promotes the connection among planning, landscape architecture, interior architecture, and architecture as interdependent practices. Further, APLA provides its students with a context for understanding how these four elements of the building process integrate into the larger community as a whole and the urban context, as well as the planning, design, and construction industry. The relationship between the programs in the college also allows for joint degree programs that extend professional opportunities for the students. See: http://cadc.auburn.edu/architecture/architecture-degrees-programs/architecture-program.

I.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages 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.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy that also includes a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition to the matters identified above, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.
- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include, but are not limited to, participation in field trips, professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

2017 Analysis/Review: The program demonstrates that it has adopted a studio culture policy in a form resembling the Bill of Rights. The team’s conversations and meetings with the students confirmed that the studio culture policy has been an architecture student-led initiative, which has been refined through a series of town hall meetings, debates, and discussions in consultation with the administration, faculty, and students. Opportunities are provided to encourage learning outside the classroom. In this regard, the Rural Studio, Urban Studio, and Study Abroad program are examples of programs that are considered exemplary from the perspective of both students and professionals. Auburn University chapters of the AIAS and NOMAS are examples of professional organizations that allow students to develop professional, networking, and advocacy skills. See the following website for the link to the studio culture policy (“Bill of Rights“): http://cadc.auburn.edu/architecture/architecture-degrees-programs/architecture-program.

I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students as compared with the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution during the next two accreditation cycles.
- The program must document that institutional-, college-, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.
2017 Analysis/Review: Social equity in the program and in the university is described and addressed in the APR (pp. 9-10). Sixty-one percent of the students at the university are from Alabama, 34 percent are from other states, and 4 percent are from foreign countries. More than 50 percent are female, and 13.5 percent are ethnic minorities. The university's efforts to increase diversity are visible in an initiative that fosters the university's climate for inclusion, equity, and diversity to be implemented in the academic year 2016-2017.

In the architecture program, student diversity with regard to minority enrollment and gender balance has improved since 2010. Several relevant efforts exist such as the 2012 Strategic Diversity Plan, which supports a NOMAS chapter, and university scholarships for underrepresented students.

The program has recognized the problem of low gender and racial diversity in the faculty, with 73 percent male vs. 27 percent female, and 95 percent white vs. 5 percent minority. The success in increasing student diversity has not yet been achieved with regard to faculty.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Collaboration and Leadership. The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders.

2017 Analysis/Review: The architecture program describes and exhibits its implementation of collaborative and leadership opportunities very successfully through a model of collaborative team-based learning and collaborative team-based teaching. The program's commitment to community-based studios is deeply rooted in the continuation of the Urban Studio and the Rural Studio as its flagship programs. Encouragement toward interdisciplinary learning is prominent in first-year and third-year collaborations with other colleges. Through these collaborative efforts, students are exposed to the dynamics of practicing and working at real sites, and with real clients, programs, schedules, and budget constraints.

The real-world nature of these collaborations results in exposure to the various roles that an architect takes on during practice. Students are given the opportunity to work with consulting professionals to practice the skills needed to understand the complex strategies that can be used in response to issues such as financing, structure, and codes and regulations.

The team observed that the program excels in collaboration and leadership not only on the part of the students, but also in the way that the faculty interacts with students and other faculty members in their teaching.

B. Design. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multidimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed at addressing increasingly complex problems, engaging a diverse constituency, and providing value and an improved future.

2017 Analysis/Review: In the APR (p. 11), the program describes its approach to developing graduates who have an understanding of design. The curriculum integrates formal design strategies with the science
of building construction. The vision of the program is to provide an education that develops problem solvers and change makers who understand the complex social and environmental issues of today.

The program is structured so that, as students progress, they develop a greater understanding of how to address more complex problems in order to resolve them. In the first year, the foundations laid involve discovering issues that require resolution, researching the problems associated with them, assembling relevant data and research material, and developing solutions that are then tested and communicated to diverse constituencies. By the fifth year, the graduates have experienced real-world situations and have responded to them with design solutions.

C. Professional Opportunity. The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and career paths for architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings, and in local and global communities.

2017 Analysis/Review: The team observed that this perspective is an inherent value of the program and believes that it is Met with Distinction. In the APR (p. 12), the program has described the professional opportunities and career paths for architects that are available through the program. The stated mission is to prepare the professional program graduates to become licensed architects. ARCH 1000 Introduction to Careers in Design and Construction focuses on professional opportunities and the breadth of career paths. Students are encouraged to work in architecture offices or in construction-related jobs for at least two summers. Students in the Urban Studio work as interns in local Birmingham architecture offices for a 15-week period during the fifth year of the program. As a result, students often complete much of their path to AXP completion upon graduation. Additionally, students regularly interact with practicing architectural professionals as faculty, adjunct faculty, visiting critics, lecturers, and Advisory Council members.

Distinction was demonstrated in the students’ immersion in the profession, in their concern for the needs of diverse clients and communities, and in their understanding of the practice of architecture with a social mandate. Program alumni say that Auburn graduates’ preparation for practice has given them a clear understanding of the profession and the path to licensure. This has made them confident in their ability to get jobs, understand complex ideas and problems, work collaboratively, and contribute meaningfully to the profession.

D. Stewardship of the Environment. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and the natural resources that are significantly compromised by the act of building and by constructed human settlements.

2017 Analysis/Review: Through discussions with faculty and students and a review of the APR (p. 13), the team found that the meaning of environmental stewardship in the program has been expanded to include not only the stewardship of the physical environment, but also social and economic stewardship.

According to the APR, the program believes that architecture can be a catalyst for finding solutions to issues regarding stewardship of the environment, such as access to clean water, air, food, healthcare, sustainable energy, affordable housing, education, equality, safety, and security. As the profession has increasingly embraced issues of environmental stewardship, the program has worked diligently to integrate the teaching of sustainable practices into the curriculum, the APR states.

The APR states that the program advocates a belief in an architecture that is inseparable from place and environment. Practicing architects can make a positive difference in the world through active engagement in their communities. It follows that design advocacy through material action can improve the human
condition. Enabling the radical transformation from a design student to an active, professional, and successful “citizen architect” is what drives the architecture program.

The program described its approach to meeting this perspective. This includes redesigning and restructuring the building technology sequence of courses (ARCH 2210 Environmental Controls I and ARCH 2220 Environmental Controls II) and including the sequence in earlier design studios, where they may become more formative. The coupling of these two courses, along with ARCH 2110 Architectural History I and ARCH 2020 Studio II, elevated the quality of the design work performed by sophomore students and provided invaluable leverage to the community-centered public interest work of subsequent year levels.

According to the APR, as students progress into upper-year levels, they continue their commitment to making a difference by providing architectural solutions and stewardship advocacy for pressing local, national, and global challenges. Integration of environmental stewardship into the curriculum is a requirement alongside other requirements such as space, structure, materiality, and light.

E. Community and Social Responsibility. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens that are able to understand what it means to be a professional member of society and to act on that understanding. The social responsibility of architects lies, in part, in the belief that architects can create better places, and that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program’s response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to positively influence the development of, conservation of, or changes to the built and natural environment.

2017 Analysis/Review: This perspective is Met with Distinction due to the program’s dedication to community and social responsibility. The program describes itself as “practice-based with a social agenda,” and the faculty, students, and administrators fully identify with this description. The curriculum provides students with the opportunity to spend their third year and/or fifth year at the Rural Studio or the Urban Studio, both of which are opportunities for interaction with communities and for understanding the ethical obligations of architects. A program administrator stated that “Auburn produces practitioners with a clear social mandate,” and this assessment is well demonstrated in student work that expresses the desire to professionally interact with community stakeholders, to work for the common good, and to address social needs. The founder of the Rural Studio stated that architecture “has to address social values as well as technical and aesthetic values.”

The program’s mission of promoting community and social responsibility matches well with the university’s responsibilities as a land-grant institution. Both the Rural Studio and the Urban Studio are outstanding outreach efforts that serve communities with varying needs and, at the same time, teach students to value the complexity of a pluralistic society.

For more than two decades, the program has focused its efforts on defining itself as the leader in “innovative community-based public interest design” (APR, page 14). In so doing, it has successfully created a distinctive identity for the program.

1.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement with a ratified planning document and/or planning process. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources, to identify patterns and trends to inform its future planning and strategic decision making. The program must describe how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college, and university.
2017 Analysis/Review: Long-range planning is addressed in the APR (pp. 14-17) and has been discussed by the team with the college dean and program administrators. The University Strategic Plan 2013-2108 lists the following five priorities: enhance student success and diversify enrollment; support faculty excellence and strengthen Auburn's reputation; enhance research, scholarship, and creative work; enhance public engagement; and focus resources on the institutional mission and priorities.

The CADC recently developed the College Strategic Framework, which is in alignment with the University Strategic Plan. Interviews with the architecture program leaders and faculty confirmed that they have contributed what they believe to be meaningful input to the University Strategic Plan, and they are currently working on an in-depth response to the College Strategic Framework.

I.1.6 Assessment:

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

- How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated objectives.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives.
- Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

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

2017 Analysis/Review: The program demonstrated that it has a self-assessment system as described in the APR (pp. 17-19). This was verified by the team in discussions with the program administrators, staff, faculty, and students. They described several protocols for regular self-assessment as a continuous and ongoing process. The process involves the active participation of the students, faculty, alumni, professionals, and administration. The self-assessment reviews range from course evaluations by students every semester, to annual reviews by advisory councils and committees inside the school, to 5-year and 10-year reviews by the upper-level administration of the CADC, to reviews of the university as a whole by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

B. Curricular Assessment and Development: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments, and must identify 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.

2017 Analysis/Review: In the APR (pp. 17-19), the program describes a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and development, which was verified by the team in discussions with the program administrators, faculty, and staff. Curricular assessment and development are carried out through the Curriculum Committee for Architecture, which is composed of year-level coordinators and is overseen by both the program chair and the associate program chair. The Architecture Advisory Council meets bi-annually to evaluate student work on display, and the council's evaluations inform curricular adjustments. During a "Peer Review Day" at the end of each semester, year-level curriculum is examined. A 2-day retreat of the college faculty is held at the end of the spring semester, where the curriculum is reviewed, as indicated in the APR and in a team meeting with the faculty.
Part One (I): Section 2 – Resources

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:
The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and the teacher that promotes student achievement.
- The program must demonstrate that an Architect Licensing Advisor (ALA) has been appointed, is trained in the issues of the Architect Experience Program (AXP), has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the ALA position description, and regularly attends ALA training and development programs.
- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including, but not limited to, academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

[X] Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment: This condition is addressed in the APR (pp. 23-27). The description in the APR was verified by the team in discussions with the university provost, college dean, program administrators, staff, and faculty.

According to the APR, support for the professional development of the architecture faculty has doubled compared to the prior 6-year NAAB review period. Both tenure-track and visiting faculty feel well supported in their research and creative activities, for example, through course adjustments to allow time for these activities or through support for travel to conferences and field studies. Tenure-track faculty are supported by a mentoring program and feel that they are prepared for success during the tenure process.

There is an Architect Licensing Advisor and a Student Architect Licensing Advisor. The students are well aware of the AXP program. The CADC provides three staff members to advise undergraduate students. One of them is for APLA. An additional staff member advises graduate students in the college. Student counseling is also covered at the university level. Career guidance is currently addressed by faculty members, but the college is studying the possibility of installing a career placement office.

I.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including labs, shops, and equipment.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- Information 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, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

**[X] Described**

**2017 Team Assessment:** Through the APR (pp. 27-29) and on-site observations, the team found that Dudley Hall and Dudley Commons have appropriate studio spaces to support the program's studio culture and learning. In the APR, there are floor plans of several levels of the buildings. Since the last NAAB assessment visit, the Dudley Hall facilities have been significantly renovated and updated to repair structural and exterior deficiencies. The renovation includes updated ADA-accessible restrooms and larger windows for more interior lighting. Space is also provided in the building to support faculty teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising. Dudley Hall, the Urban Studio, and the Rural Studio support social interaction as part of the learning process.

The program's 5-year plan indicates that, in the near future, the next steps will be the renovation of the classroom interiors and exterior learning spaces, and the expansion of the shop facilities. The team observed that the shop in the Urban Studio is a temporary solution.

**I.2.3 Financial Resources:** The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

**[X] Demonstrated**

**2017 Team Assessment:** The APR (pp. 30-33) addresses financial resources. The university has recently changed the budget model from a historical model to a "Responsibility Centered Model." APLA's annual budgets have been fully supported by the CADC in each of the last 3 years under the new model. The CACD, APLA, and the architecture program are confident that this funding model will not be a challenge in continuing to operate the program. The team verified this in discussions with the provost, dean, program administrators, and faculty. There also have been marked increases in philanthropic support.

**I.2.4 Information Resources:** The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

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

**[X] Demonstrated**

**2017 Team Assessment:** Data on information resources are presented in the APR (pp. 33-36) and have been verified through the team's discussions with the full-time librarian who heads up the Library of Architecture, Design, and Construction (LADC) and through a facilities tour during the visit. A rich provision of information, literature, and digital and visual resources has been identified. The LADC, renovated in 2012, is well equipped, with over 40,000 volumes, over 70 current periodicals, and numerous student theses, drawings, and videos. Students in the Rural Studio and the Urban Studio have access to the library via the online system. Books are delivered to the Rural Studio and the Urban Studio, or they are scanned upon request. The library has a full range of computers; scanners; televisions; DVD
players, and VCRs; and printers. The writing center provides writing-skill support for students, particularly for papers assigned in history and theory coursework.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

- **Administrative Structure**: The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and the school, college, and institution.
- **Governance**: The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[X] Described:

**2017 Team Assessment**: The administrative structure of the program is available online through the program’s website (http://cadc.auburn.edu/explore-cadc/about-cadc/deans-message). The team was provided with a diagram depicting the overall structure of the program within the larger context.

The team found the governance structure described in the APR (p. 37). The dean is acknowledged by faculty and administrators for her strong, engaging, and optimistic leadership and advocacy in the CADC, APLA, and the program.

According to the APR, Auburn University is governed by a Board of Trustees consisting of one member from each congressional district, as these districts were constituted on January 1, 1961; one member from Lee County; three at-large members, all of whom are residents of the continental United States; and the governor, who is ex-officio. The governor is the president of the Board of Trustees. Prior to 2003, trustees were appointed by the governor, by and with the consent of the State Senate, for a term of 12
years. Trustees appointed since the beginning of 2004 have been appointed by a committee, by and with the consent of the State Senate, for a term of 7 years, and they may serve no more than two full 7-year terms. Members of the board receive no compensation. By executive order of the governor in 1971, a non-voting student representative, who is selected by the student body of the Auburn University Main Campus, and a non-voting student representative of the Auburn University Montgomery Campus serve as members of the board ex-officio.
CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria: The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

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

A.1 Professional Communication Skills: Ability to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of student achievement in professional communication skills at the ability level in student work prepared for ARCH 2020 Studio II. The Architectural History course sequence (ARCH 2110, ARCH 3110, and ARCH 4110) demonstrated the ability to write effectively in an increasingly complex manner by incorporating the requirements of the Writing for Majors Program.

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

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the ability level was found in several presentation boards, research papers, sketches, and project binders prepared for ARCH 5010 Studio VII and ARCH 5020 Studio VIII, coupled with a progression of courses starting in the first year. Coursework at the Main Campus, the Urban Studio, and the Rural Studio supported this criterion.

A.3 Investigative Skills: Ability to gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

[X] Met
2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the ability level was found in student research papers, quizzes, and presentations prepared for the Architectural History course sequence (ARCH 2110, ARCH 3110, and ARCH 4110) and in student work exhibits prepared for ARCH 5010 Studio VII and ARCH 5020 Studio VIII.

A.4 Architectural Design Skills: Ability to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the ability level was found in ARCH 2020 Studio II. Students developed a design solution that addressed basic organizational and environmental responses to a project.

A.5 Ordering Systems: Ability to apply the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the ability level was found in student work prepared for the course sequence ARCH 1010, ARCH 1020, ARCH 1060, and ARCH 1420, First Year Program.

A.6 Use of Precedents: Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the ability level was found in a series of research papers, work sample exhibits, and project booklets prepared as coordinated assignments in ARCH 4010 Studio V, ARCH 4020 Studio VI, and ARCH 4110 Architectural History III. Evidence of this ability was also found in coordinated projects prepared for ARCH 2010 Studio I and ARCH 3320 Materials and Methods I.

A.7 History and Culture: Understanding of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, and regional settings in terms of their political, economic, social, and technological factors.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of an understanding of history and culture in student research papers, presentations, and quizzes prepared for ARCH 2110 Architectural History I and ARCH 3110 Architectural History II, with an emphasis on building techniques and materials, and the impact of geography and climate conditions. Additional evidence was found in ARCH 3010 Studio III and ARCH 3020 Studio IV, where students have the option to work in a variety of locations and cultures, including the Rural Studio, the Urban Studio, and the Rome program.
A.8 **Cultural Diversity and Social Equity:** *Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to buildings and structures.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** This criterion is **Met with Distinction.** The team found evidence of this in student work prepared for ARCH 3010 Studio III and ARCH 3020 Studio IV. The student work involving background precedents and applied research at the Main Campus, the Rural Studio, and the Urban Studio is a hallmark of the program.

**Realm A. General Team Commentary:** The team noted that all criteria in this realm are **Met**, and one criterion, A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity, is **Met with Distinction.** Students demonstrated the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research into, and extensive analysis of, multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, and cultural contexts. This involved using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, hand-drawing, digital media, model-making, and construction of actual buildings and facilities.

**Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge:** Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. Additionally, the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

- Student learning aspirations for this realm include:
- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately.

**B.1 Pre-Design:** *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** The team found evidence of student achievement at the ability level in student written comprehensive programs prepared for ARCH 5010 Studio VII, ARCH 5020 Studio VIII, and 5990/5991 Thesis Research: On Campus, the Urban Studio, and the Rural Studio.

**B.2 Site Design:** *Ability* to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation in the development of a project design.

[X] Not Met
2017 Team Assessment: In its examination of student project work, and in the further material requested and provided, the team was not able to find consistent evidence of responses to several critical site design characteristics at the ability level, such as adapting paths and streets to sloped topography, designing for the surrounding ecology and climate conditions, and making adjustments to building orientation in the development of a project design.

B.3 Codes and Regulations: Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found that student achievement at the ability level was demonstrated through student research and studio projects in ARCH 4010 Studio V, District Plan; ARCH 4010 Studio V, Urban Architecture; and ARCH 4020 Studio VI, Design Development.

B.4 Technical Documentation: Ability to make technically clear drawings, prepare outline specifications, and construct models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found that student achievement at the ability level was demonstrated in student presentations and drawings in ARCH 4020 Studio VI and ARCH 4320 Materials and Methods II.

B.5 Structural Systems: Ability to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravity, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the ability level was found in quizzes, assignments, and projects in student work prepared for BSCI 2400 Structures I, BSCI 3400 Structures II, and BSCI 3450 Structures III. Ability was also demonstrated in integrative building design projects prepared for ARCH 4010 Studio V and ARCH 4020 Studio VI.

B.6 Environmental Systems: Understanding of the principles of environmental systems' design, how systems can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This must include active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of an understanding of environmental systems in student research, models, and projects in ARCH 2210 Environmental Controls I and ARCH 2220 Environmental Controls II.

B.7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies: Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to
fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of student achievement at the understanding level in student work prepared for ARCH 2010 Studio I, ARCH 4320 Materials and Methods II, and ARCH 4020 Studio VI.

B.8 Building Materials and Assemblies: Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components, and assemblies based on their inherent performance, including environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the understanding level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 3320 Materials and Methods I and ARCH 4320 Materials and Methods II.

B.9 Building Service Systems: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems, including mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation security, and fire protection systems.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of an understanding of building service systems in student research, quizzes, and projects in ARCH 2220 Environmental Controls II and in analysis and diagramming in ARCH 4320 Materials and Methods II.

B.10 Financial Considerations: Understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found that an understanding of this criterion was developed through ARCH 4010 Studio V and ARCH 4020 Studio VI. In these courses, financial calculations were presented in binders and in board presentations. In ARCH 4320 Materials and Methods II, materials were compared to initial costs and to life cycle costs.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The team found B.2 Site Design to be Not Met. All other criteria in Realm B were Met. Students were generally able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. However, the team noted that there were aspects of site design where ability was not clearly demonstrated: adapting paths and streets to sloped topography, and designing for the surrounding ecology, climate conditions, and building orientations.
Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions. Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.
- Responding to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.
- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.

C.1 Research: Understanding of the theoretical and applied research methodologies and practices used during the design process.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of an understanding of the theoretical and applied research methodologies and practices used during the design process in student research papers prepared for ARCH 5990/5991 Thesis Research: On Campus, the Urban Studio, and the Rural Studio.

C.2 Evaluation and Decision Making: Ability to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the ability level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 4020 Studio VI and ARCH 5990/5991 Thesis Research: On Campus, the Urban Studio, and the Rural Studio.

C.3 Integrative Design: Ability to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of the ability to incorporate integrative design in integrative building design projects prepared for ARCH 4010 Studio V and ARCH 4020 Studio VI.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The team found all criteria in this realm to be Met. The team found evidence that students demonstrated the ability to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. Students also demonstrated the ability to synthesize research, evaluate options, and make decisions to develop complex, integrated designs.

Realm D: Professional Practice: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.
• Student learning aspirations for this realm include:
  • Comprehending the business of architecture and construction.
  • Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.
  • Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

D.1 **Stakeholder Roles in Architecture:** *Understanding* of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect, and other key stakeholders, such as user groups and the community, in the design of the built environment, and understanding the responsibilities of the architect to reconcile the needs of those stakeholders.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** This criterion is **Met with Distinction.** The team found evidence of this in student projects, public and stakeholder presentations, public outreach, and experience in professional firms with actual clients and projects in ARCH 5990/5991 Thesis Research: On Campus, the Urban Studio, and the Rural Studio.

D.2 **Project Management:** *Understanding* of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams; identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements; and recommending project delivery methods.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** The team found evidence of student understanding of this criterion in student tests and case studies in ARCH 4500 Professional Practice.

D.3 **Business Practices:** *Understanding* of the basic principles of business practices within the firm, including financial management and business planning, marketing, business organization, and entrepreneurialism.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** The team found evidence of student achievement at the understanding level in student tests and case studies in ARCH 4500 Professional Practice.

D.4 **Legal Responsibilities:** *Understanding* of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

[X] Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** The team found evidence of student achievement at the understanding level in student tests and case studies in ARCH 4500 Professional Practice.

D.5 **Professional Ethics:** *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice, and understanding the role of the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.
[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of student achievement at the understanding level in lectures and student tests in ARCH 4500 Professional Practice.

Realm D. General Team Commentary: The team found all criteria in this realm to be Met, and one criterion, D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture, is Met with Distinction. The team found evidence that students understood the business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.
Part Two (II): Section 2 – Curricular Framework

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation:
In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

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

2. Institutions located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: A letter from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) dated January 13, 2014, states that Auburn University's accreditation was reaffirmed by the SACS Commission on Colleges Board of Trustees on December 9, 2013, and that the next reaffirmation will take place in 2023.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following 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.

The B. Arch, M. Arch, and/or D. Arch are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch, M. Arch, or D. Arch for a non-accredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Every accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The program provides descriptions of all curricular requirements for the successful completion of the 5-year professional Bachelor of Architecture degree, along with the number of credit hours required as specified in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. This information is provided in the APR (pp. 40-43), and a hard copy of it was given to the team in the form of an Architecture Foundation curriculum model.
Part Two (II): Section 3 – Evaluation of Preparatory Education

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student’s prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB Student Performance Criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.

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

- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The program does not rely on preparatory educational experience. The program presents a clear system of evaluating transfer students in the APR (p. 43), including several steps of review. Since the previous NAAB visit, no transferring student has been successfully admitted above the rank of second year through this process, the APR says.
Part Two (II): Section 4 – Public Information

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the general public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online.

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 1, in catalogs and promotional media.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: This statement appears on the public CADC architecture program website (http://cadc.auburn.edu/architecture/architecture-degrees-programs/architecture-program) and exactly matches the text found on page 26 of Appendix 1 of the 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty, and the public:

The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The Conditions for Accreditation in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004, depending on the date of the last visit)

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and the 2014 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation are linked on the public CADC architecture program website: http://cadc.auburn.edu/architecture/architecture-degrees-programs/architecture-program

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Students and graduates have access to career development and placement services through the public CADC architecture program website: http://cadc.auburn.edu/architecture/architecture-degrees-programs/architecture-program
II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs:

In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents electronically available to the public:

- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- All NAAB Responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB.
- The most recent APR. [1]
- The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The program has provided access to all required reports on the public website of the university: http://cadc.auburn.edu/architecture/architecture-degrees-programs/architecture-program

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates:

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their websites to the results.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. Auburn University's architecture program ARE pass rates are available on the public CADC architecture program website: http://cadc.auburn.edu/architecture/architecture-degrees-programs/architecture-program

II.4.6 Admissions and Advising:

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions.
- Admissions requirements, admissions decision procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing.
- Forms and process for the evaluation of preprofessional degree content.
- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships.
- Student diversity initiatives.

[X] Met
2017 Team Assessment: The architecture program website provides information and documentation on all policies and procedures regarding admissions and advising. This information is available and accessible to the public.

All links are available on the following website:
http://cadc.auburn.edu/architecture/architecture-degrees-programs/architecture-program

Link to diversity initiatives:

II.4.7 Student Financial Information:

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.
- 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.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The architecture program website provides a link to information on attendance cost, financial aid, and scholarships. A new tuition calculator is available on the website. The website also provides a cost-of-attendance fact sheet for the academic year 2016–2017.

This information is available on the following websites:
http://cadc.auburn.edu/architecture/architecture-degrees-programs/architecture-program
http://www.auburn.edu/admissions/money-matters.html
PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit Annual Statistical Reports in the format required by the *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*.

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

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The program provides a letter from Auburn's University's chief institutional research officer certifying that all statistical data is accurate and consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the National Center for Education Statistics.

III.2 Interim Progress Reports: The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (see Section 10, *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*, 2015 Edition).

[X] Met

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

I.1.4. Perspective C: Professional Opportunity
I.1.4. Perspective E: Community and Social Responsibility
II.1.1. A.8: Cultural Diversity and Social Equity
II.1.1 D.1: Stakeholder Roles in Architecture
### Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

| COURSE #s                  | A  | B  | C  | D  | E  | F  | G  | H  | I  | J  | K  | L  | M  | N  | O  | P  | Q  | R  | S  | T  | U  | V  | W  | X  | Y  | Z  |
|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| First Year Program         | ARC | 1010, 1020, 1030 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 2nd year studio            | ARC | 2010, 2020 | x | x | x | x |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 3rd year studio            | ARC | 3010, 3020 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 4th year studio            | ARC | 4010, 4020 | x | x |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Thesis Studio              | ARC | 5010, 5020 | x | x |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Thesis Research            | ARC | 5900, 5991 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Materials &                | ARC | 3330, 4320 | x |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Environmental              | ARC | 2210, 2220 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Professional               | ARC | 4500 |     |     |     | x | x | x | x | x |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| History                    | ARC | 2110, 3110 | x | x | x |     | x | x | x |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Structures                 | BSCI | 2400, 3400, 3450 | x |     | x | x | x | x | x |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the NCARB
Stephen Parker FAIA, LEED®AP
Chairman Emeritus and Co-Founder
GRIMM + PARKER ARCHITECTS
11720 Beltsville Drive
Suite 600
Calverton, MD 20705
(240) 603-9014 mobile
sparker@gparch.com

Representing the ACSA
Ute Poerschke, Ph.D., LEED®AP
Associate Professor of Architecture
429 Stuckeman Family Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802-1425
(814) 865-4238
uxp10@psu.edu

Representing the AIAS
Maria Syed
33 Kinnaman Avenue
Washington, NJ 07882
(908) 249-3222
ms674@njit.edu

Representing the AIA
Gabriel Durand-Hollis, FAIA
Principal
Durand-Hollis Rupe Architects, Inc.
14603 Huebner Road, Building 18
San Antonio, TX 78230
(210) 308-0080
(210) 697-3309 fax
g.durandhollis@dhrarchitects.com

Non-voting Member
Paula McEvoy, FAIA, LEED FELLOW, LEED FACULTY
Co-director Sustainability
PERKINS + WILL
1315 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30300
(404) 443-7660
Paula.McEvoy@perkinswill.com
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