

2023 Visiting Team Report

School of the Art Institute of
Chicago
Architecture, Interior Architecture
and Designed Objects

M.Arch.

Continuing Accreditation
November 13-15, 2023

NAAB

National
Architectural
Accrediting
Board, Inc.

Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Visit	3
II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	4
III. Program Changes	5
IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation	6
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	
V. Appendices	25
1. Conditions Met with Distinction	
2. Team SPC Matrix	
3. The Visiting Team	
VI. Report Signatures	29

For Program COF

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The visiting team would like to thank Douglas Pancoast for his responsiveness and help with requests for information and clarification. The team would also like to thank the faculty, students, staff, administration, and university leadership for their time and willingness to meet and answer questions. The team felt the sense of community and love for architecture and education and observed pride in the program, unique educational opportunities in the larger context of the Art Institute, and an acknowledgement to continue working toward implementing changes to address the NAAB 2020 Conditions. In the exit interview, the team shared that a key element of the Program and Student Criteria in the 2020 Conditions is course assessment. The evidence to support the criterion is the procedure, implementation, modifications, and outcomes of assessment. Assessment is an integral part of the process. Without assessment, the condition is Not Met. In several pre-visit meetings with the program, they acknowledged that they were in the process of creating assessment procedures and were hopeful that the accreditation visit would spur them to action.

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

3.1 - Program Criteria

- PC.1 Career Paths
- PC.2 Design
- PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility
- PC.4 History and Theory
- PC.5 Research and Innovation
- PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration
- PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture
- PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion

3.2 - Student Criteria

- SC.1 Health, Safety and Welfare in the Built Environment
- SC.2 Professional Practice
- SC.3 Regulatory Context
- SC.4 Technical Knowledge
- SC.5 Design Synthesis
- SC.6 Building Integration

4 - Curricular Framework

- 4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education

5 - Resources

- 5.2 Planning and Assessment
- 5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development

6 - Public Information

- 6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures (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.)

6.4 Public access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents (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.)

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2009 Conditions Not Met

I.2.2 Governance: The program must demonstrate that all faculty, staff, and students have equitable opportunities to participate in program and institutional governance.

Previous Team Report (2014): The visiting team found an environment that has yet to institutionalize procedures that will help sustain the program past its initial burst of formational momentum. Currently much decision-making on curricular, financial, and administrative matters specific to the interests of the M. Arch program lies with the Interim Director and Chair of the Department, who solicit faculty opinion in an ad hoc manner. There are no standing committees charged with issues of governance. The team found that the informal nature of this process does not sufficiently guarantee robust participation or effectiveness.

Similarly, a formal structure for student representation and active participation in governance is not evident. The team found that although the AIAS chapter is strong and is occasionally invited to participate in faculty meetings with specific issues as they arise, students do not have the benefit of a defined process or representation to address concerns or participate pro-actively in governance.

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

The program discontinued the director structure and created an institute department chair structure. They feel this structure can respond better to curricular concerns. The program reports to the department which then reports to the university which has a Graduate Student Senate with M.Arch. representation. They also rely heavily on the AIAS/NOMAS leadership to advocate for changes and represent the student voice.

I.2.3 Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

Previous Team Report (2014): Currently the inadequacy of physical facilities is a tangible hindrance to design teaching, to integrated/cross-disciplinary design projects, to the types or formats of classes that can be offered, to overall student productivity and types of work that can be produced. The physically adjacent studios promote inter-level collaboration. The average space per student is low; contiguous table space in the studios is narrow (42"), with limited layout space, which constrains model making, larger scale drawings, etc., or for developing larger collaborative team projects. While some pinup space is available in each of the smaller studios, the only space large or long enough for pinups/critiques is the main corridor, which does not provide acoustic privacy for critiques. There is no large lecture hall available in the same building (Sullivan Center); although the School does have larger facilities in other buildings (Columbus Drive), they are remote from the AIADO Department. The School is well aware of the

facilities deficiencies and has commissioned and completed a Campus Master Plan (2013). A capital campaign has begun in order to implement the recommendations.

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

New spaces were built out in 2015 and 2016 to support the faculty and its administrators for assignment and specialized teaching. The facility tour showed expanded spaces and shared labs for all programs.

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

Previous Team Report (2014): The team did not find evidence of criterion in required course work. Some evidence of cultural exploration was found in process notebooks for INARC 6210 – Interior Architecture Studio 5, but no such documentation was found for the architectural cohort of the same course ARCH 6210. Furthermore other evidence of cultural understanding found in ARTHI 6118 - Semper and Beyond: Historiography of Architecture and Technology existed in a unilateral sense (i.e. a Persian student referencing Persian culture) thus not addressing diversity criterion as stated in the definition of “cultural diversity” found in the Conditions for Accreditation.

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

The program engages a wide variety of diverse artists and practices including Theaster Gates and Rebuild Foundation, Rick Lowe and Project Row Houses, Tonika Lewis Johnson and the Folded Map Project, Paola Aguirre and Opening Closings, Bernard Lloyd and Build Bronzeville, and Emmanuel Pratt and Sweetwater Foundation.

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

Previous Team Report (2014): The team did not find evidence of criterion in required courses for all tracks. Evidence of understanding of human behavior can be found in projects in INARC 6210 - Interior Architecture Studio 5, but no such evidence was found for the cohort of the similar course ARCH 6210.

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

The team did not find evidence that the program addressed APC C.2 – Human Behavior.

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.

As of the Board of Director's 2020 review of the program's five-year Interim report, the program demonstrated progress toward addressing some deficiencies, but was required to provide additional information for II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum for schools of architecture still using the “M. Arch.” title for nonaccredited programs. “A narrative must be submitted in the next APR. The program must discontinue use of the title ‘Master of Architecture with an emphasis in Interior Architecture (M.ArchIA)’ upon receipt of notice from NAAB. The name must be removed from all school materials, including information on the school's website, and on any other promotional materials, syllabi, etc.”

2023 Team Analysis: The program provided more of a definition of the sort of changes that are being considered with no action to implement. In response to the letter from NAAB concerning the nomenclature, the program has implemented the change and announced it to architecture faculty during the recent curriculum retreat. As curriculum review and course development and assessment standards continue to be implemented, the department will revise relevant and/or available course syllabi templates used to aid faculty in course descriptions. This may still be an issue for the program to address as there are close to 75% of the students are majoring in the M.Arch. with emphasis on Interior Architecture.

IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

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

Described

Program Summary Statement of 1 – Context and Mission

Program Response:

Design and preservation participate in the examination of how the past becomes the future. In response to the SAIC Long Range Plan, the Architecture and Interior Architecture graduate and undergraduate programs, including the M.Arch. program, will reorganize with the Historic Preservation program into a single department. The merger inspires the faculty to explore how hosting a variety of place and material focused degree pathways, in one department, allows for a deep examination of the natural and social preconditions that drive the conservation and development of places, events and systems. This context will give new opportunities to an already engaged M.Arch. program.

The department is implementing this work now via class prototypes like ARCH 6110: Architecture: Grad Studio 3 (see below). The department will continue to bring together architects and preservationists to develop new approaches to design and preservation that are focused on addressing the most pressing social, technological and environmental issues of our time. Provisionally titled Preservation, Architecture and Material Studies, the new department is an important moment at the SAIC for exploring how architecture can contribute to the creation of a more sustainable, equitable, and just society.

The reorganization will extend current methods of assessment and a shared studio-based curriculum that empowers students to build strong and relevant practices through making, technical training and external project opportunities, with special focus on the engagement and analysis of complex durational interactions of people, place, materials, technologies.

With new colleagues, M.Arch. students will continue to learn about the history and cultural significance of different architectural movements and the value of various modes of preservation practice, as well as the ways in which these fields have been used to make the systems of living that operate today. They are introduced to innovative approaches to design that prioritize community engagement and multidisciplinary exchanges to produce a variety of testable approaches for studying and delivering racial and social justice, economic coequality and resilient responses to natural environmental crises.

2023 Team Analysis:

SAIC is in the heart of Chicago and its Department of Architecture benefits greatly from its setting in a college offering programs in a comprehensive array of creative arts and professions. Students have many opportunities to engage in city and college-wide events and programs. The focus on engaging professional themes in the local and global context is clear in both the structure of the curriculum and the non-curricular offerings. As their web page states, they are creative across disciplines and engaged with their community at SAIC, their context in Chicago, and the world. SAIC currently maintains five undergraduate degrees and seventeen graduate degree programs.

The Department of Architecture, Interior Architecture, and Designed Objects (AIADO) where the program is embedded adopted its Mission Statement as follows: "To deliver an education that embodies creativity, social responsibility, historical perspectives, technical competence, environmental consciousness, ethical imagination, and an understanding of current global economic and social changes. To educate students to become innovative transdisciplinary design leaders, in the disciplines of architecture, interior architecture, and designed objects." The program then benefits from SAIC educational philosophy based on an interdisciplinary approach to art and design, giving students unparalleled opportunities to develop their creative and critical abilities. The Department of Architecture defines its learning as a collaborative project between students and faculty, and they welcome diverse perspectives. Their studio culture foregrounds student practice and responds to student goals with critique that is considered and constructive. The school rewards risk-taking and understands that failure is part of the creative process.

The program, through The Shapiro Center for Research and Collaboration, develops its curricular footprint outside the school and into the Chicago ecosystem via engagement with several service opportunities for students and faculty like the Homan Square community and West Side community, among others. The Shapiro Center also offers programs and grants for faculty and students to research, teach and learn outside of class. SAIC also encourages students to explore the world beyond Chicago. One option for gaining this experience is to participate in a semester or year-long study abroad program in one of the numerous SAIC Study Abroad Exchange Partner Schools. The program is also benefitted by the numerous Faculty-led study trips taught by SAIC faculty where instruction takes place off-campus.

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: The school's success as an art school is modeled in the studio culture within the program and is the primary teaching mode. Open studio space where all disciplines of the graduate AIADO student body are housed develops a cohesive and dynamically responsive culture. This model allows interactivity in various points during course progression. Attendance during studio hours is encouraged and experimentation with materials, technology and ideas are essential. Being a part of the liberal arts focus at SAIC, design is celebrated through all mediums and the university is not divided into schools or colleges which allows open flexibility to explore courses in other disciplines.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: The program focuses its efforts in this area through classes that explore several topics, including landscape and how it shapes spaces, ecology and biodiversity, historic preservation, and social practices. One program uses the Chicago River to engage the community in water politics and policy. The program also engages the community in two interesting ways, essentially introducing architecture to one underserved neighborhood, and enticing middle schoolers through hands on experiments to think about architecture as a career.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: Early opportunities for underrepresented minorities through department-led camps, workshops, and courses while in junior high and high school identify students interested in an architecture education. The program supports the students through fully funded scholarships, application, and portfolio development. "Inside/Outcomes at Mollison Elementary - Field Rooms" is a new initiative with no outcomes to show yet.

Knowledge and Innovation: SAIC encourages experimentation and drawing inspiration from other visual and decorative arts, as well as collaboration with students and faculty in the Historic Preservation program. Students are encouraged to take the knowledge they garner from their more traditional architecture focused classes and apply it in other ways.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: External engagement is demonstrated through project development with the Office of Engagement. The program has recently worked with research classes and special opportunities by corporations with a specific design brief and a multi-year commitment from a corporation who is open to creative proposals. Some of the examples are "WA|K-H" project focused on neighborhood walkability and "Cultural Futures: Heritage Survey Studio" course.

Lifelong Learning: SAIC does not have a continuing education program established for its graduates; however, it does cooperate fully with AIA and NOMA in their programs and SAIC encourages students to participate in the professional organizations and to develop a routine of lifelong learning.

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)*

Not Met

2023 Team Analysis:

The program relies on engagement with the profession through the graduate design studios AIADO 5110 and AIADO 5120 and the professional practice course AIADO 6222. In addition to teaching the basics of how to operate ethically in the profession, this course simulates real world practice. Actual practice seems more robust than the APR describes. Most of the students polled intend to pursue licensure, regardless of their track.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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:

The program describes that all required courses begin with a research phase. In AIADO 6110: Arch: Grad Studio 3, the course “Field Kitchens” explores place-making through the opposition of landscape and interiority, of nature and of wilding and preservation. In AIADO 6120: Arch: Grad Studio 4, the course “Neighborhood Futures” explores the design of adaptive re-use sited in a culturally diverse and historical context.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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)*

Not Met

2023 Team Analysis:

The team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions during the site visit.

The APR suggests that the syllabi will document the learning goals for the students especially on these topics, as well that the student work should provide evidence of understanding through diagrams that display such information. Seen in a few but not all syllabi, courses appear to list assignments throughout the semester and then give a detailed description of the assignments. Following the assignments, learning goals for the semester are stated as such: PC.3 Ecological Literacy and Responsibility, followed by a brief description of what that means.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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:

For the M.Arch. three-year and two-year tracks, there are only two required courses for History and Theories of architecture and urbanism, AIADO 5102: Global History of Architecture, 1750-1900 and ARTHIS 5122: Critical Terms in Modern Architecture. Between both courses the students understand histories and theories of architecture and urbanism from the late Eighteenth Century to the Modern Movement. The team did not find evidence of how the program ensures all students entering the three-year track understand architecture before 1750.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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:

The program notes two required courses as evidence for this criterion, ARCH 6210: Grad Studio 5 and AIADO 6213: Thesis Strategies. AIADO 6213: Thesis Strategies is a seminar-studio course intended for graduate students in Architecture engaged in preparatory research work. The course offers content on research methods, project structure and execution, and clarifies common art and design thesis conventions and research-through-design methods that prepare graduate students for the responsibility of contributing to the field while allowing for the translation of research into a personal and informed position.

AIADO 6220: Grad Studio 6 Thesis provides the opportunity for students to determine and research an original problem with pertinent issues and design an innovative response to some aspect of architectural production. Both course syllabi learning outcomes still mention the student and program criteria and

course outcomes related with the NAAB 2014 Conditions. These have not been updated satisfy the NAAB 2020 conditions.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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:

AIADO 6220: Grad Studio 6 Thesis requires team-based coursework. Students participate and hold leadership positions with AIAS and NOMAS. The student leaders participate with other architecture programs annually on the AIA CHICAGO BOARD advocating for all architecture students in the Chicago professional community.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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

Not Met

2023 Team Analysis:

To address this criterion the program explains how the traditional long group critique is typically performed in the program and how staff, faculty and students are driven by collegiality. The team found that the Student Handbook for 2022-23 addresses students' rights and responsibilities. It also addresses Rules of Conduct for students related to topics such as Covid-19, Discrimination and Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Assault or Violence, Alcohol and Drugs, Fire Safety, and Smoking, among many others. In AIADO 6213: Thesis Strategies course syllabus, the team found a reference to an AIADO Studio Culture and the department's studio culture policy.

The team found evidence that demonstrates this criterion in the Studio Culture Statement shown on the Web of the SAIC at <https://www.saic.edu/aiado-studio-culture-statement>

This policy is made available to students, faculty, and staff by being posted on the SAIC website, printed and posted in the department information cabinet and discussed in studio introductions and in student organization meetings. It is also being reviewed regularly by the Graduate Student Representative Committee and the faculty.

The program notes that students may be outperforming grading rubrics, and if students wish to better themselves, they must ask "Tell me how to get better at what I want to do here." If asked this, teachers in turn are then able to "bend" the rubric/grading scale to in turn better the student.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment,

modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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:

The Neiman Center is identified as the program's window on the world. It offers the community an opportunity to view what is happening within the university but doesn't expand the student's awareness of the world around them, or the breadth and diversity the world offers. Some of the specific classwork may provide this, but on a more limited basis than the matrix suggests. It seems a significant number of the students enrolled in the program are foreign nationals, so there is plenty of diversity in the student body. Faculty is less diverse, but most are going to age out before potential new faculty can reach tenure.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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)

Not Met

2023 Team Analysis:

AIADO 6123: Codes, Specs, Joints offers the exposure to the impact of the built environment through weekly topics and discussions. The GFRY Endowment provides opportunities for students to delve into real world issues and investigate real world solutions. The course schedule lists weekly exercises, presentations, and discussion topics covering zoning, combustibility, building code occupancies and emergency egress, accessibility and universal design and codes for engineering systems.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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:

AIADO 6222: Practice Economies is a series of lectures, discussions and in-class workshops related to Professional Architecture Practice. The content includes addressing legal and ethical issues, public health and safety, leadership, architect's and client's role, office costs and organization, and building cost estimation.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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:

AIADO 6123: Codes, Specs, Joints provides the background for an understanding of the principals of regulation and how professionals should respond to those regulations and take them into account in their daily practice.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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)

Not Met

2023 Team Analysis:

The program provides three opportunities to address this criterion, AIADO 5113: Construction Systems; AIADO 6123: Codes, Specs; Joints and AIADO 6212: Choreographed Systems, each discussing various aspects of current technical knowledge.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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)

Not Met

2023 Team Analysis:

ARCH 6210: Grad Studio 5 student work showed projects for the AIA HQ RENEWAL in DC. None of the student work showed evidence of design synthesis, user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, or measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions. Other projects show evidence of design synthesis through site and climate conditions, user requirements, considerations of sun impact on the facade, and the design follows ADA requirements. The work is inconsistent.

INARCH6210: Grad Studio 5 student work showed projects for a Food Hall-Food market. The student work does not show evidence of measurable outcomes of building performance and some students' work does not show evidence addressing user requirements or accessible design. Other student work does not show evidence of life safety, assemblies, or environmental control systems addressed. The work is inconsistent.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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:

ARCH 6210: Grad Studio 5 showed student work projects for the AIA HQ RENEWAL in DC, none of the student work showed evidence of integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance. Other projects show evidence of building integration as required in this criterion. For instance, the student work showed detailed wall sections, the structural scheme and the modifications to it and showed building systems such as the HVAC system, the rain water reuse system, and life safety systems.

ARCH 6212: Choreographed Systems student work has also been set as evidence for this criterion. The student work showed evidence of developing an “understanding of” and “ability in” the selection and location of building systems and their integration into design considerations, although there are inconsistencies in the students' work; as some of the work showed egress plans; HVAC systems and plumbing systems, and others do not show those systems.

Assessment: The program is still in the planning process to create and implement assessment as described by the 2020 Conditions. The program does not have in place a procedure for assessment, modifications, and outcomes. Without this process, the team was unable to find evidence that the program demonstrates how its curriculum, structure and other experiences address this criterion.

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)

Team Findings:

Met X

Not Met

2023 Team Analysis:

The APR identifies HCL as the regional accreditor.

This information is found in the Appendix of the APR Supplemental Material number 3. A letter from HLC from October 3rd, 2013. There is also a link to the letter.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/13F7Fpk1a5wFk8w-3M7X0Hbr1CDVreIIV/view>

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 APR provides a link to their website. Degree representation expresses both a two-year M.Arch. track (60 credits) and a three-year M.Arch. track (90 credits).

4.2.2 The APR describes the “student spine”, which is what students are required to complete during undergraduate education. The HLC accredits the 126 hours required by the university that is consistent with U.S. Department of Education.

- Sophomore Seminar (SOPHSEM 2900) is taken in the spring of the second year of study
- Professional Practice Experience (PROFPRAC 3900) is taken in the third year of study
- Capstone (CAPSTONE 4900) is taken in the final year of study
- Transfer students must complete the Professional Practice Experience and Capstone course

4.2.3 The APR as well as the link provided to their website, describes the degree plan of the three-year M.Arch. track, starting in the second semester of year one. There is an open elective offered each semester allowing optional studies within the curriculum. The two-year M.Arch. track is similar to electives offered every semester except year one semester two.

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:

4.3.1 - The program describes the admissions process, it can also be found on their webpage <https://www.saic.edu/aiado/graduate/master-architecture#accordion=anchor-1271-2>

They require students to have completed the following classes:

- semester credit hours in building science
- 3 semester credit hours in structural engineering
- semester credit hours in architectural history
- semester credit hours in design studios

Students may be placed into the three-year M.Arch. program if their undergraduate transcripts and syllabi do not include courses covering all of the topics included in the first year of the M.Arch. program. This consideration is made after admission to the MARCH program.

Not found:

- Evidence/document of process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria.

4.3.2 The program does not rely on preparatory education experience program.

4.3.3 The Master of Architecture Application and Admissions Information found on the web page link: <https://www.saic.edu/aiado/graduate/overview> showed evidence that the program has a clearly articulated evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degrees in the admission process and the students have the chance to understand the evaluation through a personal interview before being admitted.

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 Administrative Structure: The program described how the tracks are part of the AIADO Department. The program describes in the APR that a specific chair for Architecture with the support of coordinators dedicated to clearly defined roles and responsibilities remains the administrative structure. The three disciplinary programs share physical space and resources.

5.1.2 Governance: The Faculty Senate plays a key role in the School's long-standing tradition of shared governance, collaborating on multiple facets of institutional governance and providing valuable insight to the administrative leadership team.

To support a larger school, new administrative and governance structures have been developed, including an academic cabinet, a chair of faculty, and a part-time faculty committee. New administrative roles have been added to better support diversity and inclusion for domestic and international students; a faculty population with many teaching styles; assessment and accreditation; data collection and analysis; Title IX equity, etc. In 2010, the provost position was created to oversee budgeting, academics, enrollment, information technology, and student affairs. The provost oversees the school's endowment fund and chairs the Budget Planning Committee. The acting provost and academic dean is a licensed Architect and is working hard to breathe new life into the program.

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 multi year 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 University has an overall university-wide strategic plan and the department has a clear understanding of where the M.Arch. degree program fits into the overall University strategic plan. There is a process in place for vetting proposed changes at the University level, and it is described in the APR.

5.2.2 Key performance indicators used by the university or the department were indicated, but not described. Also, the Regional Accrediting Body provided an assessment process but the department has yet to initiate the process.

Not found: Key performance indicators not found.

5.2.3 Evidence of an ongoing Strategic Plan not found.

The program has provided the NEXT Strategic Plan for the SAIC, but the team did not find how the program is progressing toward its mission and multiyear objectives.

5.2.4 The program lists the new collaboration with Historic Preservation as an exciting opportunity for the M.Arch. program, as well as the school's location in the center of Chicago. The program lists the lack of faculty and the ability to offer additional classes as a challenge.

The program defines a great opportunity to strengthen its curriculum in joining with the Historical Preservation Program. The program identifies as a challenge the need for additional full-time faculty members.

5.2.5 No indication in the APR that input from others outside the University is sought or acknowledged in any way other than "ad hoc".

The program mentions "Potential external community partners" as a response to 5.2.3 "To support the AIADO + HPres reorganization the School is creating an advisory group". The team found external or outside input in the large number of guest critics and practitioners from the thesis review.

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:

5.3.1. The program describes a program-level assessment of its curriculum and student learning, “approximately every 5 years”, that provides a rationale for future curricular changes. Course level assessment is primarily undertaken by individual faculty members. The program describes the assessment process in 2014 for the regional accreditation body HLC with the rubrics that are consistent with NAAB 2014 criteria, but not adapted to NAAB 2020 Conditions. HLC Rubrics were provided but the process has not been started.

5.3.2. The program identifies the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee as the permanent standing committee to review new course proposals and they regularly meet each semester. The department chairs lead discussions with faculty members to determine new course proposals or curricular changes.

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.

Team Findings:

Demonstrated

Not Demonstrated X

2023 Team Analysis:

5.4.1 - The program had fourteen (14) teaching staff. That has been reduced to six currently, then five when a planned retirement takes effect in 2024. The university has not issued a call for additional staff in many years, and with the required administrative duties added in, it is difficult to see where the remaining staff have adequate time to teach. There was no mention of adjunct faculty, which typically could be used for a specific class and ease the load of full-time faculty. The program mentioned that the addition of the HPRES program will add 2 full time faculty, but that would not provide additional faculty to cover the required basic courses.

5.4.2 - The program describes a part-time licensed architect who served as the Architect Licensing Advisor for the past two academic years. Duties include hosting meetings between M.Arch. students and NCARB and AIA members to answer practical questions.

5.4.3 - Professional development opportunities described in the APR consist of enrichment grants (<https://www.saic.edu/faculty-enrichment-grants>), sabbatical time, and residency opportunities. Among those residency opportunities is the Roger Brown Residencies for faculty and staff to spend time on educational or personal projects, and the Artist in Residence Niederosterreich in Austria. <https://www.saic.edu/faculty/residencies#:~:text=AIR%E2%80%93E2%80%93ARTIST%20IN%20RESIDENCE%20Nieder%20sterreich,Open%20to%20faculty&text=To%20ensure%20diversity%2C%20a%20vibrant,literature%2C%20architecture%2C%20and%20music>.

During the visit, the team understood that faculty in the M.Arch. program struggle in competing for those grants due to lack of writing support and lack of funding to initiate or advance research that would make their applications stronger. There is also a concern about limited funds to participate and attend conferences that disseminate their research to advance in the rank and tenure process.

5.4.4 - The program describes Graduate Academic Advising, Office of Career and Professional Experience, AIAS and NOMAS Chapters, Wellness Center and The Disability and Learning Resource Center as services available to 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.

Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:

5.5.1 University-level programs have been formed to support and extend the existing DEI efforts and enforce meaningful change. In addition to this larger work at the institutional level, the program has created a DEI coordinator position which has helped target specific geographic locations for recruitment. Additional considerations include advocating to retain current faculty from the historically under-represented groups.

5.5.2 The institution has a diversity plan in place to increase diversity in the faculty, which includes training in inherent bias, intentional diversity on hiring committees and advertising for faculty in a broad array of non-typical locations. Diversity concerns have been elevated to the university president level with the search for a VP of Diversity.

5.5.3 The program has a unique take on diversity at the student level - they interact at the middle school level with a design/build project program at a local Chicago Middle School to introduce students to the idea of architecture. The team did not find any follow-through with students expressing an interest. Nearly 50% of the student body is international students, with most of them from China according to the APR.

5.5.4 No specific institutional or program initiatives for diversity were noted beyond what is mandated at the federal law level.

5.5.5 Accommodations for accessibility for those with disabilities was not noted beyond specific situations for specific individuals when needs are known.

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 The Sullivan center in the Video Tour to the Facilities showed large open spaces with student workstations, area to work with models, and pin up spaces, that support and encourage studio-based learning.

5.6.2 The Advance Output Center, and Sullivan fabrication Studio shown in the Facilities video Tour are evidence of this criteria.

5.6.3 Offices in Sullivan's 14th floor, as well as Conference and meeting spaces shown in the provided floorplan is evidence of this criterion.

5.6.4 The Department of Computer Resources and Information Technology (CRIT) helps faculty, students, and staff in the support of all learning formats and pedagogies.

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 is financially supported from the university level which has a bi-annual budget cycle. During the visit the program described resources budgeted for conference attendance and faculty development. There was a reduction in the budget during the pandemic, however, the program has returned to a positive balance and is no longer in existence mode.

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 John M. Flaxman Library at the heart of the SAIC campus is open to SAIC students, faculty, staff, and alumni without an appointment. As the web page states, the mission of the Flaxman Library is to advance student learning and enrich the research environment at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago. <https://www.saic.edu/libraries-special-collections/john-m-flaxman-library>

Library staff members collaborate as peers with students, faculty, and colleagues throughout and beyond the institution, to further the scholarly and artistic achievements of all.

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 website statement has not been updated to address the required changes to the degree nomenclature as indicated. NAAB directed the program to discontinue use of the title "Master of Architecture with an emphasis in Interior Architecture (M.ArchIA)" upon receipt of notice from NAAB. The name was to be removed from all school materials, including information on the school's website, and on any other promotional materials, syllabi, etc.

<https://www.saic.edu/accreditation>

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)

Not Met

2023 Team Analysis:

The website does not include any of the current Conditions or Procedures for Accreditation 2020 Editions or the ones in effect during the previous visit.

<https://www.saic.edu/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:

APR response includes information on Career and Professional Experience (CAPX) which is a program that is to prepare students and alums through career education and connect them to diverse professional experiences and opportunities.

[CAPX Brochure.pdf \(saic.edu\)](#)

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 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

Not Met

2023 Team Analysis:

[Accredited Art School - SAIC | Accreditation](#) does not include any access to documents listed a) through h).

- i) [Statement and/or policies on learning and teaching culture](#) can be found at [AIADO Studio Culture Statement | School of the Art Institute of Chicago \(saic.edu\)](#)
- j) [Statement and/or policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion](#) was not found.

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

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

- a) Application forms and instructions
- b) Admissions requirements; admissions-decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (when required); and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing
- c) Forms and a description of the process for evaluating the content of a non-accredited degrees
- d) Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships
- e) Explanation of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures

Met

2023 Team Analysis:

All requirements are listed at this link [Master of Architecture | M.Arch Programs at SAIC](#)

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

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

Met

2023 Team Analysis:

The program describes the process and access through this link [Cost & Financial Aid | School of the Art Institute of Chicago \(saic.edu\)](#)

APR provides a link that works and has information on financial aid as well as the cost of the program.

For Program COF

V. Appendices

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

N/A

For Program COF

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

For Program COF

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Practitioner Representative

Kristine Harding, FAIA, NCARB
Sr. Vice President
KPS Group
Huntsville, AL
kharding@kpsgroup.com

Educator Representative

Miguel Angel Calvo Salve, PhD
Full Professor
Marywood University
Scranton, PA
salve@marywood.edu

Regulator Representative

Mark McKechnie, AIA, NCARB
Principal
Oregon Architecture, Inc.
Medford, OR
mark@oregonarchitecture.biz

Student Representative

Louis Cobb
Student
University of Kansas
Chicago, IL
lcobb097@gmail.com

Observer

Paulette Singley, Ph.D., F.A.A.R. '21
Professor
Woodbury University
Burbank, CA
Paulette.Singley@woodbury.edu

VI. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristine Harding, FAIA, NCARB
Team Chair

Miguel Angel Calvo Salve, PhD
Team Member

Mark McKechnie, AIA, NCARB
Team Member

Louis Cobb
Team Member

Paulette Singley, Ph.D.
Observer