

# ***2023 Visiting Team Report***

University of Illinois at Urbana-  
Champaign  
School of Architecture

M.Arch.

Continuing Accreditation Visit  
April 3-5, 2023

The logo for the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) is displayed in large, bold, white, sans-serif capital letters. The letters are closely spaced, with the 'A's and 'B's having a distinctive, slightly irregular, blocky appearance.

National  
Architectural  
Accrediting  
Board, Inc.

## Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>I. Summary of Visit</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>III. Program Changes</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation</b>	<b>10</b>
1. Context and Mission	
2. Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession	
3. Program and Student Criteria	
4. Curricular Framework	
5. Resources	
6. Public Information	
<b>V. Appendices</b>	<b>36</b>
1. Conditions Met with Distinction	
2. Team SPC Matrix	
3. The Visiting Team	
<b>VI. Report Signatures</b>	<b>39</b>

## I. Summary of Visit

### a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The NAAB visiting team would like to thank Provost William Bernhard, Dean Kevin Hamilton, Director Francisco Rodriguez-Suarez, and the UIUC architecture program's faculty and students for their courtesies and their commitment to the principles of accreditation. The team extend special thanks to Program Director Tait Johnson and Associate Director of Academic Affairs David Isern for their patience and their diligent efforts in providing information and access to your academic community. Their efforts enabled the team's work before and during the visit, allowing the team to work proactively with the department to address questions and complete its tasks.

The team preceded the visit with a thorough exploration of the curriculum of the accredited degree program. Though the team could not be on site to appreciate the campus and this impressive architectural home, it enjoyed a glimpse of the life and energy of the place from a video tour. The meetings with engaged faculty, staff, and students allowed all to perceive a robust optimism. During the visit, the team sensed that the School of Architecture was in the midst of an intentional transformation, the results of which could not yet be fully measured.

The team followed a rigorous process of review and consensus to produce a report that will inform the NAAB board of your adherence to the accreditation conditions. The meetings over the course of two days were necessary to verify and clarify an understanding of the information in the materials that the team had been reviewing. The team greatly enjoyed candid conversations.

The team acknowledges the historic significance of the architecture program of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and the state of Illinois' leadership in establishing a licensing credential for architects. Although the disruptions of the pandemic came on top of some years of instability, the arrival of Distinguished Professor Rodriguez as a new Director in 2020 proved to be a turning point. His vision and ideas combined well with initiatives underway from faculty-led curricular renewal. The variety and vitality of studio options that have been developed is notable. The school has been able to overcome its geographic limitations, and to develop new horizons beyond Urbana-Champaign, but also beyond Chicago, and beyond Barcelona. The Illinois School of Architecture has truly gone global. In addition to enhancing the student experience, this positions them well in a university-level initiative to coordinate multiple investments in Chicago-based teaching and learning across the institution.

Of further note, the school has made substantial investments in building a more robust culture of equity and inclusion. The relatively newly appointed Associate Director of Student Services La Tanya Cobb provides consistent oversight and an administrative framework to partner with the faculty and students on the Social Justice, Equity, and Inclusion Committee, and to support students that may be experiencing some difficulties. Furthermore, Associate Director of Academic Affairs David Isern, also new to the school, has implemented a rubric-driven holistic admissions evaluation process that reduces some of the unintentional bias that can arise in ratings based on elements of the application, especially recommendation letters.

The faculty expressed strong appreciation of the unique qualities of the institution, its meaning as a site for architectural education, and their culture of service that makes it all work. They have made a resilient return from pandemic conditions, and were quick to praise the support that was generated for remote teaching. The team enjoyed hearing about the degree of devotion that senior faculty still have for the school, and also how they are supporting and welcoming new faculty members that bring fresh energy and new avenues of research and innovation. The team noted similar engagement of the staff members

that support faculty and students, and a ready willingness to do their best despite sometimes overwhelming demands.

Perhaps the most surprising and inspiring revelation from meeting with various groups and individuals that compose this community was to witness first-hand the energy and commitment that the leaders of your student organizations contribute to the life of the school. It was not difficult to connect their passion for leadership in augmenting academic excellence and professional development to the faculty that daily model commitment to those values. The school is building new strength through fostering connections with alumni, and it is evident your current student leaders will add to that pool significantly once they graduate.

Collectively, the team has substantial experience with accreditation visits, both on-site and with these virtual visits of the past two years. There are always important things learned that could not be conveyed through the bureaucratic framework and language of the Academic Program Report. But this visit stands out in the degree to which it provided an understanding not available in the APR. The team sincerely thanks everyone who has participated in these meetings for that.

b. Conditions with a Team Recommendation to the Board as Not Achieved (*list number and title*)

PC.2 Design

PC.4 History and Theory

PC.5 Research and Innovation

PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration

PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion

SC.2 Professional Practice

SC.3 Regulatory Context

SC.6 Building Integration

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, Inclusion

6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

(The site visit team recommended a finding of "not met" for this Condition following the exit meetings, and therefore the recommendation was not shared with the program at that time.)

6.5 Admissions and Advising

## II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

### 2014 Conditions Not Met

#### I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

*Finally, the program must document, through narrative and artifacts, its efforts to ensure that all members of the learning community: faculty, staff, and students are aware of these objectives*

*and are advised as to the expectations for ensuring they are met in all elements of the learning culture.*

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

[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.

**Previous Team Report (2015):** The team found evidence that the program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment as documented in the APR on pages 13 through 17. A Task Force, which was composed of an administrator, several faculty members, and a majority of the students, revised the school’s School Culture Policy, which was adopted in May 2010. Cornerstones of that policy are respect, sharing, engagement, innovation, communication, and academic excellence across the program’s community. The policy has been broadly shared through digital and print media, posted within the program’s facilities, and included in the orientation week program given to incoming graduate students. Further revisions to the School Culture Policy were made in 2011 and 2014 in concert with other policy revisions being undertaken by the program. These revisions have been shared, as noted above.

The team found evidence that the program has not demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich learning environment relative to maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students. A Diversity Plan was developed by a committee whose members included faculty, students, and staff, and it was adopted in May 2000. The plan embraces five major principles that are to be activated through nine initiatives as described on page 18 of the APR. The plan is distributed digitally through the program’s website. The undergraduate and graduate student enrollment figures provided on pages 97 and 98 of the APR illustrated that diversity decreased between fall 2007 and fall 2012. The ethnic diversity of the faculty has not increased as illustrated through examination of the faculty diversity figures reported in the 2009 APR relative to those reported in the 2013 Annual Report on page 100 of this APR. These figures illustrate that faculty gender diversity has increased by a small percentage, as the number of female faculty has remained unchanged while the total number of faculty has decreased. Additional information for 2014/2015, provided at the request of the visiting team, indicated that the percentage of tenure track female faculty campus wide is 34.2% compared to the Architecture unit’s 23.3%. These additional figures reflected multiple years in which the Architecture unit’s faculty diversity has been below that of the campus as a whole. The visiting team inquired about specific implementation plans—in addition to the eight Director’s Scholarships and the NOMA-sponsored symposium, which both occurred in 2014—to activate the initiatives described on page 18 of the APR. No additional specific actions or plans were described in response to this inquiry, nor was additional documentation about the plans provided.

**2020 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.6 Comprehensive Design. In

addition, the program did not provide the faculty diversity plan as requested for I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity.

**2023 Team Analysis:** The program's response lists four items: a new staff position, Director of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, has been created; a Justice and Equity Task Force including faculty, students, and staff appears to now have become a standing committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion headed by Prof. Kathryn Anthony, a scholar of architecture's inequities; new faculty hires of Director Rodriguez-Suarez have made progress in faculty diversity, which was verified by comparing the 2016 and 2020 Annual Statistical Reports; and guest speakers and events of the past several years have brought diverse perspectives to the culture of the school. At the assistant Professor rank there has been noticeable improvement in faculty diversity, and there is an active Learning and Teaching Culture Policy on the School website. This 2014 condition appears to now be Met.

**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:*
  - o *Solicitation of faculty's, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning, and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.*
  - o *Individual course evaluations.*
  - o *Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.*
  - o *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.*

**Previous Team Report (2015):** The team found evidence that the program **has not demonstrated** that its processes meet Condition I.1.5 as documented in the APR on pages 27 through 34. The program has defined its objectives and assessed its challenges. While the program's Curriculum Committee members include students to assist in the evaluation of courses, few other inputs appear to be utilized. The campus-wide Instructor and Course Evaluation System (ICES), the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL), the "Teachers Ranked as Excellent by their Students" list, and the Chancellor's Senior Survey are available inputs that can be used, but there is no evidence that they are regularly consulted. The student meetings with the director and the "Quipit" forums that include students and faculty, which are held periodically throughout the academic year, are additional opportunities for input, but there does not appear to be any documentation of these discussions that can be referenced in the assessment process. There is no discussion in the APR of regular, documented input to the assessment process from practitioners or alumni. No specific implementation plan with milestones is used to evaluate progress toward achieving the program's goals or the many changes that it currently has underway. See also Causes of Concern, A., listed above.

**2020 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.6 Comprehensive Design. In addition, the program did not provide the faculty diversity plan as requested for I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity.

**2023 Team Analysis:** As of the Board of Director's 2020 review of the program's 5-year Interim report, the program demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies previously identified.

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

**Previous Team Report (2015):** The visiting team found that the A.4 Technical Documentation criterion is Not Met through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in either Arch 475 or Arch 573 as noted on the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

**2020 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.6 Comprehensive Design. In addition, the program did not provide the faculty diversity plan as requested for I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity.

**2023 Team Analysis:** As of the Board of Director's 2020 review of the program's 5-year Interim report, the program demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies previously identified.

**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 (2015):** The visiting team found that the A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture criterion is Not Met in Arch 577, Arch 573, Arch 475, or Arch 210 as noted on the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. A review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work **provided did not** demonstrate that the traditions and culture of either the Eastern or the Southern hemisphere was addressed.

**2020 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.6 Comprehensive Design. In addition, the program did not provide the faculty diversity plan as requested for I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity.

**2023 Team Analysis:** As of the Board of Director's 2020 review of the program's 5-year Interim report, the program demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies previously identified.

**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.

**Previous Team Report (2015):** The visiting team found evidence that the B.1 Pre-Design criterion is **Not Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binder for Arch 572. Some student work did illustrate that students acquired these skills as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. In response to the team's request for additional evidence, the program indicated that not all

graduate students were required to enroll in Arch 572. Perhaps as few as 85% of the students were enrolled in this course.

**2020 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.6 Comprehensive Design. In addition, the program did not provide the faculty diversity plan as requested for I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity.

**2023 Team Analysis:** The program response in the 2022 APR references a 2017 response, which was made irrelevant by the 2020 IPR Review. The relevant criterion in the 2020 Conditions now applicable is SC.5. Coursework from ARCH 575 Integrated Architectural Design Studio is provided for that student criterion, and the team has found SC.5 to be Met.

**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 (2015):** The visiting team found evidence that the B.2 Accessibility criterion is **Not Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 573 and Arch 475 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. In addition, evidence was not found in studio courses Arch 571, Arch 572, and Arch 574. Evidence in student drawings was inconsistent in demonstrating that accessibility and inclusive design issues are consciously or critically addressed in students' design solutions. This SPC was also **Not Met** in the 2009 accreditation cycle.

**2020 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.6 Comprehensive Design. In addition, the program did not provide the faculty diversity plan as requested for I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity.

**2023 Team Analysis:** The program response in the 2022 APR references a 2017 response, which was made irrelevant by the 2020 IPR Review. The relevant criterion in the 2020 Conditions now applicable is SC.5. Coursework from ARCH 575 Integrated Architectural Design Studio is provided for that student criterion, and the team has found SC.5 to be Met.

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

**Previous Team Report (2015):** The visiting team found evidence that the B.5 Life Safety criterion is **Not Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for courses Arch 573 and Arch 475 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. In addition, evidence was not found in studio courses Arch 571, Arch 572, and Arch 574. Evidence in student drawings was inconsistent in demonstrating that life-safety provisions, including door swings, exit stair layouts, areas of refuge, fire sprinklers, and fire rated assemblies, are often considered in the studio courses.

**2020 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.6 Comprehensive Design. In



addition, the program did not provide the faculty diversity plan as requested for I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity.

**2023 Team Analysis:** The program response in the 2022 APR references a 2017 response, which was made irrelevant by the 2020 IPR Review. The relevant criterion in the 2020 Conditions now applicable is SC.6. Coursework from ARCH 575 Integrated Architectural Design Studio is provided for that criterion, and the team has found SC.6 to be Not Met.

**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 |
| B.5. Life Safety             |                            |

**Previous Team Report (2015):** The visiting team found evidence that the B.6 Comprehensive Design criterion is **Not Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 573 and Arch 475 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. In addition, evidence was not found in studio courses Arch 571, Arch 572, and Arch 574. A number of the underlying SPCs required of this SPC were **Not Met** as noted, resulting in student drawings that were inconsistent in demonstrating that these design issues are consciously or critically addressed. This SPC was also **Not Met** in the 2009 accreditation cycle.

**2020 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide sufficient evidence for the following SPC: B.1 Pre-Design, B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.6 Comprehensive Design. In addition, the program did not provide the faculty diversity plan as requested for I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity.

**2023 Team Analysis:** The program states that the learning objectives for comprehensive design were moved in a 2018 curricular adjustment to ARCH 575 Integrative Architectural Design Studio. However, the criterion was still "not met" in the 2020 IPR Review.

The relevant criteria in the 2020 Conditions now applicable are now SC.5 and SC.6. The elements of B.1 Pre-Design are now part of SC.5, which was found to be Met by work from ARCH 575 Integrated Architectural Design Studio. B.2 Accessibility, B.5 Life Safety, and B.6 Comprehensive Design are now part of SC.6, which was found to be Not Met. See the 2023 Team Analysis of SC.6 for further details.

The faculty diversity plan required by the 2014 condition I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity, found still lacking in the 2020 IPR, has been superseded by numerous initiatives and actions since the arrival of Director Rodriguez-Suarez. Faculty hires since then and an additional four now underway are showing real progress for diversifying the faculty. Adjunct faculty and visiting practitioners are all bringing greater diversity to the school. Instead of a plan, the school now has a committee charged with ongoing improvements in the school's cultural diversity. This deficiency has now been Met.

### III. Program Changes

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

**2023 Team Analysis:** In response to the 2020 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, the School of Architecture established a new NAAB/Assessment Committee charged with addressing the self-assessment requirements of the new conditions. The committee created and administered new surveys for continuing students and an exit survey for graduating seniors. They also began collecting and analyzing some existing institutional data. At the time of writing the APR, the committee was preparing to implement a plan in Fall 2022 for collection and analysis of new kinds of data needed to adequately report on student learning outcomes. The full plan will take two years to include assessment of all coursework that fulfills NAAB criteria. The first cycle was aimed at studio courses only.

At the same time, the Curriculum Committee began a process of developing program-level student learning outcomes. These are in turn correlated with individual courses and the NAAB PCs and SCs. The full implementation of an “assessment protocol” was expected to take two years; when completed it will provide a baseline for ongoing continuous improvement. Further details are provided in the APR Section 5.2 Planning and Assessment. Syllabi provided in the digital team room have not yet reflected coordinated student learning outcomes described in Section 5.2.

### IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

#### 1—Context and Mission (*Guidelines, p. 5*)

To help the NAAB and the visiting team understand the specific circumstances of the school, the program must describe the following:

- The institutional context and geographic setting (public or private, urban or rural, size, etc.), and how the program’s mission and culture influence its architecture pedagogy and impact its development. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the mission of the college or university and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program’s role in and relationship to its academic context and university community, including how the program benefits—and benefits from—its institutional setting and how the program as a unit and/or its individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university’s academic plan. Also describe how the program, as a unit, develops multidisciplinary relationships and leverages unique opportunities in the institution and the community.
- The ways in which the program encourages students and faculty to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective opportunities (e.g., field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities).

#### Described

**2023 Team Analysis:** The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), the state’s flagship institution of higher learning, was founded in 1867 and is one of the original land-grant institutions. Located in a rural community with a population of 180,000 persons in Central Illinois, the university has an enrollment of more than 56,000 students. UIUC is a Carnegie research-intensive university and has been ranked as the #15 Public University and the #47 National University by *U.S. News & World Report*. The architecture program is the oldest public school of architecture in the United States and this year is celebrating the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of graduating its first architecture student (1873). Since 1931 the School of Architecture has been housed in the College of Fine and Applied Arts, with an enrollment of 1786 undergraduates and 630 graduate students. Urbana-Champaign is within a 180-mile radius of three major cities, including Chicago—an important architecture center.

The School of Architecture takes advantage of being part of a major research university by promoting interdisciplinary collaborations and offering joint graduate degrees in areas such as urban planning (M.Arch + MUP), structures and structural engineering (M.Arch + M.S. & M.Arch + M.S.C.E.), and construction management (M.Arch + M.S.C.E.). The program also offers graduate study concentrations in Health & Wellbeing, Building Performance, Detail & Fabrication, and Urbanism, and participates actively in community and regional design projects.

The School of Architecture takes advantage of its proximity to Chicago where it is building a network of notable alumni and offering firm-sponsored studios each semester. These provide students an opportunity to engage directly with problems encountered in major cities and international settings. Graduate students can also engage in urban issues in exchange programs with institutions in Munich and Stockholm.

## **2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession** (*Guidelines, p. 6*)

The program must report on how it responds to the following values, all of which affect the education and development of architects. The response to each value must also identify how the program will continue to address these values as part of its long-range planning. These values are foundational, not exhaustive.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Described**

### **2023 Team Analysis:**

**Design:** As found in the APR, the program responds to design throughout the four curricular Program Areas: Building Performance, Urbanism, Detail and Fabrication, and Health and Wellbeing. Within these areas students engage in urbanism, research, social and environmental responsibility, equity, and culture

through a broad diversity in studios. Throughout the studios, the program emphasizes critical, conceptual, and analytical thinking as the foundation for future ethical professionals. The ongoing assessment process examines the continuity of design values and outcomes to ensure alignment with the program's long-range planning.

**Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility:** The Program Areas integrate environmental and socio-political aspects of the built environment throughout the student's coursework, crafting an inductive and holistic structure when approaching the intersection of human/non-human subjects and architectural media. Students work with faculty members recognized for their expertise in sustainable construction, education, and scholarship. The program depicts stewardship as an integrated aspect of building - imperative to society and functioning alongside social, environmental, and economic factors. Such convictions are assessed by several committees comprising both faculty and students, helping guide the program's intentions concerning environmental stewardship and professional responsibility, currently focused on technological advancements, the intersection of health and the built environment, societal and historical re-examination, global warming, and the demands of an increasingly urban population.

**Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion:** In the past three years, the school has endeavored to expand initiatives to increase equity across the breadth of race, ethnicity, gender, and abilities within the school. The program acknowledges these efforts are neither sufficient nor complete. Efforts taken towards addressing its culture include the hiring of new director Francisco Rodrigues-Suarez FAIA, who initiated four steps including a Justice and Equity Task Force for ongoing improvement. Statistical evidence supports growing diversity among the school's student population. The school has responded to its NOMAS chapter's requests to improve the climate at the school and is responsive to the ongoing fundamental agenda on racial equity within the culture and curriculum.

**Knowledge and Innovation:** Knowledge and Innovation value areas align with the five Program Areas of the School of Architecture. These are Building Performance, Detail & Fabrication, Health & Wellbeing, Urbanism, and the recently added History & Theory. The faculty and staff have been recognized through awards, publications, and leadership roles within professional and scholarly organizations. This is further encouraged by the establishment of the position of Associate Director for Research, which provides resources and opportunities for the exchange of salient information and practices. Greater levels of input to studio instruction from practicing alumni in firm-sponsored studios keeps the curriculum focused on changing conditions and challenges for architecture.

**Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement:** This shared value has two focus areas; to focus on strategic interactions with the profession and to apply architectural inquiry to civic and community life. In addition, students practice leadership skills in student organizations, in production of the school journal, the *Ricker Report*, and through a generous number of teaching assistantships. Many one-time events and lectures highlight architects' accomplishments and impact through leadership. The teaching assistantships provide renewal as the courses that students are assigned to are themselves subject to review and revision on a regular cycle.

**Lifelong Learning:** The program instills the value of lifelong learning through the promotion of a "growth and innovative mindset" requiring commitment, efficiency, intentional choices, and focus. It offers a variety of learning opportunities that demonstrate the breadth of the profession: five Program Area concentrations, a certificate program for students and professionals, and joint degrees focused on structures and construction. Continuous integration of theory and practice is inherent to the lecture series, colloquia, and various summer programs. The maintenance and evolution of programs that bring professionals and other guests into the school and that offer students a variety of experiences beyond the classroom is a priority of the strategic plan.

### **3—Program and Student Criteria** (*Guidelines, p. 9*)

These criteria seek to evaluate the outcomes of architecture programs and student work within their unique institutional, regional, national, international, and professional contexts, while encouraging innovative approaches to architecture education and professional preparation.

#### **3.1 Program Criteria (PC)** (*Guidelines, p. 9*)

A program must demonstrate how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address the following criteria.

**PC.1 Career Paths**—How the program ensures that students understand the paths to becoming licensed as an architect in the United States and the range of available career opportunities that utilize the discipline’s skills and knowledge. (*p.9*)

**Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

*Narrative:* As described within the APR, the Program Areas reflect possible career aspirations through concentration on developing a particular expertise. A full view of career paths in the profession is found in ARCH 501 Professional Practice (a required course), which outlines firm structure & management, portfolio development, traditional and non-traditional practices, and discussion of future trends in the profession. An annual Career XPO is voluntary, but also offers opportunities for interviews with professional firms.

*Assessment:* Supporting materials include the ARCH 501 syllabus (with assignments and grading criteria), an optional Chicago Studio that is located within architectural firms (currently Kahler Slater & Gensler) and offer real life mentoring opportunities. Optional events also include a lecture series and events sponsored by student organizations that support professional skill development.

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

**Not Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

*Narrative:* As described in the APR, all students in the M.Arch. program take ARCH 575 Integrative Design Studio. Topics in ARCH 575 include structures, systems, environment, assembly, sustainability, codes and regulations; the course encourages critical thinking and skillful communication through representation throughout the studio. Additionally, students are required to take three design options studios (ARCH 57X) which are centered on projects that relate directly to one of four of the Program Areas: building performance, health and wellbeing, detail and fabrication, and urbanism. Location-themed studios also provide students with supplemental experience in community engagement, urban scales, and international cultures depending on the options they select.

*Assessment:* External reviewers and selected faculty used an evaluation survey to assess the student work in ARCH 575 and the option studios of Fall 2022, but the survey did not address PC.2. Within the assessment folder provided in the virtual team room, the team was not able to find assessment related to PC.2 Design nor any evidence indicating the frequency or response to assessment of this criterion. Supplemental information provided from the program indicates that the Assessment Committee aims to deploy assessment surveys for all courses that contribute to the PC/SC matrix in the 2023-2024 academic year. Without this evidence of assessment, this criterion is Not Met.

**PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility**—How the program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to

mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities. (p.9)

**Met**

### 2023 Team Analysis:

*Narrative:* The APR points to the content and student work outcomes of ARCH 575 Integrative Design Studio and ARCH 537 Architectural Control Systems. The program stresses energy use analysis, daylighting, acoustics, and its impact on human wellbeing. (These courses show little content with regard to topography, water management and conservation, and flora and fauna.) ARCH 594 Special Problems in Building Performance involves greater understanding of technology and performance but is an elective course. ARCH 593 Design and Construction Futures stands out as a series of lectures and student exercises in addressing change over many professional and ecological areas (artificial intelligence, new technologies, climate issues, human wellbeing, etc.).

*Assessment:* Supporting materials include quizzes in ARCH 537 and final projects in ARCH 575. Invited reviewers rated the two Fall 2022 ARCH 575 studios at 73% & 60% of projects meeting this PC. The APR response provides no discussion of benchmarks for this PC, however, because this first cycle of assessment of SC.5 did capture a systematic review of student outcomes specific to this PC, the team found this criterion to be Met.

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

**Not Met**

### 2023 Team Analysis:

*Narrative:* The primary coursework for PC.4 consists of ARCH 517 Architectural History 1850 - Present and ARCH 577 Architectural Theory. The learning objectives of both syllabi are appropriate to PC.4. The history course covers many social, economic, and technological factors in the development of modernism in Europe and North America. The second half reviews late- and post-modernism, and the last four weeks focus on modernism as it was adopted in other cultural contexts—Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The theory course is thematically organized around topics with relevance in the 20th and 21st centuries. The sources are almost entirely Western; but themes include race, gender, and vernacular and indigenous space among standard theory topics such as functionalism, rationalism, ornament, etc. Between the two courses, the diversity of content was judged to be sufficient.

These core courses are supplemented by elective seminars with a variety of topics based on faculty research. However, electives are not required for all students. The resources of the Ricker Library assist students in pursuit of individual research topics. In addition to coursework, the lecture series offers wide exposure to historical and theoretical research and arguments. Travel studios offer immersion in cultural contexts with historical and contemporary dimensions.

*Assessment:* Recent actions described by the APR include making History and Theory a Program Area in order to provide a structure for regular curricular review. But there is not yet any evidence of assessment relevant to this criterion—non-studio courses are due to start in the second cycle of the program's assessment plan. Without assessment evidence, this criterion is Not Met.

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

**Not Met**

### 2023 Team Analysis:

*Narrative:* The university places a high priority on faculty research productivity, and architecture faculty are encouraged to use their research focus in coursework within the appropriate Program Area and in optional studios. Students then benefit directly from the innovative outcomes of the faculty research, and from faculty engagement in national and international networks in their specialization. The APR cites three of the eleven courses shown in the matrix for this PC. The required ARCH 593 Design and Construction Futures provides students with the broadest view of innovation in the profession through speculation on the future of design and construction practice. The learning objectives for ARCH 593 are consistent with this PC. Other courses contribute a variety of in-depth experiences, but their specific content is changeable from year to year.

There are also more focused elective courses such as ARCH 576 High Performance and Design and ARCH 571 Design: Detail and Architectonics and Design Studio Options that contribute content on current research and its innovative applications in design. Coursework is supplemented by selected student engagement in two faculty research labs and exposure to the annual Building Performance Symposium. Also contributing are the information resources and the computing and fabrication capacity of the program.

*Assessment:* While assessment of student learning is not yet available, the APR notes an annual symposium and Program Area research agendas that provide a form of consistent updating and renewal of topics. There is not yet any evidence of assessment relevant to this criterion—non-studio courses are due to start self-assessment by instructor in the second cycle of the program’s assessment plan. Without assessment evidence, this criterion is Not Met.

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

**Not Met**

### 2023 Team Analysis:

*Narrative:* According to the PC/SC matrix, required courses that convey an understanding of the need for leadership and collaboration in real-world design and construction processes are ARCH 536 Planning and Design of Structural Systems and ARCH 501 Professional Practice. ARCH 536 does not list leadership or collaboration among the student learning outcomes, nor is it evident in the course description or schedule. ARCH 501 enumerates many student learning outcomes and their measures but does not put leadership and collaboration among them. In a separate section, PC.6 is listed, but not tied to any particular content or assignment.

The APR response to this PC focuses on studios with revolving content. In many of the studios, students work with one or more partners to accomplish the research, design, and production that the studio requires. Some of the studios, and therefore the student teams, are interdisciplinary. The program has a tradition of emphasis on community and civic engagement. Students in these studios rely on community partners to understand the context and problems being addressed—sometimes client/user groups, sometimes public agencies. Firm-sponsored studios are exposed to the array of complex project client groups, stakeholders, and interest groups that are integral to the firm’s work. They witness the balance of leadership and collaboration of the architect first-hand, and in some cases students have one-to-one mentors within the firm. These are all valuable for demonstrating the functions of leadership and collaboration in design problem-solving, but they may need a more intentional position in the curriculum to be adequately assessed.

Some students practice leadership skills in student organizations, in production of the school journal, the *Ricker Report*, and through a generous number of teaching assistantships. Many one-time events and lectures highlight architects’ accomplishments and impact through leadership.

*Assessment:* There is not yet any evidence of assessment relevant to this criterion. Without assessment evidence, this criterion is Not Met.

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

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

*Narrative:* Engagement, respect, and collaboration are apparent in the program’s curricular and extracurricular offerings, all of which emphasize faculty-student engagement and relations. This was verified during the team visit. Both the Curriculum and the Student Advisory Committees allow students to have their voices heard within the department (verified within student and faculty meetings). And such mechanisms further operate under the program’s continually reassessed Statement of Anti-racism and Diversity, and the school’s Statement of Diversity, Equity, and Respect.

The school further engages in narratives of respect and collaboration within the architectural discipline through its offered studio coursework. For example, Arch 574 “Plym Studio: Analog Studio” partners with students from UIUC and the University of Johannesburg GSA to emphasize the “invaluable and nuanced differences reflected in our individual motivations, spatial histories, experiences, and desires” through process rather than product. This level of collaboration is expanded to include the profession within Arch 57X “Kahler Slater Studio” which connects UIUC with the University of Milwaukee and Wisconsin, allowing students to work alongside practitioners and students of other states.

Student organizations focus on engaging students and faculty through their programming. Organizations such as NOMAS, the Gargoyle Honor Society, and the Society for Business Management in Architecture partner with faculty and professionals to host symposia, workshops, and events catered to the academic, social, and professional development of their student cohorts.

This criterion has been designated as being Met with Distinction given the college’s engaged and ambitious student body and dedication to engaging with global narratives and voices. The visiting team has noted the student organizations to be remarkably involved in changes at the department level through its organized committees and engaged student body.

*Assessment:* The assessment regarding this criterion resides within the school’s statement of Anti-Racism and Diversity (<https://arch.illinois.edu/about/statements/>). Updated by the DEI Committee every year on Martin Luther King Day, this document assesses and tracks the institution’s response to the goals and demands put forth by its DEI Committee to further expand the perspectives present within its institution and decrease disparities on campus. Such assessments have diversified the representation within lecture series, final reviews, career fairs, collaboration efforts, conference attendance, and student and faculty recruitment practices.

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

**Not Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

*Narrative:* the APR describes social equity and inclusion as a core tenet of the program. Numerous courses in the curriculum and a variety of optional studios foreground various identities and cultures, as well as understanding culture-specific needs in a designed environment. Studios ARCH 571 and ARCH



574 have included focuses on topics ranging from collaborations with Native American communities, barrier-free and universal design, inclusion of transient populations, refugees, and designing for cultures and contexts in Puerto Rico, Nigeria, and Buenos Aires.

Electives that address this criterion as a central theme include ARCH/GWS 424 Gender and Race in Contemporary Architecture, which calls attention to the work of women architects and architects of color, and ARCH 576 Architectural Design Seminar: Black Square to Black Reason, which explores the role of media in architecture imagery.

Required courses that have some content that raises awareness of cultural differences include ARCH 517 Architectural History 1850-Present, which includes a unit on modernism in the Global South and Eurasia, and ARCH 577 Architectural Theory, which contains lectures and readings related to race and gender, and urban and rural conditions.

Outside of the curriculum, the program has taken steps to further supplemental experiences, such as the lecture series. Various student organizations provide an affinity group to students that are not part of the school's dominant culture, including ARCH China, Global Architecture Brigades (GAB), Hispanic Organization of Urban Studies and the Environment (HOUSE), National Organization of Minority Architecture Students (NOMAS), Women in Architecture (WIA), and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee. These groups also help to raise awareness of significant architectural contributions.

*Assessment:* While some courses listed above and noted in the APR have been assessed for other criteria, there was no evidence provided that they have been assessed in regard to PC.8, therefore, there is no approach to curricular improvement in response. Without assessment evidence, this criterion is Not Met.

### **3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes** (*Guidelines, p. 10*)

A program must demonstrate how it addresses the following criteria through program curricula and other experiences, with an emphasis on the articulation of learning objectives and assessment.

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

**Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

*Narrative:* The School has placed a high emphasis on this criterion, such that it “should be a central offering, not a tangential elective”. The program has a Health and Wellbeing Program Area (one of five Program Areas). The APR indicates that all graduate level studio options apply these HSW concepts, which are evaluated by mid-term and final design reviews which include many external reviewers. Descriptions of studio emphasis include human experience design, sustainable design, urban design (cities), building accessibility, life safety & environmental stewardship. ARCH 575 Integrated Architectural Design Studio is the single required studio that all M.Arch. students take. The required course ARCH 536 Planning and Design of Structural Systems provided evidence in Handout 2 that the building code use of construction type to determine height and area limits was explained, although student learning on this topic does not appear to have been tested in the course.

*Assessment:* Invited faculty reviewers assessed this criterion at 69% successful across all studios. Individual studio assessment varied from 45% to 90%. Supporting materials are vague and do not show evidence of how the individual concepts noted within the criteria and narrative are emphasized or addressed within the projects. For example, there is no mention of zoning or building codes mentioned in syllabi or lectures. However, the two sections of the required studio, ARCH 575 were rated at 79% and 60%. Since this gives a basis for improvement, the criterion was found to be Met.

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

**Not Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

*Narrative:* The program addresses professional ethics, conduct of professional practice, legal aspects, and business practices such as management, marketing, contract administration, and financial planning in the curriculum for ARCH 501 Architectural Practice. ARCH 536 Planning and Design of Structural Systems emphasizes occupant comfort as well as structures that are safe and meet appropriate codes and regulations. ARCH 593 Design and Construction Futures reflects on the regulatory, ethical, and economic implications of the future.

*Assessment:* End of semester assessment of this criterion is overseen by the curriculum committee in coordination with the program's NAAB Assessment Committee, faculty of these courses, and invited outside reviewers. An assessment matrix was provided in the virtual team room noting assessment will be undertaken Spring 2023. Without assessment evidence, this criterion is Not Met.

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

**Not Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

*Narrative:* The School “imbeds knowledge of and reaction to regulatory contexts” within classwork and studio projects. The program encourages students to be properly trained in current standards, but also to understand the limits of the regulatory processes and when they should be questioned by professionals. The APR indicates understanding of legal responsibility through ARCH 501 Professional Practice, and a limited understanding of standards and codes through ARCH 536 Planning and Design of Structural Systems, both of which are required courses. The application of this understanding is expected in all the graduate design studios. There is inconsistent evidence of constraints arising from land use regulations or building code references in assignments or projects reviewed.

*Assessment:* Invited faculty studio reviewers assess the student's understanding of this criteria at an overall success range of 62% to 74% across all studios assessed. Individual studios varied between 40% to 90%. Supporting materials, including course syllabi and studio syllabi were quite varied. ARCH 571 (Kapp studio) explored Historic preservation standards, ARCH 574 (Chasco studio) noted fire exits, circulation and accessibility & ARCH 574 (Armstrong studio) noted zoning and building code regulations within student requirements. Syllabi of other studios did not mention regulatory requirements. This suggests an inconsistent approach to this criterion, which could enable students to not be given a thorough understanding of these regulatory issues. Although there was assessment data provided, its dramatic variance was not addressed, nor was there evidence of recommendations that would lead to improvement; therefore, the criterion was found to be Not Met.

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

**Met**

### 2023 Team Analysis:

*Narrative:* To respond to the ever-changing technological advancements in the profession, the student learning outcomes of this criterion are integrated in four required courses and currently assessed in one of these. ARCH 536 Planning and Design of Structural Systems address structural systems, materials, and methods/technologies as well as how the systems are selected relevant to cost and scheduling. ARCH 537 Architectural Control Systems investigates building thermal environments and envelope design. This course specifically addresses heating and cooling loads, energy calculations, primary and secondary mechanical systems, indoor air quality, energy, lighting and daylighting, building envelope systems. ARCH 575 Integrative Design Studio requires the graphic representation of the structural, envelope, and environmental systems. ARCH 593 Design and Construction Futures addresses research of emerging technologies and social, political, economic, technological, and ecological contexts.

In addition, one studio option, ARCH 573 Design: Technology and Performance focuses on integration of structure, enclosure, and technology in building materials, systems, sustainability, and construction. However, only self-selected students would have benefitted from this particular studio.

*Assessment:* As part of the Fall 2022 assessment process, ARCH 575 was assessed for SC.4, where 66% of students met this criterion. This data was provided within the virtual team room. A benchmark of 70% has been set for the next assessment cycle of AY 2023-2024. The Fall 2022 assessment process included identifying which courses and learning objectives contributed to each PC/SC. During the final reviews, invited reviewers were asked to complete surveys to which studio projects met SC criteria. Instructors also assessed their studio's work using the same survey. Three randomly selected graduate studio faculty also reviewed the work of three other studios. The results of the surveys were tabulated and presented as a percentage. A plan for improvement in the assessment process has been established. The curriculum committee will deploy recommended curriculum changes in the future based on assessment feedback. Therefore, this criterion is found to be Met.

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

Met

### 2023 Team Analysis:

*Narrative:* The program cites numerous elective design studios, but the syllabi for these courses do not have a uniform requirement for meeting SC.5 in total. The course that is most central to meeting this criterion is ARCH 575 Integrative Architectural Design. This course is taught by a variety of instructors; there were two sections in Fall 2022, and their syllabi were provided in the digital team room. (However, there are projects in the student work file for three different 575 studios.) Neither of the syllabi provided reference SC.5 or its basic elements as learning objectives. One references the C realm of the 2014 Conditions, and the other references SC.6 only. However, the work demonstrated reasonable consistency in demonstrating all components of SC.5.

*Assessment:* The program's assessment produced results by survey that yielded user requirements 70% & 100% met, site conditions 87% & 70% met, regulatory requirements 42% & 70% met, accessible design 63% & 60% met, and measurable environmental impacts 70% & 50% met. The strengths and weaknesses were in relative agreement with the team's review of the student work, although the team's scale was somewhat more positive. Due to a clear assessment that was exceeded by the student work, the team found this SC to be Met.

**SC.6 Building Integration**—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and

assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance. (p. 12)

**Not Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

*Narrative:* The program describes ARCH 575 Integrative Architectural Design as follows: Schematic design and development of a public building focusing on the integration of environmental, structural, and building envelope systems, while also addressing issues of accessibility, life safety, environmental stewardship, and site conditions. Syllabi from various instructors assigned to teach this course in different quarters vary not only in the project that is used, but also in the description of learning outcomes. While the assessment tool, a reviewer survey, is based on the components of criterion SC.6, the work produced in one of the two studios represented was graded according to: precedent and typology studies, concept and schematic design, and overall work and thinking process (Belanger Studio, Fall 2022). The inconsistency of learning objectives, instructor evaluation of student outcomes, and program assessment does not verify the program narrative's claim that "this work requires clear understanding of each system, how they are implemented, and how they work together to achieve desired outcomes."

*Assessment:* The program's assessment produced results by survey that yielded building envelope systems and assemblies 73% & 70% met, structural systems 63% & 30% met, environmental control systems 63% & 30% met, life safety systems 70% & 50% met, and measurable outcomes of building performance 60% & 50% met. The team findings were generally of a lower scale, though not quantified. The team found consistent absences or gaps in the demonstration of complete building envelope systems from foundation to roof; a lack of integration of envelope systems and assemblies with the structural system, and gaps in acknowledgement of how the facade impacts environmental conditions of interior spaces. Technical information given was often focused on details not shown in the context of adjacent elements or the whole, and it relied on drawings that needed labels and/or a written description to demonstrate a complete understanding. Application and integration of life safety requirements was inconsistent. Due to these deficiencies in the particular projects that the team was given access to, the team found that the evidence did not support the program's assessment. Furthermore, the program's assessment has not yet yielded recommendations or actions to improve student outcomes. For these reasons, the team found this SC to be Not Met.

**4—Curricular Framework** (*Guidelines, p. 13*)

This condition addresses the institution's regional accreditation and the program's degree nomenclature, credit-hour and curricular requirements, and the process used to evaluate student preparatory work.

**4.1 Institutional Accreditation** (*Guidelines, p. 13*)

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

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

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The institutional accreditation was confirmed by a December 18, 2020 letter from the Higher Learning Commission to Dr. Robert Jones, Chancellor informing him of the continued accreditation status until the

---

next reaffirmation in 2029-2030. The letter was located in the digital team room in a folder named "Response to APR RFI."

#### 4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum (*Guidelines, p. 13*)

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

- 4.2.1 **Professional Studies.** Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program are the core of a professional degree program that leads to licensure. Knowledge from these courses is used to satisfy Condition 3—Program and Student Criteria. The degree program has the flexibility to add additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. In its documentation, the program must clearly indicate which professional courses are required for all students. (*p.13*)
- 4.2.2 **General Studies.** An important component of architecture education, general studies provide basic knowledge and methodologies of the humanities, fine arts, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences. Programs must document how students earning an accredited degree achieve a broad, interdisciplinary understanding of human knowledge. In most cases, the general studies requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution's baccalaureate degree. Graduate programs must describe and document the criteria and process used to evaluate applicants' prior academic experience relative to this requirement. Programs accepting transfers from other institutions must document the criteria and process used to ensure that the general education requirement was covered at another institution. (*p.14*)
- 4.2.3 **Optional Studies.** All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum to allow students to develop additional expertise, either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking courses offered within the department offering the accredited program but outside the required professional studies curriculum. These courses may be configured in a variety of curricular structures, including elective offerings, concentrations, certificate programs, and minors. (*p.14*)

NAAB-accredited professional degree programs have the exclusive right to use the B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. titles, which are recognized by the public as accredited degrees and therefore may not be used by non-accredited programs.

The number of credit hours for each degree is outlined below. All accredited programs must conform to minimum credit-hour requirements established by the institution's regional accreditor.

- 4.2.4 **Bachelor of Architecture.** The B. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 150 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in general studies, professional studies, and optional studies, all of which are delivered or accounted for (either by transfer or articulation) by the institution that will grant the degree. Programs must document the required professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.
- 4.2.5 **Master of Architecture.** The M. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate coursework and a minimum of 30 semester credits of graduate coursework. Programs must document the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for both the undergraduate and graduate degrees.
- 4.2.6 **Doctor of Architecture.** The D. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 210 credits, or the

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

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

**4.2.1:** The Illinois School of Architecture offers two tracks for the NAAB accredited M. Arch degree program. One requires a pre-professional degree + 62 graduate credit hours for students holding a pre-professional Bachelor of Science in Architecture or equivalent. The other, designed for students with a bachelor's degree in a different field or an architecture major not equivalent to UIUC's Bachelor of Science in Architecture, requires the undergraduate degree + 119 credit hours (65 pre-requisite hours + 54 graduate credit hours). They are referred to as *Master of Architecture (M.Arch.)*, and *Master of Architecture 2+(M.Arch. 2+)*, respectively. The "2+" designation for what is often called a 3-year track acknowledges its ambiguity—there is a personalized program for each student that may in fact result in different lengths of time required to complete the degree.

The program listed required core courses for each track in the APR and provided links to the courses required for both tracks at these URLs:

Master of Architecture: <https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/graduate-degrees/master-of-architecture/>

Master of Architecture 2+: <https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/graduate-degrees/master-of-architecture-2-plus/>

**4.2.2:** The undergraduate Bachelor of Science in Architecture Studies (BSAS) program within the Illinois School of Architecture requires 42-44 hours of general education which is established by the University Senate Committee on Educational Policy. These general education requirements course topics are: Humanities and Arts, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Natural Sciences and Technology, Quantitative Reasoning, Composition/writing, and Cultural Studies. These courses are taken as a part of the BSAS curriculum that creates a foundation for future architects. There is no minimum number of general studies required by the institutional accreditor. The graduate program accepts transfer students with 24 credits of general studies and outlined the process for evaluating transfer students into the program in meetings during the visit; see the "Assessing Admission—UIUC ISoA Grad Programs" document in the Response to APR RFI folder in the digital team room.

**4.2.3:** Within the school, students can explore focus areas in Building Performance, Health and Wellbeing, Urbanism, and Detail and Fabrication, or their own focus through courses within the school or college. Students are encouraged to select a concentration in conjunction with their academic advisor. The M. Arch program requires 16 hours of elective courses and the M.Arch 2+ requires 9, which allow students to take courses outside the department and school. There are also opportunities for students to enroll in joint degrees including Master of Urban Planning, M.S. Civil and Environmental Engineering, Construction Management, and M.S. in Structures.

**4.2.4:** Not Applicable

**4.2.5:** The program provided the required chart on pages 81-85 in the APR documenting the courses and credits required to fulfill the minimum of 168 semester credit hours of combined undergraduate coursework and minimum 30 semester credits of graduate coursework including professional studies

courses, elective professional studies courses, required number of credits for general studies and optional studies, and total credits.

#### 4.2.6: Not Applicable

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

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

- 4.3.1 A program must document its process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria when it admits a student to the professional degree program.
- 4.3.2 In the event a program relies on the preparatory education experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain accreditation criteria, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these accreditation criteria are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- 4.3.3 A program must demonstrate that it has clearly articulated the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content in the admissions process, and that a candidate understands the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program before accepting an offer of admission.

**Met**

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

The initial intake and review of applicants is handled by the UIUC Graduate College for meeting the University's minimum requirements for undergraduate studies: 3.0 GPA, bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, and language proficiency (Graduate Admissions Minimum Requirements Policy, <https://grad.illinois.edu/admissions/apply/requirements>). The program provides the Graduate College with further program-specific requirements for initial screening for the 2-year track: a pre-professional degree consisting of at least 24 cr. general studies, 36 cr. design studios, 15 cr. building and system performance courses, 6 cr. architecture history courses, 6 cr. additional architecture courses, and other electives. These specifics were provided to the team in a document titled "Assessing Admission—UIUC ISoA Grad Programs" which is used by the program to instruct the Grad College Admissions office, but which is not available on the website. Applicants with other undergraduate degrees or those not meeting all of the pre-professional requirements are considered for the 2+ track.

Applications are then forwarded to the program, where a committee of two or three faculty members use a rubric with 8 criteria to rate on a 1 to 5 scale. The detailed rubric is provided in the APR (p. 88), but is not publicly available. This holistic evaluation was first used in Spring 2022; it is widely acknowledged that such holistic review favors the admittance of a more diverse cohort. The school website states that the admission process is based on the items required (i.e. portfolio, letters of recommendation, previous academic work, etc.) but the criteria that are defined by the new evaluation rubric are not listed.

The team did not see individual student files in a way that allowed direct comparison, but they did see the records of several applicants and how the data is assembled in a comprehensive spreadsheet. The rigor of the review process demonstrated on-site outweighed the fact that a second tier of detail in the process was not fully described. The team deferred that issue to Condition 6, Public Information.

**4.3.1:** There is no evidence of evaluation of an applicant's prior academic coursework with respect to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria. Therefore, the team's evaluation of the program treated all undergraduate coursework as "preparatory," (the program representative called them "leveling courses") with no specific contribution to meeting accreditation criteria.

**4.3.2:** Not applicable; although the matrix provided to the team indicates contribution of undergraduate coursework to the NAAB criteria, there was no evidence of evaluation on this basis. Therefore the team concluded that the program meets the criteria in full in the required courses of the 2-year track that every M.Arch. student takes.

**4.3.3:** It is clear to applicants that placement can vary depending on undergraduate coursework. Holders of pre-professional degrees equivalent to the one at UIUC are admitted to the 2-year track. Placement for those not meeting the undergraduate requirements is determined on a case-by-case basis: “Students develop an individualized curriculum in consultation with their advisor, resulting in a program that varies in length from two-and-a-half to four years. Upon completion of requisite background course work, M. Arch 2+ students follow the M. Arch program of study.” (<https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/graduate-degrees/master-of-architecture-2-plus/>)

The coordinator of the M.Arch. 2+ track was not available for the meeting on this topic; the team was told by the Associate Director for Academic Affairs that it is a small number of applicants annually (approx.. 18), and the team was also assured that applicants receive the determination of placement before their decision to matriculate is due. It was observed that while this approach may intend to give applicants every possible benefit of previous coursework, such individualized placement in the 2+ track can lead to perceptions of differential treatments.

## 5—Resources

### 5.1 Structure and Governance (*Guidelines, p. 18*)

The program must describe the administrative and governance processes that provide for organizational continuity, clarity, and fairness and allow for improvement and change.

- 5.1.1 **Administrative Structure:** Describe the administrative structure and identify key personnel in the program and school, college, and institution.
- 5.1.2 **Governance:** Describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures and how these structures relate to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

#### Described

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

**5.1.1** The administrative structure and personnel were described. The School of Architecture is one of seven academic units within the College of Fine and Applied Arts. The college provides centralized administrative support for Academic Affairs, International Programs, Admissions and Recruitment, Diversity Equity and Inclusion, Business Services, Communication, Marketing, and Advancement, and Career Services. The Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Fine Arts report to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the University of Illinois Urbana Champaign. This was confirmed by the team in site visit meetings.

The Director of the School of Architecture is assisted in administrative matters by Associate Directors for Academic Affairs, Student Services, Research and Faculty Development, and Advancement. Assistance in management of the programs and curricula is distributed to faculty chairs of five Program Areas in Urbana-Champaign; there are also directors that manage the Barcelona Program (undergraduate only) and the Chicago Studio.

**5.1.2** The School of Architecture relies on committees made up of tenured and tenure track faculty; some may also include non-tenured teaching faculty, adjunct faculty, visiting faculty, emeritus faculty, and students. The Executive Committee and the Faculty Grievance Committee have unique roles, one to support the Director, the other to support faculty members independent of the Director if needed. There are 12 standing committees responsible for Curriculum, Tenure Review, Awards, Admissions, Student



Concerns, DEI and Exhibits, etc. (APR, p. 94) These committees report to the Program Area Chairs, the Executive Committee and the Director as appropriate. This was confirmed by the visiting team in site visit meetings. Some faculty members also serve in college-level and university-level committees.

## **5.2 Planning and Assessment (*Guidelines, p. 18*)**

The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies:

- 5.2.1 The program's multiyear strategic objectives, including the requirement to meet the NAAB Conditions, as part of the larger institutional strategic planning and assessment efforts.
- 5.2.2 Key performance indicators used by the unit and the institution.
- 5.2.3 How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated multiyear objectives.
- 5.2.4 Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program as it strives to continuously improve learning outcomes and opportunities.
- 5.2.5 Ongoing outside input from others, including practitioners.

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

### **Demonstrated**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

**5.2.1** The APR (p. 98) describes the school's three-year strategic plan, "Building the Future: 2022-2025". This plan was developed with guidance from the College based on their strategic priorities. External reviewer recommendations from a review that took place in 2020 were also taken into consideration; they focused on recruitment, branding and marketing, alumni relations, curricular integration, research initiatives, and human/financial resources. Undergraduate curricular development has been underway to provide a better foundation for students to meet NAAB requirements when they transition into the M.Arch. program. The strategic priorities of the school are: promoting strategic interactions with the profession and stakeholders; sustaining and facilitating a culture of curiosity and discovery; expanding and redefining the discipline by ensuring access through who and how they teach; and applying architectural inquiry to all civic and community life. The Program Areas within the school act on this plan by contributing to the curriculum and participating in the development of learning outcomes, assessment metrics, and progress towards meeting NAAB requirements.

**5.2.2** Twelve key performance indicators are noted in the APR (p. 99-100) and are reviewed annually. The performance indicators reflect typical metrics of higher education institutions such as student retention, graduation rates, funding, awards, outreach, research, diversity, technology, and tuition.

**5.2.3** The School's administration and the Program Area faculty groups contribute to facilitation and implementation of actions and initiatives that contribute to progress toward the multi-year objectives and mission as stated in the APR and confirmed during the visit. The Administration structure is approved by the Executive Committee and assists in the process of accomplishing multi-year objectives in 18 ways that are outlined in the APR (p.101). Four Program Areas address the curricular and strategic plan for the school as described in the APR (p. 102-103).

**5.2.4** The program has identified a list of their strengths in the APR (pp. 103-106) including history and prominence of the school, proximity to major urban hubs in the region, extensive alumni network, faculty leaders, and administration structure redesign. The challenges the program has noted range from state budgets, rising tuition costs, recruiting, and geographic difficulties. Opportunities identified align with the "Building the Future: 2022-2025" strategic plan. Opportunities include improving rankings, addressing climate change and environmental design directly in the curriculum, increasing enrollment, and improving faculty cohesiveness.

**5.2.5** The program receives outside input as a part of their assessment process. The process also aligns with the campus strategic goal of ensuring excellence in the academic programs. Ongoing outside

feedback is requested from over 150 invited professionals and academics who review courses and studios as well as collective assessment of the school.

In 2021, the school went through a comprehensive assessment from External Reviewers, which identified five recommendations which are provided in the APR. These recommendations were used to establish goals for the NAAB Assessment Committee, the Program Area Chair Committee, and the Curriculum Committee.

### **5.3 Curricular Development** (*Guidelines, p. 19*)

The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for assessing its curriculum and making adjustments based on the outcome of the assessment. The program must identify:

- 5.3.1 The relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including NAAB program and student criteria.
- 5.3.2 The roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

### **Demonstrated**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

A new M.Arch. curriculum was adopted in 2016-17; the major changes involved the design studio sequence and the professional practice courses. The studios were revised to allow flexibility in addressing changing social issues. It also allowed a variety of frameworks such as professional firm partnership, community engagement, and geographic outreach. Professional practice course content was diversified to include expanded models of practice beyond the twentieth century corporate norm. Annual review of aspects of the curriculum by the Curriculum Committee, with input from the School Director, has provided guidance for improvements in particular courses or course sequences. Five years later the school conducted comprehensive internal and external reviews, and once again diversified studio options. At this time, the school also reduced studio courses to meeting twice a week.

**5.3.1:** The APR (p. 110-111) reports on the annual work of the standing Curriculum Committee for five consecutive academic years and describes many course revisions that the committee has recommended. Many of the actions are in response to problems or new conditions that have been identified, or else are seeking better coordination within a Program Area. Program Area goals were reviewed to provide a larger framework, approved in 2021-2022. Discussion included adjustments to address the new program and student criteria of the NAAB Conditions. The school also conducted a university mandated comprehensive self-assessment in 2020 and a subsequent external review in 2021. These activities yielded actionable results for the curriculum.

**5.3.2:** The Curriculum Committee has the primary responsibility to review and revise courses and curricula based on faculty and outside reviewers' responses to end-of-semester reviews. Other input comes from: the NAAB/Assessment Committee; ongoing faculty discussions and faculty retreats; individual instructors who identify learning objectives and self-assess their courses; Program Area chairs that oversee course alignment and coordination issues and the correspondence of learning objectives to outcomes. All of these efforts are guided by the goals of meeting M.Arch. program learning outcomes and NAAB Criteria. Ongoing and rigorous examination and response to curricular issues was verified in various meetings during the virtual site visit.

### **5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development** (*Guidelines, p. 19*)

The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate and adequately funded human resources to support student learning and achievement. Human resources include full- and part-time instructional

faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. The program must:

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

**☒ Not Demonstrated**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

**5.4.1** According to the APR, the program promotes a balance of 40% teaching, 30% research & 30% service for tenure-time faculty, whereas other full-time faculty, such as Specialized Faculty, have a distribution of 60% teaching, 20% research, 20% service. The team found that some perceptions differed in amounts, but the general truth that all faculty have responsibilities in these realms that accord with their mutual endeavor to meet their educational mission was fully embraced. The APR provides a list of faculty activities, publications, and awards as evidence of their capacity to be productive in research while engaged as expected with teaching and service.

**5.4.2** The program desires to have an Architect Licensing Advisor and is expecting a new hire that will have this responsibility. While a faculty member has filled this role in a temporary capacity, no one is listed on the NCARB directory. More importantly, the team could not verify that students were aware of this resource.

**5.4.3** The program has multiple funding sources for faculty to travel, attend conferences, and pursue individualized professional development opportunities. These opportunities contribute to collaboration within the program's faculty and students. This was demonstrated and verified in site discussions.

**5.4.4** The program provides students with academic advising for undergraduates and graduate students, including architectural career guidance through program advisors, career expos, and mentorship. The university provides counseling in numerous areas for student well-being, including mental health, minority student issues, wellness, international student issues and cultural issues. This was demonstrated and verified in site visit discussions with students.

**5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (*Guidelines, p. 20*)**

The program must demonstrate its commitment to diversity and inclusion among current and prospective faculty, staff, and students. The program must:

- 5.5.1 Describe how this commitment is reflected in the distribution of its human, physical, and financial resources.
- 5.5.2 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's faculty and staff demographics with that of the program's students and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.
- 5.5.3 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its students since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's student demographics with that of the institution and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.

- 5.5.4 Document what institutional, college, or program policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other social equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.
- 5.5.5 Describe the resources and procedures in place to provide adaptive environments and effective strategies to support faculty, staff, and students with different physical and/or mental abilities.

**Not Demonstrated**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

**5.5.1** Physical, human, and financial resources are foundational to the four core points of EDI for the program: teaching, research, public engagement activities, and ongoing support for diverse groups of students and alumni. Under each of these four core points, the APR describes ways in which human, physical, and financial resources are distributed.

**5.5.2** The school has established guiding principles for maintaining diversity amongst faculty and staff. These principles focus on retaining a more diverse faculty, teaching a more diverse curriculum, and increasing diversity among reviewers. While there is no explicit plan on how to increase the diversity of faculty, the program fully acknowledges the need to increase representation of women and minority groups among tenure and tenure track faculty and expresses a need for change to tenure and tenure-track ranks from the College and University level to increase and replenish faculty.

The APR did not include faculty demographics or the required comparison to student demographics which were provided in 5.5.3. The team therefore asked for the annual reports required by NAAB and made the following comparison:

According to the 2022 Annual Statistical Report, there was a male to female faculty ratio of 30:11, or 73% male | 27% female as compared to the M.Arch student male to female ratio of 88:168, 34% male | 66% female. The faculty is 51% White, 22% Hispanic/Latino, 17% Asian, 5% Nonresident alien, 2.5% American Indian or Alaska Native, and 2.5% Black or African American. Comparatively, the student population is 39% Nonresident alien, 30% Asian, 21% White, 7% Hispanic/Latino, 1% Black or African American, 1% American Indian or Alaska Native, and 1% Two or more races.

**5.5.3** The program has established six points to maintain and increase diversity amongst the student body. These points include emphasizing diversity in promotional materials, recruiting a more diverse student body, retaining diversity in the student body, stressing diversity in extracurricular activities, soliciting awards for underrepresented students, and making the NOMAS symposium a centerpiece of the school. Current student demographic data was provided, but no comparison data to the institution as a whole was able to be ascertained by the team.

**5.5.4** The University's Office for Access and Equity (OEA) has an EEO and AA division. The EEO investigates complaints of staff, faculty, student employees, or third party violations of the Nondiscrimination Policy or Sexual Misconduct Policy. The AA division administers campus recruitment and appointment as well as offering workshops on inclusive practices. This information was found in the APR and online at University's OEA website (<https://oae.illinois.edu/>). Title IX Sexual Harassment allegations are governed by the Procedures for Addressing Title IX Sexual Harassment Complaints. The Office for Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR) investigates complaints against students or student organizations.

In January 2021, the College of Fine and Applied Arts appointed Professor Rochelle Sennet to Associate Dean for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. The Dean for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion works with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to ensure the College is following the best research-based practices. In Fall 2021, the school appointed La Tanya Cobb as the Associate Director for Student Affairs and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. She previously led the school's DEI

committee which works with faculty, staff, student leaders, and NOMAS and developed the school's statements on Anti-Racism and Diversity. Additionally, the school has a Culture Policy to promote a learning environment for all students to succeed.

**5.5.5** Faculty are required to place the Accommodation Policy for students with special needs in their syllabi as outlined in on the Division of Disability Resources and Educational Services (DRES) website. The ADA is taught in most studios and is a part of the Integrative Design Studios. All buildings have accessible entrances and classroom furniture, such as desks and tables are wheelchair friendly. The Technology Services Help Desk is an available resource for faculty, staff, or students with disability needs for classroom technology support.

## **5.6 Physical Resources** (*Guidelines, p. 21*)

The program must describe its physical resources and demonstrate how they safely and equitably support the program's pedagogical approach and student and faculty achievement. Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

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

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

### **Demonstrated**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

**5.6.1:** Studio-based learning is instantiated through the following provisions:

- 14 graduate studio rooms (Capacity: ~220 students)
- 7 Dedicated review spaces (Capacity: 262 students)
- A photo studio
- A spray booth room
- Gallery Space (Capacity: 90 students)

The program has adopted a "cold desk" approach, where students have their own dedicated workstation within their chosen studio. During the review process, students present either within their studio, a dedicated review space, or Temple Hoyne Buell Hall's atrium. The team verified there to be no issues concerning spaces dedicated to studio-based learning.

**5.6.2:** Didactic and interactive learning is instantiated through the following provisions:

- 2 lecture halls (178 students)
- 1 auditorium (214 students)
- 2 seminar rooms (32 Students)
- TBH Cafe
- 2 Computer Labs (80 Students)
- 2 Fabrication Classrooms (40 students)
- Equipment Seen in plans and video (Housing scanners and printers)

Most classrooms are under the control of the school and are adapted to meet the shifting needs of the school's curriculum (pin-up space, reviews, faculty/ student organizing). The university controls larger classrooms and most lecture halls, which may be reserved by request.

**5.6.3:** Faculty roles and responsibilities are supported through the following provisions:

- Preparation and teaching room

- 36 private faculty offices
- 5 shared adjunct faculty research labs
- 7-8 specialized research labs

Tenure, tenure-track, and specialized faculty have dedicated private offices where advising, mentoring, and research may take place. Fabrication Shops and Digital Labs are also offered to support their research efforts and serve as an extension for their teaching and mentorship. Faculty and students are encouraged to meet across the school's offered facilities yet can meet within a private office for discussions necessitating a formal environment. The school has further converted a set of classrooms into a faculty lounge and mail room.

The APR states the following specialized labs to be in development.

- The "Annex Robotic Lab," dedicated to robotics.
- The "DigiShop at the Annex, DITA lab, and iCraft," dedicated to digital fabrication.
- The "ArchArchive," is dedicated to the preservation.
- The "Responsive Architecture Lab," dedicated to simulation.

**5.6.4:** The team verified that current spaces in Urbana-Champaign are adequate for learning formats and pedagogies in use. The school also has an established "Chicago Studio" to further engage its urban presence. The space (1800 square feet large) houses the studio and Booth Hansen Architects, offering a shared gallery, pin-up and review areas, and 16 dedicated workstations for students. To fulfill other academic obligations, students take coursework virtually and within Chicago. The majority live in the Chicago area during the semester, and few opt to commute between Champaign and the city two days per week. The team verified, via student and faculty interviews, there to be no significant nor immediate concerns regarding the physical resources offered at the Chicago studio.

### **5.7 Financial Resources** (*Guidelines, p. 21*)

The program must demonstrate that it has the appropriate institutional support and financial resources to support student learning and achievement during the next term of accreditation.

**Demonstrated**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

The program response takes the form of a series of tables with line items given values for the past three years and the proposed budget for the following year (FY23 at the time of writing). Though ICR and self-supporting fees dipped in the pandemic, the total budget was very stable. Salaries for the period are also stable, except for "Student hourly," which reasonably plummeted in the pandemic but has not fully recovered. Discretionary spending was cut in half during the pandemic, and the savings was added back in the following year. Scholarships and awards are also very stable. It is notable that the department allocates an almost equivalent amount annually to fund 45-50 student assistants, which are given tuition waivers and stipends.

The program is aware that state demographics indicate fewer high school graduates in the State of Illinois will push applications and admissions downward in the next five years. They are preparing to expand the reach of their recruitment activities to attract and ultimately support a greater number of international students.

### **5.8 Information Resources** (*Guidelines, p. 22*)

The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient and equitable access to **architecture** literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in architecture.

---

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

**Demonstrated**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The Ricker Library is one of the 37 Unit Libraries which compose the institution's collection of literature and research materials. In its totality, the Institution's library system holds "9 million microforms, 120,000 serials, 148,000 audio recordings, over 930,000 audiovisual materials, over 280,000 electronic books, 12,000 films, and 650,000 maps," which are also digitally available, 24/7, within the I-Share catalog. The library also provides study tables, computer terminals, scanners, microfilm readers/printers, and photocopiers for its student body.

The library's collection is comprised of main library stacks and a rare book room, ranging from "highly scholarly and technical work" for its Ph.D. and graduate students to introductory and popular material often found at the undergraduate level. The library, located on the second floor of the Architecture Building, holds 65,000 volumes (35,000 architectural subjects). Other contents include rare architectural treatises, books selected to support instruction and research, and foreign texts. The library also receives 99 percent of the titles on the core list of architectural periodicals published by the Association of Architectural School Librarians. Several Licenses further grant student and faculty access to Literature Indices, such as the Avery Index, IBA/BHA, Grove's Dictionary of Art, DAAI, and JSTOR. The team verified, through virtual interviews, that the faculty, staff, and students regard the collection highly, citing the library as a noteworthy, accessible resource for their scholarship and research. Access extends to the rest of Illinois by adopting the Interlibrary Loan system to access literature held at other University Libraries within the state.

The library is headed by Emily Matthews, who is cited to help with "more complex queries" beyond research strategies development and assistance. The team noted during the visit that librarians seem understaffed concerning their responsibilities, seemingly having two librarians to aid the students within the institution's undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral curricula. The librarians are involved in selecting literature and covering research topics for the student body and are available for virtual research consultations by appointment. The primary service the library offers is a reference help desk, which is open every day of the week for more than 8 hours a day. 1,200 architecture listings are added to the collection annually, where collection development statements follow the research and curricular needs of faculty and students.

This evidence was cited in the APR (p.141-144) and confirmed in meetings with faculty and staff during the virtual visit.

**6—Public Information**

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

**6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees** (*Guidelines, p. 23*)

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*, Appendix 2, in catalogs and promotional media, including the program's website.

**Not Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The required statement was found on the program website: <https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/accreditation/>

However, the required statement does not appear in the program listing in the Graduate Catalogue of UIUC: <http://catalog.illinois.edu/graduate/faa/architecture-march/#text>

Therefore, this condition was found to be not met.

**6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures (*Guidelines, p. 23*)**

The program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program's website:

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

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The required links to NAAB Conditions and Procedures are present and active on the school's website: <https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/accreditation/>

**6.3 Access to Career Development Information (*Guidelines, p. 23*)**

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that help them develop, evaluate, and implement career, education, and employment plans.

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program describes their career development and placement services on their website at the following URL: <https://arch.illinois.edu/about/careers-in-architecture/>

Through student and faculty meetings, the visiting team verified that students have access to career development and placement services through efforts put forth by both student organizations and the ISoA. Student organizations such as the Gargoyle Honor Society, the AIAS, NOMAS, and SBMA provide services such as portfolio reviews, resume workshops, and mock interviews to prepare their cohort for their post-academic careers, further inviting professionals to help guide students on paths to licensure and tangential career paths through select workshops and colloquia. At an administration level, The ISoA's Architecture Career Services center further exposes students to post-academic opportunities through "soliciting and publicizing job openings for students and graduates, facilitating on-campus interviews between prospective employers and our students, organizing the annual Career Expo, and providing resume and job search assistance."

**6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents (*Guidelines, p. 23*)**

To promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program's website:

- a) All Interim Progress Reports and narratives of Program Annual Reports submitted since the last team visit



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

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The team verified the following:

All Interim Progress Reports and narratives of Program Annual Reports submitted since the last team visit  
<https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/accreditation>

All NAAB responses to any Plan to Correct (not applicable) and any NAAB responses to the Program Annual Reports since the last team visit.  
<https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/accreditation>

The most recent decision letter from the NAAB  
<https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/accreditation/>

The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit.  
<https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/accreditation/>

The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda.  
<https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/accreditation/>

The program's optional response to the Visiting Team Report (part of the Visiting Team Report)  
<https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/accreditation/>

NCARB ARE pass rates—via a link to NCARB for all accredited programs.  
<https://www.ncarb.org/pass-the-are/pass-rates/are5-pass-rates-school>

Statements and/or policies on learning and teaching culture  
<https://arch.illinois.edu/culture/studio-life/>

Statements and/or policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion  
<https://arch.illinois.edu/about/statements/>

**6.5 Admissions and Advising (*Guidelines*, p. 24)**

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

- k) Application forms and instructions
- l) Admissions requirements; admissions-decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (when required); and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing
- m) Forms and a description of the process for evaluating the content of a non-accredited degrees

- n) Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships
- o) Explanation of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures

**Not Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

This information is available on the program website as follows:

Application forms and instructions

<https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/admissions/>

Admissions requirements, procedures, and policies

<https://arch.illinois.edu/programs-applying/admissions/>

Forms and process for evaluating content of non-accredited degrees

No forms are publicly available; the process is described as subject to faculty review.

Requirements and forms for financial aid

<https://osfa.illinois.edu/process/eligibility/>

Student diversity goals in the admission procedures

<https://grad.illinois.edu/faculty/promoting-diversity>

The APR describes a “holistic admission process” that “considers the whole student.” This approach is often used by institutions that are seeking to increase student diversity, but the APR does not state that intention.

**6.5 Student Financial Information (*Guidelines, p. 24*)**

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

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

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

**6.5.1:** The information is available on the Graduate College website, found at the following URLs:

<https://grad.illinois.edu/prospective/funding>

<https://grad.illinois.edu/funding-jobs>

These pages provide information concerning the various forms of funding graduate students may utilize within their academic careers, including fellowships, scholarships, loans, assistantships, and extracurricular employment. The Director of Graduate Study serves as a primary contact for funding opportunities. Virtual meetings have verified the ease of access to such resources and the responsiveness of faculty and staff within the department. Virtual meetings have also revealed that students may not be completely aware of the conditions for various awards, which may change over time.

**6.5.2:** Estimation costs are based on term, year, program, residency, and course load, through the program’s provided cost calculator. The calculator is found using the following URLs:

<https://osfa.illinois.edu/cost/graduate-professional-cost/>

<https://cost.illinois.edu/>

Students are provided with the estimated cost of each specialized studio before the first day of class, yet students seem subject to auxiliary material costs not fully disclosed within class syllabi. All links and information were verified through the institution's website and during the virtual visit.

## **V. Appendices**

### **Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction**

#### PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture

This condition has been designated as being met with distinction for two primary reasons: the program's dedication to engaging with global narratives and voices, and noteworthy level of involvement of the student organizations. The leadership of these organizations demonstrated a high level of involvement in School governance and in providing peer mentorship. The team has also verified contributions of the DEI Committee and Student Organizations in advocating, voicing concerns, and to promoting diverse and equitable representation within the departments programming and curriculum.



### **Appendix 3. The Visiting Team**

#### **Team Chair**

Ann Marie Borys, PhD, AIA  
Associate Professor  
Department of Architecture  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA  
[amborys@uw.edu](mailto:amborys@uw.edu)

Nicole Becker, AIA, LEED AP BD C  
Associate  
ZGF ARCHITECTS LLP  
Portland, OR  
[nicolejbecker1@gmail.com](mailto:nicolejbecker1@gmail.com)

Paul May, AIA, LEED AP  
Principal  
Miller Dunwiddie  
Minneapolis, MN  
[pmay@millerdunwiddie.com](mailto:pmay@millerdunwiddie.com)

Tomás Stankiewicz  
B.Arch. Student, Class of 2023  
California Polytechnic University - San Luis Obispo  
Belmont, CA  
[tstankie@calpoly.edu](mailto:tstankie@calpoly.edu)

#### **Observer**

Rafael Longoria, AIA, ACSA Distinguished Professor  
Hines College of Architecture & Design  
University of Houston  
Houston, TX  
[rlongori@central.uh.edu](mailto:rlongori@central.uh.edu)

## VI. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,



---

**Ann Marie Borys, PhD, AIA**  
Team Chair



---

**Nicole Becker, AIA, LEED AP BD C**  
Team Member



---

**Paul May, AIA, LEED AP**  
Team Member



---

**Tomás Stankiewicz**  
Team Member



---

**Rafael Longoria, AIA, ACSA Distinguished Professor**  
Observer