Georgia Institute of Technology
College of Architecture

Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture
Track I (non-preprofessional undergraduate degree + 108 graduate credit hours)
Track II (preprofessional undergraduate degree + 60 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
12 February 2014

Table of Contents

I.   Summary of Team Findings

1.   Team Comments & Visit Summary

The School of Architecture at Georgia Tech encompasses five distinct degree programs, a reflection of the school's multiple missions in undergraduate education, professional education, and advanced studies and research. In addition to the professional degree in architecture, the school offers degrees such as the Bachelor of Science in Architecture, the Master of Science with a major in architecture, the Master of Science in Urban Design, a dual M. Arch – MCRP, and a PhD with a major in architecture. Yet, at the heart of the school is the Master of Architecture. This professional degree program consists of approximately 55 students per academic year, split evenly between the 2-year and 3+ year curricular tracks.

The program has experienced noticeable milestones since the last accreditation visit. Most notable is the reorganization of the academic programs in the college to school-level units comparable to all other academic units in the Institute with each responsible for its own discipline-specific doctoral-level degrees and cross-disciplinary research programs. Parallel to the academic reorganization, the school experienced the appointment of a new dean to the College of Architecture and the opening of the renovated Hinman Research Building. Designated for use by the Master of Architecture students, the Hinman Research Building houses studios, computer labs, faculty offices, and jury space. In addition to directly addressing physical facility concerns raised by previous visiting teams, the Hinman Research Building project clearly demonstrates institutional support for the professional degree program.

While positive strides have been made in the administrative and physical context of the School of Architecture, the visiting team found three areas of specific concern.

1.   The program continues to suffer from a systemic lack of representation in female and minority faculty which is reflective of the student population, an observation made by previous NAAB visiting teams in 2002 and 2008. During the visit, students, faculty, and administration all directly noted the disparity in female and minority representation. While the lack of diversity is a shared concern of many at the school, college and institute, a vision for, or a commitment to, a path forward is unclear. Reliance on workshops, retreats, and general faculty recruitment and retention demonstrates a passive approach to a complex topic.

2.   The School of Architecture is involved in the intellectual, governance and social activities of the Institute; however, engagement with peer professional programs or institutional initiatives was not strongly evidenced. Georgia Tech's strategic vision, termed "Designing the Future," may provide a unique leadership opportunity for the School of Architecture within the Institute.

3.   The preprofessional degree program is not under review by the visiting team, yet it is important to note that declining enrollment at the undergraduate level presents a significant risk to the applicant pool for the M. Arch program. The visiting team acknowledges the critical importance of the Bachelor of Science in Architecture program in supporting the M. Arch degree. Nearly 30% of the current student enrollment in the professional program comes from the Georgia Tech undergraduate architecture program.

The team noted two exceptional opportunities for students, the school, and the institute. First, the financial support of an endowment affords a traveling studio for students to experience cultural diversity while studying advance wall systems. Second, the facilities of the School of Architecture are an extraordinary asset, especially the Hinman Research Building. Further, the Digital Fabrication Laboratory supports the advancement of existing connections with industry and allows notable leverage for the school and the institute.

2. **Conditions Not Met**
   I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity
   A.2 Design Thinking Skills
   A.4 Technical Documentation
   A.7 Use of Precedents
   A.8 Ordering System Skills
   B.3 Sustainability

3. **Causes of Concern**

   A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community

   The School of Architecture is involved in the intellectual, governance and social activities of the institute; however, engagement with peer professional programs or institutional initiatives was not strongly evidenced. Georgia Tech's strategic vision, termed "Designing the Future," may provide a unique leadership opportunity for the School of Architecture within the institute.
   (I.1.3.A)

4. **Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2008)**

   2004 Condition 8, Physical Resources: *The accredited degree program must provide the physical resources appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class; lecture and seminar space to accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space. The facilities must also be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and applicable building codes*

   Previous Team Report (2008): 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.

   2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is now met.

   With the completed renovation of the Hinman Research Building in 2011 additional studio space, student storage, pin-up areas, and faculty offices are now available for the Master of Architecture degree program.

The team also toured the College of Architecture Building, which houses administrative offices, undergraduate design studios, design jury spaces, lecture-style classrooms, computer labs, and faculty offices. Other facilities accommodated here include a branch of the Georgia Tech Library housing the architecture-related collections, exhibition gallery, design and model making workshops, and digital output/printing resources.

In addition, the team toured the Digital Fabrication Lab, which supports the school's initiative in digital design and fabrication and contains high-end equipment and project work space. The lab is located on the edge of campus.

Students, faculty and administration are all appreciative of the newly acquired additional space and facilities.

2004 Condition10, Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.*

Previous Team Report (2008): Relative to the number of students taught, the Program's financial resources have eroded since the 2002 Visit. Both the faculty and the administration of the Program express general concern that the quality of specific aspects of the Program is currently declining. This is most evidenced in the students' studio work, most likely the consequence of inexperience in technical mentoring, the result of less experienced, unlicensed faculty. As studio is the central element of architectural education, it is of considerable concern. Impacts on educational quality also may affect faculty morale and retention.

Some aspects of this result from widespread conditions at the Institute and are largely beyond the College's or Department's control. Program faculty raises have been very modest over this period (approximately 11%). The Program's dedicated budget has only increased by approximately 16% since the prior visit (some of this increase results from the recent establishment of an endowed chair).

In the context of the large enrollment increases that the Program has faced, such relatively static budgetary allocation proves problematic. Student growth has been much higher than faculty growth. The Program is currently holding at least one faculty line open in order to use the funds to pay part-time instructors. Part-time instructors' compensation is below both national norms of architecture programs in major cities and of competing regional programs as well. Faculty discussed recent erosions of general funds for expenditures in the department for a dedicated lecture series for the department, for the full funding of trips to professional conferences, and for exhibitions.

The President informed the Team that the financial resources coming to every College were proportional to the actual enrollment from two years prior to the current year. This suggests that the "bulge" which so stressed the physical and financial resources of the Program during the past two years should be substantially alleviated by next year assuming the dean assigns the architecture program its share of the increase. Between 2002 and 2008, the state's allocation increased 41.6%. The college of architecture's allocation increased only 36.6%, and the architecture program's allocation increased 17.8%, while enrollment increased 40% in 2004. As it significantly impacts this Program, adequate financial resources requires confirmation in the coming two years.

The Program has hired a Development Officer to develop a fundraising strategy and implement it as soon as possible. Coming from the world of non-profit arts programs, she appears confident in the potential to expand contributions to the Program.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This Condition is now met.

In June 2010 the SOA underwent a Focused Evaluation to address deficiencies noted in the previous team report. Based upon the SOA responses, the Focused Evaluation Team Report found the conditions to have been met. Also refer to I.2.4 herein.

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

Previous Team Report (2008): 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 for any project.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met.

The SOA has made progress on this criterion with a specific emphasis on building cost as evidenced in courses ARCH 6316 Practice of Architecture 2 and ARCH 6071 Design + Research 1 Studio. Also refer to SPC B7 for additional information.

2004 Criterion 13.26, Technical Documentation: Ability to *make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design*

Previous Team Report (2008): While specifications are briefly covered in the Professional Practice class, no evidence was found that any student in the Program was required or produced an outline specification.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion remains not met.

Specifications are only covered in the Professional Practice class and no evidence was found that students were required to produce a written outline specification. Also refer to SPC A4 herein.

2004 Criterion 13.28, Comprehensive Design: Ability to *produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability*

Previous Team Report (2008): 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.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met.

Comprehensive design was evidenced in ARCH 6052 Options 2 Studio Building Workshop.

II.   Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

Part One (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: The APR adequately reflects the history and mission of the institute as well as the School of Architecture. The program has shown adequate evidence to convey how the program has benefited the institution and how the institution has benefited the program.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:
- *Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff in all learning environments both traditional and non-traditional.*

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

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

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

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

[X] The program has not demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2014 Team Assessment: The SOA provides a positive and respectful learning environment. However, the program continues to suffer from a systemic lack of representation in minority and women faculty. Previous NAAB visiting teams, in 2002 and 2008, made the same observation.

Females make up 54% of the current student enrollment in the SOA, while the percentage of females in tenured or tenure-track positions is 14% (percentages were provided on page 8 of the APR). During the visit the students, faculty and administration directly noted the disparity in female and minority representation.

I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives: Programs must demonstrate through narrative and artifacts, how they respond to the following perspectives on architecture education. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently within the context of its history, mission, and culture and to further identify as part of its long-range planning activities how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. **Architectural Education and the Academic Community**. That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching.[1] In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: The faculty members of the school are involved in the intellectual, governance, and social activities of the institute by means of research, committee work, and lectures. The scholarship and research of a significant percentage of faculty members has been published. The faculty participates in scholarly conferences in several fields of study. The visiting team notes that the school, college and institute hold different views regarding the level of collaborative contribution made by the faculty to the institute as a whole.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: The students enrolled in the Master of Architecture comprise a diverse student body that is being trained to be equipped for practice in a global world. After the team's discussions with students, it is clear that they are respected and have the ability to become leaders within the academic setting and profession.

Collaboration is fostered within the School of Architecture between various graduating classes, ages, genders, and ethnic backgrounds. The strength of this program comes from within the diverse student body and varying pursuits of academic and educational interests. Georgia Tech's unique environment as a research university exposes graduate students to various traditional and nontraditional career paths.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: One of the two required courses in the Practice of Architecture devotes time to setting the context of the architect's public obligations as manifest in the legal

---

[1] See Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1990.

frameworks and regulatory controls. Each year, the executive director of the Georgia State Board of Architects and Interior Designers and an NCARB liaison participate in that course sequence in order to explain in detail the state registration process in Georgia and the reciprocity process nationally. Students are fully aware of the regulatory environment. Most students are enrolled in IDP before exiting school and fully engaged in preparations for employment and exam preparation as their next step to achieving licensure in the profession.

D. **Architectural Education and the Profession**. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to practice in a global economy; to recognize the impact of design on the environment; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to the multiple needs of a diversity of clients and diverse populations, as well as the needs of communities and; to contribute to the growth and development of the profession.

   [X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

   2014 Team Assessment: The SOA is supported by a strong professional community whose practices maintain both local and global reach. Students benefit from this support through lectures, visiting jurors, occasional co-op programs, and the engagement of adjunct professors in practice. It is clear through conversations with practitioners that the local professional community is willing to meaningfully engage in a significant way with the SOA.

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

   [X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

   2014 Team Assessment: The SOA contributes to the public good through its research efforts in the advanced Design + Research Studios. These studios extend beyond the limits of building perimeters to encompass the architecture of urban districts and infrastructure. In addition, the ARCH 6051, 1 and 2 Option Studios regularly conduct in-depth studies of expanded project sites including environmental, economic, and political issues and directly engages community groups, developers, and governmental agencies.

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: With the recent merger of the stand-alone Architecture program and PhD program in 2010, the SOA endeavored to establish and enact a common governance structure consisting of by-laws, a School of Architecture Faculty Advisory Committee, and School of Architecture Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee. The establishment of this new governance structure for the school coincides with strategic planning activities at both the institute and college levels.

As evidenced by pages 19–21 of the APR, the SOA has identified six distinct aims, which contribute to a multiplatform mission of teaching, research, and service.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:
- *How the program is progressing towards its mission.*
- *Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.*
- *Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.*
- *Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:*
  - *Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.*
  - *Individual course evaluations.*
  - *Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.*
  - *Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.*

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: The SOA participates in an extensive self-assessment procedure including internal curriculum reviews, biannual review of student outcomes, course-instructor surveys, student input and online assessment tracking systems, all of which are described on pages 25–30 of the APR. The school further solicits informal guidance from visiting critics and the Architectural Advisory Board, which consists of local alumni and practitioners.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:
- *Faculty & Staff:*
  o *An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions[2].*
  o *Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.*
  o *Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.*

[X] Human Resources (Faculty & Staff) are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The School of Architecture enrolls 309 students, approximately 109 of whom are in the NAAB-accredited Master of Architecture program. There are 28 full-time and 16 part-time faculty members based in the Master of Architecture program. Twenty faculty of the School of Architecture are tenured, 8 faculty members are on tenure-track appointments, and 16 faulty are on non-tenure-track appointments. Following is the breakdown by rank of faculty who teach in the Master of Architecture program: 9 full professors (tenured), 11 associate professors (tenured), 2 associate professors (non-tenured), and 6 assistant professors (tenure-track). Sixteen members of the faculty teaching in the Master of Architecture program are registered architects in the U.S. and 6 are registered in other jurisdictions. Of the 28 tenured or tenure-track faculty, 25 are male and 3 are female.

The student-to-faculty ratio in the Master of Architecture program as of spring 2014 is as follows:
• Design studios: 9 to 1
• Lecture courses: 53 to 1
• Seminar courses: 9 to 1

The school has appropriate faculty and staff resources to effectively complete its teaching, research, and service mission. The workloads of faculty members tend to be the traditional "2+2" model prevalent in most architecture programs nationally. For studio faculty, a full teaching load is one studio per semester and two lecture courses or seminar courses per academic year; for non-studio faculty, a full teaching load is two lecture or seminar courses per semester.

In addition to academic resources, the school has an office with staff, including a full-time student advisor. A full-time staff of the workshop and IT staff further support the students. The program has adequate staff to operate its various facilities and infrastructure/equipment.

---

[2] A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.

A professor is responsible for overseeing IDP for the Master of Architecture program. The same professor teaches the two-course sequence of Practice of Architecture. Matters of IDP education are integrated in that required course.

Faculty are encouraged and financially supported by the institute, college, and the school to pursue professional development opportunities, such as research leaves, conferences, and grants.

Faculty members, including tenure-track faculty members, have the option to apply for semester-long family leave programs (including a "tenure-track on hold option").

EEO/AA policies are available on the institute's website.

The procedures, policies and criteria for faculty reappointment, promotion and tenure are available on the institute's website.

The architecture program has documented personnel policies and has provided position descriptions for faculty, administrators, and staff.

The faculty and school's administration, as well as those at the college and institute levels, are appropriately stable, ensuring operations in the School of Architecture.

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

[X] Human Resources (Students) are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: Student admissions policies and procedures are well documented. Students are informed about the documentation of applications, admissions, and other procedures before enrollment in the degree program as well as during their studies. Students without an undergraduate 4-year degree in architecture from a US university are normally accepted for the full 3.5-year course of studies. Students with an undergraduate 4-year degree in architecture from a US university are normally accepted for a 2-year course of studies. The evaluation for advanced placement into the 2-year course of study is thorough. The Georgia Tech faculty with the respective expertise of the subject evaluates each course for which advanced standing is given.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:
- **Administrative Structure:** An accredited degree program must demonstrate it has a measure of administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm the program's ability to conform to the conditions for accreditation. Accredited programs are required to maintain an organizational chart describing the administrative structure of the program and position descriptions describing the responsibilities of the administrative staff.

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The administrative structure and governance is met as evidenced by the information provided in the APR and conversations with faculty and administration. The hierarchy of administration and leadership is evident within the program. The School of Architecture leadership is the school chair. The school chair is then supported by other administrative roles such as school associate chair, program coordinators and advisors.

The reorganization of the College of Architecture into schools helped to further structure the administrative roles by providing extra staff and faculty support. The governance is clearly divided into advising, administrative operations, curriculum coordination, and faculty committees.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: Faculty may participate in school governance through service on the Curriculum Committee; the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee; and the School Advisory Committee. Seats on those committees are filled by means of election. Seats on the following committees are filled through appointment by the chair: Faculty Search Committee and the Faculty Infrastructure Committee (equipment, software, library materials etc.).

At the college level there is an Advisory Committee with representatives from all schools; a Curriculum Committee with school representatives as well as members elected at large; a Diversity Committee with school representatives; an Information Technology Committee with school representatives; a Research Scholarship and Awards Committee with school representatives; and a Reappointment Promotion and Tenure Committee with school representatives and members elected at large.

Based on conversations with faculty during the visit, the faculty has the opportunity to participate in institute governance.

Based on conversations with staff and students during the visit, the staff and students have opportunities to participate in college/institute governance.

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

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: With the completed renovation of the Hinman Research Building in 2011, additional studio space, student storage, pin-up areas, and faculty offices are now available for the Master of Architecture degree program.

The team also toured the College of Architecture Building, which houses administrative offices, undergraduate design studios, design jury spaces and lecture-style classrooms, computer labs, and faculty offices. Other facilities accommodated in the building include a branch of the Georgia Tech

Library, which houses the architecture-related collections, an exhibition gallery, model-making workshops, and digital output/printing resources.

The team also toured the Digital Fabrication Lab, which supports the school's initiative in digital design and fabrication and features high-end equipment and project work space. The lab is located on the edge of campus.

Students, faculty, and administration are all appreciative of the newly acquired additional space and facilities.

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

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The SOA appears to be adequately funded to support student learning and achievement through public and private support. Evidence was found in the APR and through conversations with school and institutional administration.

One form of public funding is the application of differential tuition, which is solely used for the professional degree program. Differential tuition is a common funding mechanism for schools within the college and across the institute.

The SOA is also supported by private endowment funding streams, which account for nearly half of the total College of Architecture endowment. Specifically, the SOA benefits from the following philanthropic funds: a distinguished chair, a distinguished studio, a visiting scholars program, and a visiting critic/competition fund.

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

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

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The Architecture Library is conveniently housed in the College of Architecture and is the only official branch library on campus. The central library is located across the street, providing students and faculty convenient access to both collections. The Architecture Library supports teaching, learning, and research activities of faculty and students by offering services, collections, instruction, and outreach that are targeted to the five schools within the College of Architecture.

Maintaining these materials in a defined collection is a valuable asset to the architecture program.

PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

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

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

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

[X] Statistical reports were provided and provide the appropriate information

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this condition is met based on the information provided in the APR on pages 90–93.

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

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

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses *to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the* Focused

---

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

Evaluation Program Report *and* Focused Evaluation Team Report*, including appendices and addenda should also be included.*

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

2014 Team Assessment: Annual reports have been provided for 2009–2012. The Focused Evaluation Report has also been provided. A letter of "Certification of Statistical Data for the Architecture Program Report for the Georgia Institute of Technology" is included in the APR (p. 95).

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

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: Instructional faculty in the Master of Architecture program are adequately prepared and educated at universities in the United States and Europe. The faculty is involved in a wide range of research, scholarship, and creative work, and each faculty member's knowledge, expertise, and experience are principal factors in determining teaching assignment to promote student learning. The assessment of the visiting team is based on the APR, Appendix Two: Faculty Résumés, as well as the faculty exhibit, which reflects a suitable range of knowledge and breadth of faculty development and accomplishments since the most recent NAAB visit.

---

[4] The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW
The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

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

2014 Team Assessment: All of the policy documents listed in Appendix 3 are located in the team room.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE -- EDUCATIONAL REALMS & 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:
Architects must have the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This ability includes facility with the wider range of media used to think about architecture including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making. Students' learning aspirations include:

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The visiting team verified evidence of writing skills, in papers prepared as assignments for ARCH 6105 History of Architecture 1 (and across the curriculum). The team found the students to be verbally proficient.

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

[X] Not Met

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in support of this condition being met primarily in ARCH 6026 Core 2 Studio and across the curriculum in various courses.

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

[X] Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of an ability to write an outline specification was not found in any course work. Technically clear drawings and models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems and components appropriate for a building design are covered in ARCH 6230 Construction Technology 2 and upper-level studios.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The visiting team verified the abilities to effectively investigate information in architectural course work in the ARCH 6071 Design and Research Studio and also in course work for ARCH 6230 Construction Technology 2.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in support of this condition being met, as viewed in ARCH 6026 Core 2 Studio and across the other studios in the curriculum.

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

[X] Not Met

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

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

[X] Not Met

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

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.**

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 6105 History of Architecture I.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in support of this condition being met as seen in ARCH 6350 Architectural Theory 2.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Applied research was evident in the ARCH 6071 Design + Research 1 Studio.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: Core architectural design skills are deficient, especially in low-pass work.

The application of relevant information generated through systematic study and evaluation is often absent.

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

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Incorporating life safety systems.
- Integrating accessibility.
- Applying principles of sustainable design.

B. 1. **Pre-Design:** *Ability* **to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.**

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: All students prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project in ARCH 6350 Architectural Theory 1. The program included an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space, an analysis of site conditions, and a review of relevant laws and standards.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in support of this condition being met as viewed in ARCH 6026 Core 2 and ARCH 6052 Options 2 Studio Building Workshop.

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

[X] Not Met

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: ARCH 6052 Options 2 Studio taught in conjunction with ARCH 6230 covers site design, topography, vegetation and watershed in the development of a project design. Assignments are given in the lecture course and correspond to studio work specifically to site design in the studio course.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in support of this criterion being met as seen in course ARCH 6051 Options 1 Studio and across the curriculum.

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Comprehensive design is covered and demonstrated in ARCH 6052 Options 2 Studio Building Workshop.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: This criterion is met in ARCH 6316 Practice of Architecture 2 and also addressed in studio work.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in support of this criterion being met as seen in ARCH 3231 Environmental Systems + Design Integration 1.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 3241 Fundamentals of Structure.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 6229 Construction Tech 1 and ARCH 6230 Construction Tech 2.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 4231 Environmental Systems + Design Integration 2.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 4231 Environmental Systems + Design Integration 2.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: In summary, the supporting evidence found in Realm B components shows high-level comprehension of technical aspects. The work shows sufficient achievement and integration of the distinct components that comprise a building and site.

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

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 3251 Fundamentals of Structures and in other courses throughout the curriculum.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 6105 History of Architecture 1.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 6315 Practice of Architecture 1. In addition students are involved with clients, user groups, and public domains in many studio-based projects.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 6316 Practice of Architecture 2.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 6315 Practice of Architecture 1.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 6315 Practice of Architecture 1 and ARCH 6316 Practice of Architecture 2.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 6316 Practice of Architecture 2.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 6315 Practice of Architecture 1.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 6105 History of Architecture 1 and ARCH 6051 Options I Studio.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: Realm C focuses on the architect's responsibility as a leader, project manager, and community advocate. With the wealth of Atlanta's architecture firms, great opportunity exists for engagement with practicing design professionals.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, Georgia, is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) to offer bachelor's, master's and doctoral programs.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum*: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.*

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The School of Architecture offers the following NAAB-accredited program: Master of Architecture. The School of Architecture offers the Master of Architecture as the first professional degree in architecture in two tracks: a) two-year track (preprofessional degree in architecture + 60 credit hours required) and b) three-year track (non-preprofessional degree + 108 credit hours required).

The School of Architecture also offers a dual Master of Architecture & Master of City & Regional Planning (the Master of Architecture portion is a professional degree; the combined minimum credit hours, in addition to the preprofessional degree in architecture, for the dual degree is 99).

In addition, the School of Architecture offers the following non-NAAB-accredited degrees: Bachelor of Science in Architecture (preprofessional degree), Master of Science with a major in architecture (research degree), Master of Science in Urban Design (postprofessional degree); PhD with a major in architecture (research degree).

The assessment of the visiting team is based on the following source: APR, pp.107–114.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: This information is provided in the APR, pp.115–116. The process for the review and development of the curriculum is a multistep process. Individual faculty members or a group of faculty members initiate curricular matters. With the oversight of the school chair, curricular matters are subsequently brought to the review by the full faculty (including an approval by means of a school faculty meeting with quorum). Beyond the approval of the faculty of the School of Architecture, curricular

changes (e.g. new courses) are subject to a governance process customary at Georgia Tech (College Curriculum Committee, College Faculty Meeting, Institute Curriculum Committee).

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The visiting team was provided evidence, both in the APR (pp. 56–57; 117–119) and during the visit, that the evaluation process is thorough, as well as seriously and objectively undertaken.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The exact language that is found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, *Appendix 5* can be located on the School of Architecture's website.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:
    The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
    The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The NAAB Conditions and Procedures are available on the School of Architecture's website.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:
    www.ARCHCareers.org
    The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
    Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
    The Emerging Professional's Companion
    www.NCARB.org
    www.aia.org
    www.aias.org
    www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The referenced career development information is accessible through the School of Architecture's website.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:
        All Annual Reports, including the narrative
        All NAAB responses to the Annual Report

The final decision letter from the NAAB
The most recent APR
The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

These documents must be housed together and accessible to all. Programs are encouraged to make these documents available electronically from their websites.

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: All annual reports, NAAB responses, NAAB decision letter, the most recent APR, and the final edition of the most recent VTR are accessible on the School of Architecture's website through the accreditation web page.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Access to the School of Architecture's pass rates are accessible through the school's website. It links directly to the NCARB website results.

III.   Appendices:

1.   Program Information

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

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

Reference Georgia Institute of Technology, APR*,* pp. 1–2

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

Reference Georgia Institute of Technology, APR, pp. 2–4

C.   Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference Georgia Institute of Technology, APR, pp. 16–23

D.   Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference Georgia Institute of Technology, APR, pp. 24–30

2.   Conditions Met with Distinction
B9 Structural Systems
B10 Building Envelope Systems

3.   **The Visiting Team**

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
Kenneth E. Crabiel, AIA, CDT, LEED®AP
Associate
Cannon Design
1100 Clark Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63102
(314) 425-8701
(314) 598-7668 mobile
kcrabiel@cannondesign.com

Representing the ACSA
Markus Breitschmid, Ph.D., S.I.A., Chair
School of Architecture + Design
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
201 Cowgill Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0205
540-231-5254
540-231-9938
breitschmid@vt.edu

Representing the AIAS
Korey D. White, Assoc. AIA
1045 Clarkson Street, #301
Denver, CO 80218
(217) 242-3427
kdwhite2@gmail.com

Representing the NCARB
Ann Chaintreuil, FAIA
CJS Architects LLC
550 S. Ocean Blvd.
Suite 1108
Boca Raton, FL 33432
(561) 926-8385
(585) 244-1548 fax
achaintreuil@cjsarchitects.com

IV. **Report Signatures**

Respectfully Submitted,

Kenneth E. Crabiel, AIA, CDT, LEED®AP **Team Chair**	**Representing the AIA**

Markus Breitschmid, Ph.D., S.I.A **Team member**	**Representing the ACSA**

Korey D. White, Assoc. AIA **Team member**	**Representing the AIAS**

Ann Chaintreuil, FAIA **Team member**	**Representing the NCARB**