



**Harvard University
Graduate School of Design**

2018 Visiting Team Report

M. Arch.

Track I (undergraduate degree outside of architecture + 105 graduate credit hrs)

Track II (related preprofessional degree + 75 graduate credit hrs)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board

March 3-7, 2018

Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architecture education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.

Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Visit	1
II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	2
III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation	
Part One (I): Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	4
Part Two (II): Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	13
Part Three (III): Annual and Interim Reports	25
IV. Appendices	
1. Conditions Met with Distinction	26
2. Team SPC Matrix	27
3. The Visiting Team	29
V. Report Signatures	30

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The team wishes to thank the GSD, Dean Mohsen Mostafavi, Interim Chair Michael Hays, Director of the M. Arch I program Jon Lott, and the faculty, staff and students for their hospitality and previsit preparations. The team wishes to make a special mention of faculty members Mark Mulligan and Jenny French as well as recent graduates, Zahra Safaverdi and Snoweria Zhang for their efforts in organizing the team room and exhibition of design studio work. The team room was very well organized, and the digital files of student work products were well structured facilitating the visiting team's review of materials and documents. Finally, we wish to thank Ryan Jacob and Afshaan Burtram for their administrative and organizational efforts as well as Taylor Horner, Hal Gould, Trevor O'Brien and Susan Spaulding for their logistical and support services.

The visiting team finds the architecture program to be a nurturing environment that fosters student learning, creativity, and community engagement. The collegial faculty and supportive leadership have designed a variety of learning opportunities for students that center on the grand challenges of the 21st century. A central feature of this focus is design studio work with NGOs and global cities. To facilitate investigations the school has created a series of "platforms" that integrate common concerns across disciplines in the school and support studio-based experiential learning.

The staff contributes to the positive environment in the school. The visiting team found a staff that is supportive of the academic mission and who characterize themselves as happy and prideful to be of service to the faculty and students as they accomplish their important work.

The School has an impressive and ongoing effort to disseminate information about the discipline of architecture through numerous high-quality forums, symposia, lectures, exhibitions and publications. These venues contribute to the discourse of ideas and concerns within the profession and position the GSD as an advocate for critical approaches to education and practice. These efforts are underscored by applied and practice-based research laboratories and centers that are contributing to the generation of knowledge for the discipline.

The GSD is deeply committed to enhancing diversity of the faculty, staff and students. Associate Provost Lori Gross was extremely complimentary of the policies, strategies and actions the GSD leadership and faculty have taken to address diversity. In addition, the dean and faculty leadership are extremely aware of the challenges posed by the escalating cost of higher education and the resulting student debt. In response they are developing better data on education expenses, as well as working to increase scholarships and augment funds available for discounted tuition.

They are also using the considerable prestige of the GSD to improve the value proposition of an architectural education and thereby improve opportunities for recent graduates.

b. Conditions Not Achieved

C.3 Integrative Design

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2009 Condition II.4.1, Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

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

Previous Team Report (2012): The team found that the intention of the NAAB language is fulfilled in the various referenced documents, but "...the exact language..." was not met in that there were examples where the copy was incomplete and/or paraphrased and/or referenced the **2004** NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Despite this, there is compelling evidence that students are fully aware of the critical professional implications of accredited versus non-accredited architecture programs.

2018 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is now **Met** (see section II.4.1 in this VTR).

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

Previous Team Report (2012): Architectural Design (GSD-1201) is listed as the source for fulfilling this SPC. There is evidence of one lecture that addresses accessibility in this course but a review of student graphic work does not convey their ability to apply the principles of accessibility in their project work. Main entries fail to provide ADA required avenues of ingress/egress, maneuvering space is insufficient to accommodate physical disabilities, door swings inhibit egress flow, accessible toilets are not indicated, and no references could be found for addressing sensory and cognitive disabilities.

2018 Visiting Team Assessment: This 2012 criterion is now being met through the course work in GSD-1201: Third-Semester Core Studio - INTEGRATE.

2009 Student Performance Criterion B.5, Life Safety: *Ability to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.*

Previous Team Report (2012): Students have not demonstrated the ability to apply basic egress systems to buildings. Projects show required exit stairs that a) are depicted as unenclosed, b) without doors, c) exiting internal to the building, d) ending without egress and large assembly areas as provided with only one means of egress. These issues were evident in a review of documents from Architectural Design (GSD-1201) and other studio work.

2018 Visiting Team Assessment: This 2009 criterion is now being met in student work prepared for GSD-6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction, where students prepare a life safety plan for existing buildings.

2009 Student Performance Criterion 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.5. Life Safety |
| A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture | B.7 Environmental Systems |
| | B.9 Structural Systems |

Previous Team Report (2012): While evidence exists that the majority of the above sub-criteria are met individually, evidence does not exist in the comprehensive studio Architectural Design (GSD-1201) that there is any consistency within the projects in general, or from student to student, that all of the issues are integrated within the work. Particular emphasis is made for the absence of information in the comprehensive studio projects of B.2 Accessibility, B.3 Sustainability, B.5 Life Safety, and B.9 Structural Systems.

2018 Visiting Team Assessment: SPC C.3 - Integrative Design (2014 Conditions) is the criterion that most closely correlates with the SPC B.6- Comprehensive Design (2009 Conditions) . Evidence of student achievement for C.3 - Integrative Design at the prescribed level was **NOT** found in the student work available for the visiting team review. The team could not find consistent evidence of students applying knowledge of life safety codes (particularly egress requirements) and integrating environmental systems into a synthesized design that demonstrate the achievement of ability.

Previous Team Report (2012): Causes of Concern

A. Project Scale of Comprehensive Design: It is the concern of the team that assignments in the Comprehensive Design studio may be too ambitiously large in scope and complexity, thereby leading to the inability (in time, or overwhelming scope) of the students to adequately include content and representation of all required technical components, systems, and information.

2018 Visiting Team Assessment: The 2012 Causes for Concern referred to B.6 - Comprehensive Design. The Student Performance Criterion B.6 is now the SPC C.3 Integrative Design. The Visiting Team found this criterion was **NOT** Met (see Section II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria).

III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation

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

This part addresses the commitment of the institution, its faculty, staff, and students to the development and evolution of the program over time.

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

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

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

[X] Described

2018 Analysis/Review: The 2017 Architecture Program Report provides a description of the history and mission of the institution (see APR, p. 1). For over 80 years the GSD has been at the forefront of the design professions and its location in a premiere academic institution has contributed to the architecture program's national and international reputation. This leadership role is guided by the architecture program's mission that "prepares graduates for professional practice in the field of architecture by immersing them in critical discussions about the role of architecture in contemporary society, while methodically guiding the development of skills in design, visual representation, building science and technique, and professional reasoning and judgment" (see APR, p. 1).

The University administration is very complimentary of Dean Mohsen Mostafavi and the efforts of the GSD to support the "One Harvard" strategic plan. With the faculty he has established connections with the Schools of Engineering and Public Health and developed a new undergraduate track in architecture with the faculty of Arts and Sciences (visiting team meeting with Associate Provost Lori Gross).

Dean Mostafavi has reinforced the faculty's ties to Harvard University through the encouragement of GSD faculty to actively participate on university-wide committees such as long-range planning for campus expansion, public space and facilities planning. The expertise of the faculty is being used by the University to assist in the selection of architects, the review of new buildings and the provision of assistance with the planning of the Allston campus (faculty meeting, interview of Associate Provost Lori Gross). The dean has also encouraged students by sponsoring their initiatives to bring design awareness and service to underserved communities (see APR, p. 1).

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

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

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Analysis/Review: The GSD's Studio Culture Policy provides clear guidelines and instructions to all faculty and students (<http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/resources/studio-culture-policy/>). The Studio Culture Policy is guided by the GSD community values statement found at <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/community-values-statement/>. This statement emphasizes: "conscientious pursuit of excellence in one's work; respect for the rights, differences, and dignity of others; honesty and integrity in dealing with all members of the community; accountability for personal behavior." The Studio Culture Policy is further reinforced in the GSD Faculty Handbooks and Guidelines for Instruction (<http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/faculty-planning/faculty-handbooks/>). In an interview with Laura Snowdon (GSD Dean of Students), she said her office works hard to accomplish work-life balance and encourage improvement in studio habits. She attributes this to the Studio Culture Policy. This was generally reinforced in the visiting team's meetings with students.

There are various opportunities for students to offer feedback to the faculty and administration about the GSD Studio Culture Policy and the GSD community values statement. These include the Student Affairs Committee, the Student Forum, and once a semester Town Hall meetings with the Dean. Policies on Student Conduct, Sexual Harassment and Students with Disabilities are described and linked to online documents on the GSD and Harvard websites. Students are required to take online Title IX training before they can register for courses.

The team found evidence that students at the GSD are provided opportunities for learning both inside the classroom and through professional organizations (see <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/resources/gsd-student-group-directory/> for a listing), field trips (e.g. <http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/resources/option-studio-lottery/student-travel-information-and-costs-for-option-studios/> and <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/studio-abroad/current-studio-abroad/> and community activities (such as the Community Service Fellowship Program <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/resources/community-service-fellowship-program/>).

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

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students during the next two accreditation cycles as compared with the existing diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution.
- The program must document that institutional-, college-, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Analysis/Review: The issue of diversity and social equity is extremely important to the members of the GSD community. Under the School’s Studio Culture Policy, one of the four stated values is “Respect for the rights, differences, and dignity of others” (see APR, p. 3). Both Dean Mohsen Mostafavi and the interim Chair Michael Hays told the visiting team that diversity is simultaneously a strength and a challenge for the school. Although the GSD is very diverse internationally and provides a great global perspective through its faculty and student body, there is less representation for Hispanic and African American populations, as well as diversity in social and economic backgrounds (visiting team meeting with Associate Professor Mark Mulligan, Director of Master in Architecture I Program Jon Lott, and interim Department Chair Michael Hays; meeting with Dean Mohsen Mostafavi).

Diversity and inclusion is important to the leadership and has led to the Dean’s Diversity Initiative (DDI), established in 2008. The DDI is a committee of faculty, staff, and students making policy-based recommendations directly to the Dean to improve diversity. The DDI hosts an annual open discussion with Alumni, as well as summits with outside experts. Because of DDI initiatives, “the number of African Americans students at the GSD has more than tripled since 2009, and the number of Native American students has more than doubled in the same time frame” (see APR, p. 6). The school is also committed to increasing the diversity of its staff and faculty: “in 2016, 16.5% of the GSD staff members were minorities, compared to 12% in 2010 (see APR, p. 6). Associate Provost Gross pointed out to the visiting team that two of the recently appointed department chairs at the GSD are female, representing a direct effort to improve diversity.

In addition to school initiatives, the GSD has multiple core and advance studios focused on issues of equity and inclusion, such as Housing Policies in Ferguson, Missouri; Architecture and Identity in Muslim Nations; Designing Peace-Making / Building Spaces in Conflict-prone Regions; Rebuilding in Hurricane-damaged areas of the U.S. Virgin Islands; and Prosperity and Inclusion in Gentrifying Neighborhoods.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that affect the education and development of professional architects. The response to each perspective must further identify how these perspectives will continue to be addressed as part of the program’s long-range planning activities.

- A. Collaboration and Leadership.** The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles.
- B. Design.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multidimensional process involving problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value.
- C. Professional Opportunity.** The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunities and career paths, including the transition to internship and licensure.
- D. Stewardship of the Environment.** The program must describe its approach to developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and natural resources.
- E. Community and Social Responsibility.** The program must describe its approach to

developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens able to understand what it means to be professional members of society and to act ethically on that understanding.

[X] Described

2018 Analysis/Review: Collaboration and Leadership -- Collaboration is integrated into the curriculum through design studios and seminar classes where students work collectively on projects and develop collaborative skills through joint criticism and public presentations.

Several student groups also stimulate collaboration and shared learning such as the Code without Frontiers student organization or discussions fostered by the Design Research Forum. Leadership skills are honed through the encouragement of GSD students to become active in extracurricular design initiatives, entrepreneurial ventures, and social action groups. Examples include student organized symposia (GSD MEdiNA, HarvardxDesign Conference), exhibitions (Africa GSD, fortyK), lectures (Africa GSD, Greece GSD, Japan GSD, Latin GSD, Spain GSD, xDesign Club) and journal publication (Process) and outreach (Project Link).

The curriculum also emphasizes leadership for students through the public jury settings of design studios, which train students to develop public speaking and presentation skills. Case study methods and role-playing in various courses also develop leadership skills.

Design -- The curricular structure of the architecture program provides students opportunities for understanding the design activity as complex and multifaceted. Students pursue these opportunities in an array of physical and intellectual settings. These settings include design as research, design as speculative provocation, design as collaboration, design with community organizations and through coursework in international locations.

Interdisciplinary collaboration is encouraged and practiced between the GSD and the University community, including collaborative programs between the Departments of Architecture, Urban Planning and Design, and Landscape Architecture. Interdepartmental initiatives in both curricular and extracurricular settings are available to the students and faculty (visiting team interview of students, faculty, Department Chair and Dean). In addition, co-sponsored studios and non-studio elective courses between the Department of Architecture and the Departments of Urban Planning and Landscape Architecture are offered.

The GSD is committed to maintaining its reputation for leadership in design education by contributing to the academic design community through peer-reviewed journal essays and publication of design work. The GSD sponsors over 300 events a year in Gund Hall's gallery spaces and lecture halls (visiting team interview of Johnston and Borelli) for students and the public.

Professional Opportunity -- The APR describes various lectures, conferences, symposia, executive education courses, and alumni gatherings to build GSD students' awareness of the profession of architecture (APR Page 9). GSD has a seat on the BSA (Boston Society of Architects) Board of Directors. The school supports a Career Resources Center for architecture students that support students with career advice, workshops, and information on job/internship opportunities. The path to internship and licensure is linked through the GSD's website to NCARB resources for both the AXP program and Licensure requirements.

Stewardship of the Environment -- Sustainability issues and the ethical imperative of environmental stewardship is taught across the curriculum from the introductory design studios (GSD-1102: Second Semester Architecture Core - SITUATE), to advanced studios (GSD-1319: Zero Energy Residential High-Rise or GSD-1321: Forms of Energy: Appearance). The stated objective of the program is to "seek full integration of sustainability principles into the design pedagogy (visiting team interview of Dean and APR, p. 10). These learning opportunities are supported by new "designer-friendly" software applications that are used by students in courses like GSD-6125: Environmental Systems in Architecture where they pursue sustainability and building optimization through gaming. This commitment is further augmented by the Zofnass Program for Sustainable Infrastructure and the Green Building for Cities research centers.

Community and Social Responsibility -- The GSD's mission addresses the issue of community and social responsibility by stating that students are prepared to "respond to the needs not only of private clients but

also of the broader public affected by and benefitting from their design solutions.” Related course work includes an Urban Planning Master class which addresses multi-layered analysis of social and economic forces, as well as studios that tackle design problems related to New York health care and public housing, water infrastructure for local communities in South Africa, hurricane relief in the U.S. Virgin Islands and depopulation of areas in rural Japan.

Issues of Community and Social Responsibility are also covered through access to GSD student organizations such as SOCA (Social Change and Activism), AASU (African American Student Union) and Women in Design. GSD offers Community Service Fellowships as well as immersion in the Boston community through “Project Link”, a four-week Architecture and Design Studio run by students for interested underprivileged and talented high school students.

I.1.2 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies multiyear objectives within the context of the institutional mission and culture.

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Analysis/Review: The GSD has a clear process with multiple perspectives offering comment to guide its long-range planning. Planning focuses on enrollments, financial aid, faculty planning, staff support, facility planning and utilization, student information systems, executive education, and curricular planning and expansion. The Visiting Committee to the Graduate School of Design reviews this vision biennially. They prepare a report that typically includes a review of the school's long-term goals and objectives, the current status of programs, faculty, students, and a review of resources to support education. This report on the school is shared with the Overseers, the President and Fellows, the Provost and the Dean of the GSD (see APR, p. 14 and reinforced by the policy and procedure description supplied to the team during the visit). The visiting team's meeting with the faculty confirmed this process and provided insight into the formal and informal means they contribute to long-range planning at the GSD.

I.1.3 Assessment:

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

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

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

B. Curricular Assessment and Development: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments, and must identify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Analysis/Review: Program Self-Assessment Procedures -- Review and self-assessment of the Master of Architecture program occurs formally and informally in a dynamic and interwoven process. The committee structure and faculty collaborative work mean that program assessments are continually made and change is effectively implemented. The faculty review objectives and achievement through general faculty meetings and separate meetings of just the senior faculty. Both forums as well as informal cross-disciplinary meetings provide information to the Executive Committee made up of the School's leadership. In parallel to this process the Dean meets with faculty as well as committees to monitor success and respond to emerging issues. Students have an opportunity to participate through a meeting each semester with the Dean as well as through the representative Student Forum (interview with Dean and confirmed in Faculty Meeting with visiting team).

Curricular Assessment and Development -- The architecture curriculum is continually assessed and reviewed at various levels. Because of the faculty's organization, the curriculum is annually reviewed by coordinators of the four semesters of core design studios (visiting team meeting with faculty). The topical area faculty meets to discuss courses and learning objectives on a continuing basis. This is supplemented by cross-area co-teaching opportunities that lead to a further integration of themes across areas -- e.g. history/theory issues are reinforced in technology courses and/or practice courses (visiting team interview of faculty). The GSD has also created cross-discipline "platforms" that bring together faculty from the different disciplines in the same topical area to share ideas and strategies on learning. This exchange further enhances the review and development of the curriculum in architecture. Students provide input to the assessment process through the Student Forum, general student meetings with the Dean each semester and through individual course evaluations (visiting team interview with students).

Part One (I): Section 2 – Resources

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. Human resources include full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff.

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

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Team Assessment: The program has appropriate human resources to support student achievement academically and professionally and financial resources to support faculty and staff development (APR, pp. 19-24). A matrix of faculty assignments demonstrates a balanced workload affording student exchanges with faculty as well as visiting team interviews with faculty: <http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/NAAB-Faculty-Matrix.pdf>

Faculty development is well supported by the School and is described in the Faculty Handbook available to the team at <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/GSD-Faculty-Handbook-12-14-16.pdf>. Funds and research space are available to junior faculty to support faculty research (visiting team interview of Dean and faculty). Faculty research funds are awarded through a faculty committee review process (APR, p. 20).

The faculty administer several research centers, programs, initiatives and design labs that support research and design-based investigations. Several of these have interdisciplinary relationships with other schools and colleges such as the Aga Khan Program, School of Public Health as well as many governmental relationships (APR, p. 21-23 and confirmed at Faculty Meeting).

Robin Slavin, GSD's Architecture Licensing Advisor (ALA), has information available to students regarding AXP requirements and internship placement, although students were not generally aware (visiting team meeting with the students). The GSD Career Services Office hosts two career fairs each academic year as well as a series of events and opportunities for students: résumé development, portfolio workshops and portfolio reviews, and a virtual career fair (summer internship opportunities) among its activities (<http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/career-services/>). Student support services include academic writing assistance, various workshops and learning opportunities offered by the many student groups, and regular formal and informal advising provided by the faculty.

Interviews with students at the all-school student meeting and with student leaders suggest informal advising and self-advising takes the place of the formal advising protocol outlined in the APR leading to inconsistency. According to Pamela Baldwin, Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs, faculty members are required to post and hold advising hours to meet with students.

The school requires Title IX - Sexual Harassment training for all incoming students and strongly suggests similar review for faculty (visiting team meeting with Executive Dean Pat Roberts).

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

Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including labs, shops, and equipment.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- Information resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

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

[X] Described

2018 Team Assessment: Based on the material found in the APR (APR, p. 24), a tour of facilities, the visiting team's meeting with the faculty, and informal discussions with students, the architecture program has sufficient physical resources to support student achievement.

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

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Team Assessment: Based on evidence found in the APR, Section I.2.3: Financial Resources (APR, p. 11, the GSD Fact Book available in the team room and confirmed by interviews with the Executive Dean and Dean) the GSD and the architecture program in particular have sufficient operating funds to fully support student learning and achievement. The financial resources appear stable and are reflected in consistent student enrollments. Endowments are strategically used to enhance faculty achievement and student enrichment. In recent years the School has aggressively pursued financial aid and has grown aid from \$6M in FY2008 to \$15M in FY 2018 including \$4M in need-based aid (APR, p.28). This initiative has translated to an average of \$20K reduction in debt per student (visiting team interview of Dean). In terms of research, the GSD has significantly increased its funded research average in the past few years, from less than \$1M in FY2010 up to \$6M in FY2017 (visiting team meeting with Executive Dean Pat Roberts, and GSD Factbook p. 24).

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

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

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Team Assessment: The school demonstrated that students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in architecture (APR, p. 28-34, and verified by the visiting team interview of Ann Baird Whiteside, Assistant Dean for Information Resources, and Ardys Kozbial, Collections and Outreach Librarian).

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

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

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Team Assessment: The GSD has a well-organized committee structure and administrative organization that encourages joint governance and provides faculty and students input on policies as well as assessing the school's achievements (see the faculty organizational chart at <http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/faculty-planning/organizational-charts/>).

The School is transforming its faculty through a new University-wide initiative that will include tenure-track appointments at the Assistant Professor level with a maximum ten-year review period before review for tenure. The senior and junior faculty and the School's administration have been diligently working to develop the necessary process and related support, including mentoring, to implement this significant change. Implementing this change was described by faculty and the Dean as a very positive experience and provided strong evidence of joint governance to the visiting team.

Student governance occurs through the GSD Student Forum that has representation of all GSD academic programs through class representatives. The GSD Student Forum representative serves on the Student Academic Affairs Committee and this committee serves as the primary source of input for students. The Student Academic Affairs Committee is composed of the chairs, program directors and school administrators. Students also meet biannually with the Visiting Committee to the GSD when they visit the school.

CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the study and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. Graduates must also be able to use a diverse range of skills to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigating, speaking, drawing, and modeling.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include

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

A.1 Professional Communication Skills: *Ability* to write and speak effectively and use representational media appropriate for both within the profession and with the public.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD - 1101 First-semester Core Studio - PROJECT, GSD - 1102 Second-semester Core Studio - SITUATE, GSD - 4121 Buildings, Texts, and Contexts, GSD - 4122 Buildings, Texts, and Contexts, and GSD – 4223 Buildings, Texts, and Contexts.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-1101: First-semester Core Studio - PROJECT, and GSD-1102: Second-semester Core Studio - SITUATE.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was

found in student work prepared for GSD-1201 Third-Semester Core Studio - INTEGRATE, GSD-1202 Fourth-Semester Core Studio - RELATE, GSD-4121 Building, Texts & Contexts I, GSD-4122 Building, Texts & Contexts II, GSD-4223 Building, Texts & Contexts III, GSD-6125 Environmental Systems in Architecture, GSD-6227 Structural Design I, and GSD-6229 Structural Design II, GSD-9301 Independent Thesis.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-1101 First-semester Core Studio - PROJECT, GSD-1102 Second-semester Core Studio - SITUATE, and GSD-1201 Third-Semester Core Studio - INTEGRATE.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for, GSD-2122 Projective Representation in Architecture, GSD-2223 Digital Media I, and GSD 2224 Digital Media II. Additionally, all four core studios demonstrate students' engagement with Ordering Systems: GSD-1101 First-semester Core Studio - PROJECT, GSD-1102 Second-semester Core Studio - SITUATE, GSD-1201 Third-Semester Core Studio - INTEGRATE, and GSD-1202 Fourth-Semester Core Studio – RELATE.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is **well met**. Evidence of student achievement was found in student work prepared for GSD-1101 First-semester Core Studio - PROJECT, GSD-1102 Second-semester Core Studio - SITUATE, GSD-1201 Third-Semester Core Studio - INTEGRATE, GSD-1202 Fourth-Semester Core Studio - RELATE, GSD-6123 Construction Systems, GSD-6230 Cases in Contemporary Construction, and GSD-9301 Independent Thesis.

The course GSD-6230 Cases in Contemporary Construction uses a case study method that leads students through an extensive and sophisticated forensic analysis of existing buildings to deduce principles of facade and cladding systems, construction details, building codes, and roofing systems followed by investigations of possible alternative system designs. This format for learning using analysis followed by projective speculation effectively demonstrated a student's ability in this student performance criterion.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-4223 Building, Texts, & Contexts III.

- A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity:** *Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to sites, buildings, and structures.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-1102: Second-semester Core Studio - SITUATE, GSD-1202: Fourth-Semester Core Studio - RELATE, and GSD-9301: Independent Thesis.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The 2018 visiting team found the M.Arch. program meets all the Student Performance Criteria in this Realm. Criterion A.6-Use of Precedents was well met. The team found the case study approach in GSD-6230 Cases in Contemporary Construction was a particularly effective learning format that developed analytical skills and creative problem solving abilities. The team found evidence of a strong culture of professional communication skills particularly in the area of physical model making that capitalizes on the wide array of techniques available in the GSD Fabrication Lab. The thesis program demonstrates a commitment to writing skills, critical thinking and representation skills that are required by this realm.

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

Student learning aspirations for this realm include

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-9301 Independent Thesis.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work products including student workbooks prepared for GSD-1201 Third-Semester Core Studio INTEGRATE, GSD-6121n Environmental Systems 1, GSD-6122 Energy in Architecture, GSD-6123 Construction Systems, and GSD-9301 Independent Thesis.

- B.3 Codes and Regulations:** *Ability* to design sites, facilities, and systems that are responsive to relevant codes and regulations, and include the principles of life-safety and accessibility standards.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-6230 Cases in Contemporary Construction.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of these skills being **well met** was found in the following courses: GSD-6123 Construction Systems and GSD-6230 Cases in Contemporary Construction. The course GSD-6123: Construction Systems was particularly innovative in its format. In this course students' knowledge was acquired and tested through a combination of multiple drawing assignments and model making exercises that served to document student learning and ability.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-1102 Second-semester Core Studio - SITUATE, GSD-1201 Third-semester Core Studio - INTEGRATE, GSD-6123 Construction Systems, GSD-6227 Structural Design 1, GSD-6229 Structural Design 2, and GSD-6230 Cases in Contemporary Construction.

- B.6 Environmental Systems:** *Ability* to demonstrate the principles of environmental systems' design, how design criteria can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This demonstration must include active and passive heating and cooling, solar geometry, daylighting, natural ventilation, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for: GSD 6121n: Environmental Systems I, GSD 6122n: Environmental Systems II, and GSD 6125: Environmental Systems in Arch.

- B.7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies:** *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to

fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: This SPC is **well met**. Evidence of student achievement above the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-6121: Construction Lab, GSD- 6121n: Environmental Systems 1, GSD-6122: Energy in Architecture, GSD-6125: Environmental Systems in Architecture, and GSD-6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction.

In course GSD-6121: Construction Lab, student work demonstrated a high level of understanding of building envelope systems, material assemblies and the investigating of thermodynamic properties using computer modeling. In addition, student work for course GSD-6121n: Environmental Systems 1 showed detailed calculations of R and U values of exterior wall assemblies. This combination of courses demonstrated student understanding of both theoretical principles and the utility of computer modeling. This approach provides a foundation for evidence-based decision-making in the design process.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for: GSD-6123: Construction Systems and GSD-6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-6121n: Environmental Systems I, GSD-6122: Energy in Architecture, GSD-6122n: Environmental Systems 2, and GSD-6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The 2018 visiting team found technology courses provide a foundation of the requisite knowledge in the required advanced design studios. Two of the SPC in this realm were well met: B-4 - Technical Documentation and B-7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies. The visiting team found evidence that the technology course sequence introduces students to assessment tools that could augment design decisions made during the building design process. Since the last NAAB visit the architecture program has developed the “GSD Guide to Building Code Basics” available to students online: <http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/resources/special-interest-links/>. This provides an accessible student handbook of code requirements for egress, accessibility, occupancy types and construction types.

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to demonstrate that they have the ability to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

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

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: This SPC is **well met**. Evidence of student achievement above the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-1201: Third-Semester Core Studio - INTEGRATE, GSD-1202: Fourth-Semester Core Studio - RELATE and GSD-9301: Independent Thesis. The preparation of research books for GSD-1201: Third-Semester Core Studio - INTEGRATE were particularly well done and demonstrated how research is integrated into the design project.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-1201: Third-Semester Core Studio – INTEGRATE

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

[X] Not Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found in the student work available for the visiting team to review. The team could not find consistent evidence of students applying knowledge of life safety codes (particularly egress requirements) and the integration of environmental systems with other building components that demonstrate the achievement of ability.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The visiting team found there was considerable evidence in the individual technology courses that requisite student learning meets NAAB criteria. The integration of systems—particularly environmental systems and life safety systems with other building systems—that is a requisite knowledge for this realm was not demonstrated. The team did not find consistent evidence that students had achieved an understanding of the systems, the space they require, and how the various constituent parts are synthesized to form a whole.

Realm D: Professional Practice: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and the need to act legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction.
- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.
- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture: *Understanding* of the relationships among key stakeholders in the design process—client, contractor, architect, user groups, local community—the architect’s role to reconcile stakeholders’ needs.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-7212: Foundations of Practice and GSD-6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-7212: Foundations of Practice and GSD-6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction.

D.3 Business Practices: *Understanding* of the basic principles of a firm’s business practices, including financial management and business planning, marketing, organization, and entrepreneurship.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-7212: Foundations of Practice and GSD-6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction.

D.4 Legal Responsibilities: *Understanding* of the architect’s responsibility to the public and the

client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-7212: Foundations of Practice and GSD-6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction.

D.5 Professional Ethics: *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice and understanding the role of the NCARB Rules of Conduct and the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-7212: Foundations of Practice and GSD-6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction.

Realm D. General Team Commentary: Evidence of Student Achievement in the Professional Practice realm was found. In particular, the course GSD-7212: Foundations of Practice and its final exam (a 200 item exam that simulates the A.R.E.) was a comprehensive assessment of this entire realm.

Part Two (II): Section 2 – Curricular Framework

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation

For a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); or the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).
2. Institutions located outside the United States and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may pursue candidacy and accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture under the following circumstances:
 - a. The institution has explicit written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region.
 - b. At least one of the agencies granting permission has a system of institutional quality assurance and review which the institution is subject to and which includes periodic evaluation.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: The University meets this requirement and was last accredited by New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) in March 2010. Reference to institutional accreditation can be found on the NEASC website: <https://cihe.neasc.org/about-our-institutions/roster/harvard-university>.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs with the following titles: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and optional studies.

The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs. The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are recognized by the public as accredited degrees and therefore should not be used by non-accredited programs.

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

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*. All accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements:

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: The M. Arch. title is used exclusively when referring to NAAB-accredited professional degree programs in GSD materials (see <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/architecture/landing-page> for the architecture program website, <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/architecture/master-in-architecture-i/> description of degrees and the admissions page <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/admissions/degree-programs/>). The GSD does use the title M. Arch II to designate its non-accredited, post-professional graduate degree for applicants who hold a professional undergraduate degree.

The program meets the minimum number of credit hours specified in the 2014 NAAB Conditions: M. Arch requires 105 graduate credit hours plus an undergraduate degree. Of the 105 graduate credits, 24 credits are optional studies. Students granted advanced standing (meeting some requirements as part of their undergraduate education) to the M. Arch degree program must meet 75 graduate credits with 21 credits in optional studies.

Part Two (II): Section 3 – Evaluation of Preparatory Education

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

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic course work related to satisfying NAAB student performance criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.
- In the event a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate before accepting the offer of admission. See also Condition II.4.6.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Students entering the M.Arch program with Advanced Placement (AP) are assessed for course waiver from aspects of the required first-year curriculum. The Admissions AP Subcommittee, staffed by faculty, makes decisions on waivers. The subcommittee reviews student portfolios as well as course syllabus and transcripts. The subcommittee uses its experience and knowledge of other programs to guide decision-making. The visiting team reviewed a prioritized list of schools that often have students whose previous course work meet the standards for advanced placement. In no case can a student be admitted where they are provided a waiver of all courses in a topical area (e.g. students cannot be granted a waiver for all of the structures courses in the sequence, but only the first course).

Part Two (II): Section 4 – Public Information

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

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of the statement in its correct form as found in Appendix 1 of the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* was found in published materials and websites: <http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/architecture/master-in-architecture-i/>

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

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

- The *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*
- The *Conditions for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004, depending on the date of the last visit)
- The *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation* (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Access to the required documents is available via the Harvard GSD

website at:

<http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/architecture/master-in-architecture-i/>

and:

<https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/naab-accreditation-information-and-resources/>

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Access to the required information is through the Career Advising Center as well as a website (<https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/resources/career-resources-for-architecture-students/>). Students also have access to job postings, internships, alumni contacts, and the option to schedule a counseling session with a career counselor through the CREATE portal: <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/resources/create/>. The visiting team meeting with the students was not widely attended so our assessment of students using the Career Advising Center was limited. However, 100% of the attending students knew of the Center while only 10% have utilized its services.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs:

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

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: The required documents are found on the GSD Website at <http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/naab-accreditation-information-and-resources/>. The site includes links to:

- The most recent Architecture Program Report (2011) presented by the department to NAAB prior to its 2012 team visit:
<https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/2012-GSD-APR.pdf>
- The final edition of the 2012 Visiting Team Report:
l87r32c95dp1hz05tig4px11.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/NAAB-VTR_2012.pdf
- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB, accrediting the M.Arch I program:
<https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/NAAB-Accreditation-letter-and-report-2012.pdf>
- The program's Interim Progress Report, submitted in the fall of 2014:
<https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/2014-Interim-Report.pdf>

II.4.4 ARE Pass Rates:

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

websites to the results.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: The required information is available to students and the public through a link to the NCARB ARE Pass Rate webpage at <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/resources/career-resources-for-architecture-students/>

II.4.5 Admissions and Advising:

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

This documentation must include the following:

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: The visiting team found the requisite information for this requirement. It is available on the GSD website at <http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/architecture/master-in-architecture-i/> and <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/admissions/apply/>.

II.4.7 Student Financial Information:

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: The GSD provides information on student financial aid online (see: <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/admissions/paying-for-your-program/contact-financial-aid/>). GSD publishes a Financial Aid Handbook that contains information on the costs associated with the degree program including all tuition and fees required during a full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program. The handbook can be found online (see <https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/resources/financial-aid-handbook/> with links to: Domestic-GSD-Financial-Aid-Handbook-17-18.pdf and International-GSD-Financial-Aid-Handbook-2017-2018).

PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

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

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: The visiting team was provided interim progress reports by Jackie Piracini, Assistant Dean for Academic Services and confirmed with her the data supplied is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

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

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Interim Progress Reports are available on the GSD website, see: <http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/naab-accreditation-information-and-resources/>.

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

A.6 Use of Precedents

This Student Performance Criterion is well met. Evidence of student achievement was found in student work prepared for GSD-1101 First-semester Core Studio - PROJECT, GSD-1102 Second-semester Core Studio - SITUATE, GSD-1201 Third-Semester Core Studio - INTEGRATE, GSD-1202 Fourth-Semester Core Studio - RELATE, GSD-6123 Construction Systems, GSD-6230 Cases in Contemporary Construction, and GSD-9301 Independent Thesis.

The course GSD-6230 Cases in Contemporary Construction uses a case study method that leads students through an extensive and sophisticated forensic analysis of existing buildings to deduce principles of facade and cladding systems, construction details, building codes, and roofing systems followed by investigations of possible alternative system design. This format for learning using analysis followed by projective speculation effectively demonstrated a student's ability in this student performance criterion.

B.4 Technical Documentation

Evidence of these skills being well met was found in the following courses: GSD-6123 Construction Systems and GSD-6230 Cases in Contemporary Construction. The course GSD-6123: Construction Systems was particularly innovative in its format. In this course students' knowledge was acquired and tested through a combination of multiple drawing assignments and model making exercises that served to document student learning and ability.

B.7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies

This condition is well met. Evidence of student achievement above the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-6121: Construction Lab, GSD-6121n: Environmental Systems 1, GSD-6122: Energy in Architecture, GSD-6125: Environmental Systems in Architecture, and GSD-6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction.

In course GSD-6121: Construction Lab, student work demonstrated a high level of understanding of building envelope systems, material assemblies and the investigating of thermodynamic properties using computer modeling. In addition, student work for course GSD-6121n: Environmental Systems 1 showed detailed calculations of R and U values of exterior wall assemblies. This combination of courses demonstrated student understanding of both theoretical as well as the usefulness of computer modeling and provides a foundation for evidence-based decision-making in the design process.

C.1 Research

This Student Performance Criterion is well met. Evidence of student achievement above the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for GSD-1201: *Third-Semester Core Studio - INTEGRATE*, GSD-1202: *Fourth-Semester Core Studio - RELATE* and GSD-9301: *Independent Thesis*. The preparation of research books for GSD-1201: *Third-Semester Core Studio - INTEGRATE* were particularly well done and demonstrated how research is integrated into the design project.

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

The team is required to complete an SPC matrix that identifies the course(s) in which student work was found that demonstrated the program's compliance with Part II, Section 1.

The program is required to provide the team with a blank matrix that identifies courses by number and title on the y axis and the NAAB SPC on the x axis. This matrix is to be completed in Excel and converted to Adobe PDF and then added to the final VTR.

		A.1 Professional Communication Skills	A.2 Design Thinking Skills	A.3 Investigative Skills	A.4 Architectural Design Skills	A.5 Ordering Systems	A.6 Use of Precedents	A.7 History and Global Culture	A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity	B.1 Pre-Design	B.2 Site Design	B.3 Codes and Regulations	B.4 Technical Documentation	B.5 Structural Systems	B.6 Environmental Systems	B.7 Building Envelope Systems & Assemblies	B.8 Building Materials & Assemblies	B.9 Building Service Systems	B.10 Financial Considerations	C.1 Research	C.2 Integrated Evaluations & Decision-Making	C.3 Integrative Design	D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture	D.2 Project Management	D.3 Business Practices	D.4 Legal Responsibilities	D.5 Professional Conduct
STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA MATRIX																											
1101: First Semester Architecture Core: PROJECT		X	X		X	X	X																				
1102: Second Semester Architecture Core: SITUATE		X	X		X	X	X		X					X													
1201: Third Semester Architecture Core: INTEGRATE				X	X	X	X			X			X							X	X						
1202: Fourth Semester Architecture Core: RELATE				X		X	X		X											X							
2121: Visual Studies																											
2122: Projective Representation in Architecture						X	X																				
2223/2224: Digital Media I/II						X																					
4121: Buildings, Texts, and Contexts I		X		X																							
4122: Buildings, Texts, and Contexts II		X		X																							
4223: Buildings, Texts, and Contexts III		X		X				X																			
prior	6121 (2016 and prior): Construction Lab															X											
	6122 (2016 and prior): Energy in Architecture										X					X		X									
	6125 (2017 and prior): Environmental Systems in Arch.			X											X	X											
current	6121n (2017 and later): Environmental Technologies I										X				X	X		X									
	6122n (2017 and later): Environmental Technologies II														X			X									
	6125n (2018 and later): Building Simulation			X																							
	6126n (2018 and later): Materials																										
	6123: Construction Systems						X				X		X	X			X										
	6227: Structural Design I			X										X													
	6229: Structural Design II			X										X													
	6230: Cases in Contemporary Construction						X					X	X	X		X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X
	7212: Foundations of Practice																										
	9301: Independent Design Thesis		X				X		X	X	X									X							
require	Options Studio I																										
d	Options Studio II																										
elective	Advanced History Distributional Elective I																										
s	Advanced History Distributional Elective II																										
	Global and Cultural Diversity Distributional Elective																										
	Professional Practice Distributional Elective																										

X = primary course for SPC
o = secondary course for SPC

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA

David Cronrath
Professor and Associate Provost
School of Architecture, Planning, & Preservation
University of Maryland
Campus Drive, Architecture Bldg.
1228 College Park, MD 20742-0001
301.405.2260
cronrath@umd.edu

Representing the AIA

Joseph Lai, AIA, LEED AP
343 W Wolf Point Plaza, Unit 2803,
Chicago, IL 60654
202.468.8092
joseph.p.lai@gmail.com

Representing the NCARB

Ron Blitch, FAIA
Blitch Knevel
Architects, LLC 757 St.
Charles Avenue New
Orleans, LA 70130
504.452.1738
ronblitch@msn.com

Representing the AIAS

Elizabeth Widaski
Clemson, SC
713.562.7293

V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,



David Cronrath
Team Chair



Joseph Lai, AIA
Team Member



Ron Blich, FAIA
Team Member



Elizabeth Widaski
Team Member