National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

2023 Visiting Team Report

Lawrence Technological University
Department of Architecture, College of Architecture and Design

M.Arch.

Continuing Accreditation Visit
March 27- March 29, 2023

Contents

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

2023 Team Analysis:

Introduction:

The team would like to thank the entire LTU Architecture Department faculty, and specifically the Chair, Dale Allen Gyure, JD, Phd., and professor Eric Ward, RA, for the preparation they provided for the 2023 virtual site visit. The Architecture Program Report (APR), supplemental documentation, assessment evaluation **and** continued improvement narratives, were provided in a timely and professional manner. The effort made **prior** to the visit allowed the visiting team and program to proactively and efficiently address questions related to the Conditions for a full and constructive assessment.

In the review of the APR and its supplemental documentation, and through the virtual discussions with the various stakeholders during the visit, the team has made the following observations, strengths, and opportunities.

Observations:

1. **Inclusivity:** Lawrence Tech was founded in 1932 in a building adjacent to the original Ford Model T Plant, with the intent to provide opportunities for engineers to get a degree and move into middle management. Classes were taught at night so the Ford employees could work during the day. Today, the LTU M.Arch. program continues this culture, offering degree programs to working students with evening courses, supporting non-traditional students with an opportunity to work through the program at their own individual pace. This arrangement captures students who would not otherwise have an opportunity to pursue a professional degree in architecture.
2. **Curriculum and Assessment:** Prior to the launch of the 2020 NAAB Conditions, outcome-based self-assessment had already been embraced by both LTU and the College of Architecture and Design (CoAD). The program has a robust approach to making adjustments to the curriculum. Changes occur in a constructive and supportive manner and remain critical to the success of the program's mission to be "Focused on Design, Immersed in Technology, and Grounded in Practice." The faculty understand how alterations to the assessment of particular learning objectives can impact the overall curriculum.
3. **Communication:** All levels of the academic setting (including students, faculty, staff, and higher administration), feel at ease and able to approach anyone at the university, with very few barriers impacting direct lines of communication that may be more common at larger bureaucratic institutions. Because of the relatively small scale of the university, the CoAD family is able to act swiftly on desired actions.
4. **Supportive Learning Culture:** The CoAD has made a cognizant approach to keep the student to faculty ratio low, which in turn allows students to make personal connections with professors, including adjunct faculty, that further support their educational and professional aspirations.

Strengths:

1. **Online Graduate Degree:** In 2010 the LTU M.Arch. program began teaching studios online. With more than a decade of experience and lessons learned through their online studio platform, the program continues to make advancements in technology to support a positive online educational experience. The program easily pivoted during the Covid-19 pandemic, which ultimately led to the current online program. Today, the entire graduate curriculum (studios and lecture courses) is taught online, and at night only, to accommodate students working full-time.
2. **Technical Knowledge:** Naturally, stemming from the founding principles of the University, the architecture program prides itself in a strong foundation of technical knowledge. This was observed with reinforcement throughout the curriculum and within the capstone studio course.
3. **Practice:** The M.Arch. program follows through on its mission to prepare students for professional practice. The far majority of the student body intend to pursue licensure and are

aware of the next steps in order to do so. Furthermore, the graduate program emphasizes the skills and tools needed for online collaboration and communication, preparing graduates for a global workplace.

Opportunities:

1. **Online Learning Culture:** The flexibility for graduate students to take their required courses at their own pace, on their own time allows for great autonomy. However, with students spending nearly the entire time in the M.Arch. program in a virtual setting, there can be difficulty in developing a shared design culture among cohorts. Opportunities to help mimic the strong presence of a physical studio environment could be further explored.
2. **Professional Experience Oversight**: Nearly all, if not all, of the students in the M.Arch. program are currently working, gaining tangible professional experience, while simultaneously pursuing their architecture education. This is commendable, and further reinforced with the M.Arch. program offering NCARB's Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure program *(also referred to as IPAL)*. There is an opportunity to assess and evaluate how professional work experience directly impacts and further reinforces the student learning outcomes.
3. **Curriculum Changes**: In response to the results of the self-assessment process, the program anticipates making improvements to the curriculum. With this change comes an opportunity to make appropriate adjustments to the student learning outcomes with an emphasis on design skills, and levels of assessment, that will balance the program's pedagogy and mission to be "Focused on Design, Immersed in Technology, and Grounded in Practice."
4. **Diversity of Faculty:** The program has made progress, but with limited success since the previous visit in attracting and retaining a more diverse full-time faculty. Since 2019, the college has hired six full-time, tenure-track faculty members, However, retirements and faculty departures have also occurred. With full support from the university there are plans in place, with faculty searches currently underway, to right size and balance full-time and adjunct faculty. The architecture program has an opportunity to further align their educators with the foundational ideals and expertise that supports the programs' pedagogy.
5. **Strategic Plan:** The CoAD 2022-2025 strategic plan addressing academic culture, revenue streams, and increasing profile.
    a. **Expanding Enrollment:** As the program continues to expand its enrollment, there are opportunities for student organizations and faculty advisors to strengthen the engagement with high-school outreach within the region.
    b. **Alumni Philanthropy:** The university is committed to supporting the CoAD with dedicated staff to support philanthropic efforts with alumni. First through tracking participation rate, and next through dollars raised. Opportunities exist to align these efforts with other portions of the CoAD strategic plan.

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

The 2023 NAAB Visiting Team found all Conditions met, described, or demonstrated.

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2009 Condition Not Met

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

Previous Team Report (2014): Although some aspects of this criterion are met in ARC 5913, the depth of material is not sufficient to satisfy criterion.

2020 IPR Board Review: After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by Lawrence Technological University, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the 2-Year Interim Progress Report. No further information is required at this time.

2023 Team Analysis:
LTU was quick to make a robust adjustment to their curriculum to address this previously identified deficiency. In 2015 the professional practice course was revised to allocate three specific modules to the topic of legal responsibilities. The content is reinforced at both the undergraduate graduate level through *(Construction Systems 2 (ARC 2323/5323)* and *(Professional Practice ARC 5913)*. The student learning objectives from the criterion is now covered under SC.2 Professional Practice and is met with distinction.

III. Program Changes

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

2023 Team Analysis:
The most significant change to the LTU M.Arch. program since the 2014 visit has been focused around assessment. The architecture program has made minor changes to the curriculum and the learning objectives based on the new NAAB 2020 Conditions for Accreditation. LTU had already been providing self-assessment for the architecture program before the 2020 Conditions came online, so the transition was relatively smooth. In the summer of 2020, Professor Eric Ward, RA was appointed the new Assessment Coordinator for the program, with responsibilities for overseeing our internal self-assessment regime for both NAAB and LTU. Professor Ward worked with the department chair and associate chair to create a method for assigning NAAB criteria to program classes, translating their existing scheme for the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation to meet the new demands of the 2020 NAAB Conditions. On LTU Assessment Day in the fall semester of 2020, all full-time faculty in the program met to discuss the appropriateness of the proposed criteria and objective assignments and adjust as necessary. Minor modifications were made during Assessment Day 2021, based in part on feedback from the previous year. As a result, the architecture program's transition to the 2020 Conditions was completed by the end of Fall 2021, with a new scheme that incorporated both NAAB and LTU requirements.

Other notable changes to the program:

- 2014; M.Arch. Track 1 "direct entry" began.
- 2016; M.Arch. program began offering NCARB's Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) program
- The naming terminology of M.Arch. tracks have changed, including new terminology for Track III advanced standing (referred to as Track IV). Refer to Section 4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum of this report for more information on M.Arch. tracks.

IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

1—Context and Mission (*Guidelines*, p. 5)
To help the NAAB and the visiting team understand the specific circumstances of the school, the program must describe the following:

- The institutional context and geographic setting (public or private, urban or rural, size, etc.), and how the program's mission and culture influence its architecture pedagogy and impact its

development. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the mission of the college or university and how that shapes or influences the program.

- The program's role in and relationship to its academic context and university community, including how the program benefits–and benefits from–its institutional setting and how the program as a unit and/or its individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. Also describe how the program, as a unit, develops multidisciplinary relationships and leverages unique opportunities in the institution and the community.
- The ways in which the program encourages students and faculty to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective opportunities (e.g., field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities).

☒ **Described**

2023 Team Analysis:
LTU is a private, non-profit institution located in Southfield, Michigan (located within Detroit metro region). The university has 2,740 students, including approximately 2,000 undergraduate students and 700 graduate students. Although most programs at the university are offered on-campus, LTU has made significant investments in online learning over the last decade to support those students who are employed while enrolled in classes. Currently, for example, the entire graduate architecture program (studio and lecture courses) is taught online during the evening hours.

Lawrence Tech has long been a pioneer in addressing the needs of all students and developed some of the nation's first evening class programs when the university was founded in 1932. LTU was founded, in a building adjacent to the original Ford Model T Plant, with the intent to provide opportunities for engineers to get a degree and move into middle management. Classes were all at night so the Ford employees could work during the day. This premise remains ingrained in the university, and furthermore the architecture program, today as a guiding objective focused upon the development of innovative and agile professionals and leaders. Originally a college of engineering, LTU now has more than 100 programs in four colleges: Architecture and Design, Arts and Sciences, Business and Information Technology, and Engineering.

The architecture program began in 1962 with a bachelor's degree, and in 1973 with a master's degree. Since 1974 LTU has held a NAAB accredited degree program, initially the B. Arch., which was discontinued in 1997 when the M.Arch. became the sole NAAB degree program. Naturally, stemming from the basis of the university, the architecture program prides itself on a strong foundation of technical knowledge. The mission for the M.Arch. degree program is to be "Focused on Design, Immersed in Technology, and Grounded in Practice." The M. Arch degree program has remained in good standing since its inception and was last reviewed by NAAB in 2014.

The LTU M.Arch. program was a pioneer for online teaching for architecture education. The first online studios were taught in 2010, which made for an easy transition during the Covid-19 pandemic, and ultimately led to the currently fully online graduate program.

The architecture program's current enrollment is 263 undergraduate and 158 graduate students. The NAAB M.Arch. program has four (4) tracks to accommodate a variety of different entry opportunities. LTU began the direct entry M.Arch. program (Track 1) in 2014, allowing undergraduates in good academic standing to automatically be enrolled into the graduate program. Similarly, two years later in 2016, LTU began offering NCARB's Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) program.

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:
As evidenced in meeting discussions, and described in the APR, the shared values of the discipline and profession are integral to the mission for the M.Arch. degree program to be "Focused on Design, Immersed in Technology, and Grounded in Practice." Furthermore, the CoAD 2022-2025 strategic plan captures these very same values addressing academic culture, revenue streams, and increasing profile.

Design: The learning of design at the LTU architecture program is understood as "the acquisition of knowledge through thoughtful analysis and creative synthesis." As in most architecture schools, the design studio represents the main pedagogical space for this learning. The analysis of the context of architecture, the task of the design studios, is supported by project-based teaching methodologies implemented by most courses in the curriculum and in which students are asked to participate in focused, workshop-style activities, including fact-finding and analysis relevant to the content area. This occurs in particular in the two-credit labs that are associated, but distinct, components of most design studios. The complementary lab-studio courses are offered in the undergraduate studio sequence and Comprehensive Design studio support the students producing evidence-based design responses.

The explicit intersection with other disciplines, like interior design, landscape architecture, or the social sciences, is an intrinsic part in several design studios taught at LTU. The five part 'Integrated Design' studio sequence provides a clear framework for a pedagogy of design as the synthesis and integration of multiple scales and disciplines. Scales that, in these design courses, go from interior spaces to the city; and techniques that range from construction to urban planning. Following the LTU identity as a STEM-

focused institution, there is an emphasis on applied research and a general commitment to the reality of the profession by the design faculty, the far majority of whom are registered and/or practicing architects.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: LTU articulates the value of environmental awareness and how it affects our professional responsibility as architects through "a pragmatic way of viewing the world and its resources." The CoAD curriculum includes courses that examine the different processes of production and consumption that configure the built environment. Students examine the environmental impact of design decisions on buildings' execution and find connections between upstream and downstream processes as they relate to land occupation, water consumption, use of raw materials, supply chains, and embodied energy. Climate change is investigated under the lens of multi-scalar natural systems, anthropogenic forces, and socio-political circumstances that trigger debates about the issue of environmental justice.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: From its inception, LTU has made its programs available to people who might not otherwise have access to a quality, higher education by establishing degree programs that could be completed primarily at night so working students might have access to higher education. The LTU M.Arch. program continues this commitment, offering evening courses to working students and the opportunity to complete at a pace appropriate to the individual student.

In 2022, the CoAD appointed a new associate dean, adding a female voice to the college's administration, who is dedicated to developing and supporting the CoAD DEI Initiatives. The associate dean will partner with the Diversity in Design (DID) Collaborative to develop strategies and support for the CoAD's black student population. Furthermore, the LTU campus is deemed accessible for those with physical disabilities, and both LTU and the CoAD are dedicated to understanding the best practices of online education so that students who could not otherwise pursue a degree might be able to do so.

Knowledge and Innovation: The scaffolded approach built into the curriculum encourages a strong approach for knowledge and innovation to be pursued through teaching and learning, research and scholarship, internal service, and external outreach. The studio sequence is supported by technology and visual communication-focused courses, where exploration of knowledge and innovation take the form of experimentation, simulation, and testing. These studio, communication and modeling-simulation-prototyping courses then connect to the Construction Systems sequence and allow students to apply these knowledge structures systematically in the Comprehensive Design studio. Additionally, the faculty are active in the publication of books and articles, and the presentation of conference papers. Several faculty members also sit on the editorial boards of professional and academic organizations and academic journals.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: The entire CoAD, including the M.Arch. students are required to take *Design Leadership (DES 4112)*, a course focused "on leadership skills specific to the allied disciplines of design within the CoAD." Student organizations, specifically AIAS, and NOMAS are providing undergraduate students a chance to understand the breadth of their professional opportunities, make contacts with the larger profession, and build relationships with one another. Students reinforced this aspect in meetings with the team.

Students are exposed to interdisciplinary and collaborative work at several points in the curriculum and most specifically within the *Critical Practice Studio (ARC 5804)* where students engage research in teams, leading into the final design-build project, where the entire class works collaboratively. Students are engaged in community related pro-bono work through *Integrated Design 5 (ARC 4116)* and *Advanced Design Studio 1 (ARC 5814)*. These studios challenge students to partner with non-profit groups or informal community networks. The Detroit Studio serves neighborhood organizations, local governments, not-for-profit organizations, and other community groups, and has provided students the opportunity to participate in projects for real clients. Apart from service-based learning studios, many faculty members are also engaged in community-based practice within local communities and beyond. These are undertaken through formal and informal field trips to construction sites, urban neighborhoods, historic projects, and contemporary design examples.

Lifelong Learning: The CoAD has a long history of integrating theory and practice over the entire time students are in the program and have established an ongoing relationship with the Southeast Michigan profession. The relationships with the local profession and industry benefit everyone beyond just employment. This provides flexible schedules for work experience and enables students to connect their studies with practice and to begin their AXP Experience. The student practice experience becomes an additional educational tool. This work / learn part of the program's structure and location provides opportunities for returning or relocating students. The online M.Arch. program enables students locally, nationally, and internationally, to seek a NAAB degree as the evening online coursework schedule aligns with professional employment. The team noted that most if not all the students raised their hands when asked if they intend to pursue licensure after graduation, and the AXP advisor, Eric Ward, RA, was given high marks for his assistance.

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

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

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

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

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

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:

The team found this criterion to be introduced, reinforced, and emphasized throughout the M.Arch. curriculum, specifically within *Construction Systems 2 (ARC 2323/5232), Design Leadership (DES 4112),* and *Professional Practice (ARC 5913)* which significantly covers the content and prepares students for initial employment. The team observed in discussions, with both undergraduates and graduate students, that many if not all students when asked about if they would pursue professional licensure answered yes.

The program also utilizes several extracurricular offerings in addition to the understanding of Career Path opportunities provided by the curriculum, such as AIAS, where students participate in activities associated with the transition into professional employment, including firm tours and internships. The college's long-term relationships with practitioners in Southeast Michigan as colleagues, employers, and adjunct and visiting faculty, allow exposure to many different approaches to design and architectural work environments and illustrate flexibility across disciplinary boundaries.

Assessment was evidenced in lecture quizzes, reading responses, research projects, course assignments and exams. The APR indicates that the program tracks and evaluates each of these areas as separate Learning Objectives. Student performance for Architectural Licensure Paths is shown as being measured at 98%-100% across both undergraduate and graduate degree tracks, and this is significantly above this area's preliminary benchmarks of 70% and 80% meeting or exceeding expectations. Similarly, for Design Career Paths, the student performance for both courses, measured at 100% across undergraduate and graduate degree tracks, is significantly above the program's benchmarks.

LTU noted opportunities for improving student performance were identified as 1) raising the level of specific professional content within each course, and 2) raising the learning outcome benchmarks to

reflect current performance and to track updated course content in the future. The visiting team noted an opportunity to assess and evaluate how professional work experience directly impacts and further reinforces the student learning outcomes throughout the curriculum.

This criterion is met with distinction.

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)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The courses assessed for this criterion are distributed across all the studio curriculum, beginning with the *Visual Communication Courses (ARC 1213/1223 and ARC 5813/5823)*, reinforced throughout the entire design studio sequence (Integrated Design Studio (undergrad), and Advanced Design Studio (graduate), and then emphasized within the *Comprehensive Design Studio (ARC 5126)*. All these visual communication and studio courses are taught across the curriculum for all tracks.

LTU has made a commendable effort to structure a multifaceted assessment system for this criterion, identifying more than seven sub criteria that are separately distributed over the multiple studio courses. Furthermore, different benchmarks are assigned separately to each sub criteria (PC.2A, PC.2B, PC.2C, PC.2D, PC.2E, PC.2F, PC.2G, respectively), ranging from 70 on PC.2A Ordering Systems to PC.2B Communication and Representation. This system naturally produces a very large set of data, something which is not intrinsically problematic. However, the sheer complexity of the system, including sub criteria with arguably overlapping thematic areas (such as Design Process, Design Thinking, or Design Skills), might be hindering the clarity of the conclusions. As some members of the CoAD faculty explained during the team visit, part of this complexity is due to the attempt to reconcile the previous NAAB Conditions with the 2020 Conditions.

The APR states that some of the faculty at the CoAD wishes to find ways to improve the design Program Criteria. Furthermore, this PC explicitly includes the instilling of the design processes that integrate multiple factors. In response to the results of the self-assessment process, the program anticipates making improvements to the curriculum. With this change comes an opportunity to make appropriate adjustments to the student learning outcomes with an emphasis on design skills, and levels of assessment, that will balance the program's pedagogy and mission to be "Focused on Design, Immersed in Technology, and Grounded in Practice."

PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility—How the program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
This criterion is addressed for all M.Arch. students, regardless of track, by being introduced in *HVAC & Water Systems (ARC 5413)* and reinforced in *Ecological Issues (ARC 5423)*, furthermore the content is reinforced throughout the studio curriculum. Students demonstrate a high level of understanding to apply information pertaining to natural and built environments, including impact and mitigation strategies for climate change, and design that is responsive to local conditions in Michigan.

The program uses a variety of assessment methods, including lecture quizzes, reading responses, a research project, course assignments, and exams. The benchmark of 70% is either meeting or exceeding program expectations. LTU acknowledges that the assessment data suggests instructors and coordinators could clarify a methodology for translating resilience principles into design applications. Similarly, the program has noted that additional efforts are needed to address criteria for the successful evaluation of social factors and approaches for addressing resilience.

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)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The student learning objectives are identified throughout the history and theory sequence, including *History of the Designed Environment* I (ARC 3613-5613) and II (ARC 3623-5623), *Twentieth Century Architecture* (ARC 4183), and *Design Theory* (5643). This course sequence enables students to encounter history and theory in almost every year of the program. Assessment methods include discussions, quizzes, exams, research projects, analysis posters, and essays.

Student performance has exceeded expectations consistently. Students demonstrate a high level of understanding and successfully applying information pertaining to architectural history and theory and their relationships to global culture in their work. Each of these courses has benchmarks of 70% which will be increased to 75% and the courses will be reviewed to find opportunities for more rigorous methods of evaluation and new assignments.

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)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Similar to other learning objectives, this criterion is introduced, reinforced, and emphasized throughout the M.Arch. curriculum. LTU breaks PC.5 Research and Innovation content into two areas: (1) Research as inquiry through the study of existing information (PC.5A) and (2) Innovation as experimentation toward construction and development of new knowledge (PC.5B). LTU acknowledges that the assessment data suggests there should be additional clarity among faculty to frame research as a driving force for design.

Students engage and participate in architectural research through the *Research Methods (ARC 5013)* course which all M.Arch. students are exposed to, regardless of track. *Research Methods (ARC 5013)* has a 90% benchmark and assessment method for a manifesto (poster) and visual narrative. Within the course, students understand how to frame critical questions and assuming positions; evaluate research methodologies for testing and experimentation; use research and analysis to make decisions; and recognize the implications of design decisions. Students learn a foundational vocabulary of research and analysis, and develop critical thinking skills.

Students are first introduced to the process of evaluating innovation in the field in *Prototyping and Fabrication (ARC 3823)* (Track I & II), and *Simulation and Prototyping (ARC 5823)* (Track III & IV). All M.Arch. students (all tracks) then reinforce the student learning objective through the *Critical Practice Studio (ARC 5804)*. Within this course, as the name suggests a studio that is reflective of a professional architectural practice, innovation is observed as students research, generate, and represent design ideas in collaborative teams. *Critical Practice Studio (ARC 5804)* has an 80% benchmark and assessment methods for individual, small group, and large group assignments.

During the summer, *Research Methods (ARC 5013)* and *Critical Practice Studio (ARC 5804*) are the two courses that all M.Arch. students take prior to the Advanced Design Studio/Thesis option sequence. This is the one time during the entire graduate M.Arch. program that all students need to be physically present on campus for a 1-week collaborative build effort.

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)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Design Leadership (DES 4112 / 5112) is a course taken by all CoAD students, regardless of degree/major, and emphasizes leadership among multidisciplinary teams. With a 100% benchmark, the course incorporates lectures that emphasize the value of collaboration and establishes the importance of teamwork.

Additionally, the *Critical Practice Studio (ARC 5804*), with a current benchmark of 50% (increasing to 75-80%) for this criterion, provides students with an excellent opportunity to apply effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems. The students work with diverse stakeholder groups while designing and building in the public realm. As an example, the students receive and integrate input from the City of Southfield, a professional structural engineer, local suppliers, and fabricators with reference to material availability and lead times, cost, fabrication limitations, and tooling processes. As teams become more task-based, not all students take on the role of "designer," but make valuable contributions in areas such as cost estimating, material sourcing and specification, project scheduling, and project management. This is the one time during the entire graduate M.Arch. program that all students need to be physically present on campus for a 1-week collaborative build effort.

As part of the September 2022 Assessment Day and scheduled ARC Department meeting for April 2023, the benchmark for each of the *Design Leadership (DES 4112 / 5112)* course will likely be adjusted. LTU acknowledges that the studios should be more thoroughly coordinated with readings assigned in *Design Leadership* course as a means to further reinforce 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)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Because the intent of Learning and Teaching Culture is broader than coursework, the program approaches PC.7 differently from the other PCs and SCs. As a learning objective, this criterion is only formally assessed in one course. Other opportunities for exposure to support a positive learning environment happen through non-curricular exposure.

Design Leadership (DES 4112 / 5112) is a course taken by all CoAD students, regardless of degree/major. Each class has pre-recorded lectures with embedded questions that individual students need to respond to prior to class. Each synchronous class session includes a period of group discussion around specific topics and case studies, requiring each team to collaboratively respond to the questions. The instructor, currently the dean, meets with each group to allow for questions and interactions on the specific weekly content. At the conclusion of each semester a final group interview of an established leader in the profession is recorded. The course has a 70% benchmark for this subject matter and the assessment data to date encourages increasing the benchmark.

There is an "all hands" meeting that takes place at the beginning of each semester. During these Convocations, all students are provided updates regarding curricular initiatives, facility/equipment upgrades, significant new opportunities, new faculty members, and student organizations. Additionally, the CoAD Student Companion, last revised August 2021, document is available on the CoAD website and referenced in many, but not all, course syllabi. This document encourages optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation among its faculty, students, administration, and staff.

Faculty have had in place a long-standing cooperative and effective self-assessment tool.The 'Fine Grain' review is held at the end of each semester, and focuses on a different portion of the curriculum, for both studio and non-studio courses. At each review, faculty post course materials, present a range of selected student work, describe the intentions and outcomes for the course, and then invite discussion from the faculty. Participation is high, comments are documented, and results are discussed throughout subsequent semesters.

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)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Similar to other learning objectives, this criterion is "scaffolded" throughout the M.Arch. curriculum as it is introduced, reinforced, and emphasized through various courses. Content is introduced and reinforced in the history sequence; *History of the Designed Environment I (ARC 3613-5613)* and *II (ARC 3623-5623),* and *Twentieth Century Architecture (ARC 4183 / 5063)* with benchmarks set at 75%, 75%, and 80% respectively. Furthermore, the learning objectives are emphasized through; *Design Leadership (DES 4112 / 5112), Ecological Issues (ARC 5423), Design Theory (ARC 5643),* and *Professional Practice (ARC 5913)* with benchmarks set at 80%, 70%, 80%, and 80% respectively. Additionally, this criterion is emphasized throughout the design studio sequence.

With a high variability of courses touching this content area, the program uses a variety of assessment methods, including lecture quizzes, class projects/assignments/discussions, essays, peer reviews, reading responses, research projects, analysis poster, course assignments, and exams.

In design studios, students are challenged to create buildings and spaces that draw information from, and respond to, various users, and reflect on what constitutes an inclusive environment. Courses in theory, practice, and leadership reinforce the professional responsibility of the designer to practice as a citizen and advocate. Based upon the assessment data, the program's coverage of this criterion has been deemed successful. Student performance in coursework suggests that the students may be ready for increased challenges. The program, as it deems appropriate, anticipates incrementally raising benchmarks within the courses instructing this learning objective.

3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes (*Guidelines*, p. 10)
A program must demonstrate how it addresses the following criteria through program curricula and other experiences, with an emphasis on the articulation of learning objectives and assessment.

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

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Evidence of student understanding is provided in several areas of the program curriculum. These are shown in course syllabi, descriptions, lectures, assignments, and student work. Delivered via courses *Construction Systems 2 (ARC 2323/5232)*, and *Comprehensive Design (ARC 5126)*.

The student work points to significant evidence for understanding of HSW related to buildings at multiple scales. The team observed student work in *Comprehensive Design (ARC 5126)* showing developed buildings, that respond to size and scale of the building within the zoning/ building code restrictions, responds to light and views, responds to ventilation (heating/cooling), adheres to programmatic requirements, incorporates egress and accessibility, and explores building materiality in context. As a part of course work the CoAD lecture series offers the viewpoints of designers and architects re-thinking the breadth of their duties to the world.

The CoAD is showing assessment for the basis of architectural licensing being high at 82% and 100% meeting or exceeding benchmark expectations, respectively, across undergraduate and graduate degree tracks in *Construction Systems 2 (ARC 2323/5232)*, or far above their benchmark of 70%. The program also shows assessments for reasoning based on civil-law framework showing 100% meeting or exceeding expectations, and interpretation of case studies with student performance, having reached 98% meeting or exceeding expectations in the graduate level *Professional Practice (ARC 5913)* course, which is above the benchmark of 80%.

Because of the high assessment scores the program reports that their next steps will be to raise the level of applied content within courses to increase student knowledge of actionable specifics and increase usefulness in practice; and raising the learning outcome benchmarks to reflect current performance levels and better track the impact of ongoing course content updates.

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)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The M.Arch. program has maintained the distinct content areas delineated in NAAB 2014 criteria and employed them as learning objectives: Stakeholder Roles in Architecture, Project Management, Business Practices, Legal Responsibilities, and Professional Conduct. LTU intentionally introduces these topics early in the students education which corresponds with the students first work experience in firms in southeast Michigan where students earn Architecture Experience Program (AXP Settings A and O) credits.

The learning objectives are introduced in the Construction Systems sequence *(Construction Systems 1 (ARC 2313 & 5313); Construction Systems 2 (ARC (2323 & 5323)* and *Design Leadership (DES 4112 / 5112).* The learning objectives are further understood through *Professional Practice (ARC 5913).* Each of these courses are required for all M.Arch. students, regardless of track. Assessment methods include class projects/assignments, quizzes, and exams. The benchmarks for each of these courses is 70%, 75%, 70%, and 80% respectively.

Stakeholder Roles in Architecture: *Design Leadership*, a cross-disciplinary course, provides an initial awareness of the interaction of various constituencies. *Professional Practice* uses these understandings to develop strategies for incorporating this topic into professional decision-making.

Professional Conduct: *Design Leadership* provides a progression of understandings, beginning with ethical and civil-law frameworks governing the responsibilities of designers and designed objects to their users, followed by specific codes of conduct adopted by architects, and the ethical response that supports them. *Professional Practice* applies these skills to professional case-study analysis and decision-making.

Project Management: *Construction Systems 1 and 2* introduce and apply project management skills to the basics of project process and delivery, and documentation goals. This allows *Professional Practice* to introduce quantitative cost and time measures, as methods to increase the effectiveness of previously acquired skills.

Legal Responsibilities: *Construction Systems 2* introduces basic legal language, and the duties and consequences that are implied by it. *Professional Practice* subsequently introduces the concept of standard of care and its extension into contracts.

Business Practices: *Professional Practice* builds on the financial awareness developed in other courses and provides a basic understanding of project management and cost estimating.

A distributed, scaffolded approach creates its own set of problems; however, calibrating the work of courses with different formats is an ongoing effort, but one that the LTU views as an important aspect of its approach to the curriculum. As results are strong and benchmarks are being met, LTU does not anticipate significant changes to the delivery of this material in the short term.

This criterion is met with distinction.

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)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
A multi-pronged approach allows this criterion to be introduced, reinforced, and emphasized (scaffolded) throughout the M.Arch. curriculum. The learning objectives are introduced in the Construction Systems sequence *(Construction Systems 1 (ARC 2313 & 5313); Construction Systems 2 (ARC (2323 & 5323)* that all M.Arch tracks are required to pass. The content is then reinforced with the studio sequence *Integrated Design 3 & 4 (ARC 3116 & 3126)* (Track I and II); and *Architectural Foundation Studio 2, 3, and 4 (ARC 5024, 5034, and 5044)* (track III and IV). Lastly the capstone studio, *Comprehensive Design (ARC 4126 & 5126)* required by students regardless of M.Arch. track allows for the learning objectives to be emphasized through individual studio work.

Assessment methods for *Construction Systems 1 (ARC 2313 & 5313)* and *Construction Systems 2 (ARC 2323 & 5323)* include class projects/assignments, quizzes, and exams. The benchmarks for each of these courses is 70% and 75% respectively. Based upon the assessment data already collected, LTU is considering raising the 70% for *Construction Systems 1 (ARC 2313 & 5313)* to 75%.

The student work shared for *Comprehensive Design (ARC 4126 & 5126)* illustrates that all M.Arch. students, regardless of track, understand current laws and regulations that apply to both buildings and sites, including the fundamental principles of land use and life safety. The coordinator for Comprehensive Design suggests that the benchmark for Regulatory Context remains at the current 80%, but that some changes are necessary to address deficiencies in the graduate student self-assessment response. Furthermore, LTU acknowledges finding ways to evaluate individual students who work in teams, and reducing teacher-student ratios in labs, where needed, such as Comprehensive Design, is desirable.

The LTU M.Arch. program has adequately met SC.3 Regulatory Context objectives through scaffolding relevant content throughout the curriculum. Assessment results have convinced LTU that students who begin and complete the architecture curriculum at LTU (Track I) demonstrate competency in addressing appropriate regulatory content as it applies to building design. However, students who transfer into LTU at

the graduate level from a previous institution need additional support to learn and demonstrate competency in regulatory issues.

LTU believes that one underlying reason why students in Track 1 have a higher understanding of this criterion is due to the concurrent teaching of *Construction Systems 1 (ARC 2313)* and *Integrated Design 3 (ARC 3116)* so as to coordinate student experience with the integration of building technologies, site design, codes, and their integration into a coherent design. LTU has acknowledged that Tracks II, III, and IV do not have this direct overlap to reinforce this learning objective. LTU has acknowledged that depending on what section of what studio a student was exposed to, a different level of understanding regarding regulatory context was observed. LTU will be assessing the appropriate benchmarks and confirming that the instructors for each of the studio sections understands the learning objectives that need to be reinforced, and ultimately placing this SC in the appropriate course(s) throughout the curriculum.

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

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Similar to other learning objectives, this criterion is "scaffolded" throughout the M.Arch. curriculum as it is introduced, reinforced, and emphasized through various courses. Content is introduced and reinforced in the Structures sequence; *(Basic Structures ARC 2513/5513, Intermediate Structures ARC 3513/5523,* and *Advanced Structures ARC 4543/5543)*; the Construction Systems sequence *(Construction Systems 1 ARC 2313/5313; Construction Systems 2 ARC 2323/5323)*; and the Building Systems sequence *(HVAC & Water Systems ARC 3423/5413* and *Acoustical, Electrical & Illumination Systems ARC 4443/5543)* that all M.Arch tracks are required to pass.

LTU identifies more than seven sub criteria that are separately distributed over each of the courses. The benchmarks for each of these student learning outcomes vary between 70 and 80% and are in most cases meeting or exceeding expectations. The program's implementation of the criterion shows a consistently high level of student performance across Technical Knowledge learning objectives. The program anticipates raising the outcome benchmarks where results are strong, in order to better track the impact of ongoing updates.

In the few courses where benchmark underperformance has occurred for more than one sub criteria learning objective, this has usually been the result of ongoing content changes and improvements in the courses. For example, the Construction Systems sequence has been significantly updated since the beginning of the fall 2020 semester to respond to preceding improvements in the prerequisite Information Modeling and Simulation course and to incorporate new material needed later in the curriculum. Construction Systems sequence has nearly completed its redevelopment, and the program anticipates the student learning outcomes will return shortly to its previously high level of performance against benchmarks.

This criterion is met with distinction.

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

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The conditions of Design Synthesis are strategically addressed throughout the design studio sequence. Students experience specific SC.5 content that is selectively introduced in the beginning design studios, then reinforced in the intermediate studios, and emphasized holistically within an advanced level capstone studio where it is formally assessed with four specific learning objectives. The capstone studio, *Comprehensive Design (ARC 4126 & 5126)* is required by all students regardless of M.Arch. track allows for the learning objectives to be emphasized through individual studio work.

The visiting team observed one meeting of the *Comprehensive Design* studio, and thoroughly reviewed the provided student work for compliance with all student work indicating at an ability level to make design decisions, synthesize user and programming requirements, accounting for does and life safety requirements, providing an accessible building and site design, and considering impacts of their design decisions on the environment.

Formal assessment protocols for the Design Synthesis criterion content have been in place since 2021 and formal assessment has been conducted for the *Comprehensive Design* course on an annual basis since 2014. Assessment methods include assignment rubrics for each of the learning objectives, as well as instructor and student self-assessment reports based upon the individual studio project. A preliminary benchmark of 70% for SC.5 was established in 2021 to provide a performance baseline for evaluation and improvements. Results of assessment, interpretation, and continuing improvement actions are summarized below for each of four learning objectives.

- Students met or exceeded expectations. Benchmark could be raised to 80%.
    - SC.5-01 Identify Essential Issues: assessment 87.5%-100%.
    - SC.5-02 Evaluate Multiple Needs and Relationships: assessment 69%-100%.
    - SC.5-03 Analyze Outcomes and Interpret Significance: assessment 63% -93%.
- SC.5-04 Compare Options and Establish Position: assessment 72%-78%. The lower number for ARC 5126 was attributed to possible weak preparation by some Track III students. The results were interpreted by faculty as the greatest challenge within SC.5, recognizing that many students often struggle to develop options and alternatives within their design process. Faculty determined that the program selection for spring 2022 was perhaps too large and complex for some students, inhibiting their ability to develop viable options and establish clear positions for their building design. Continuous improvement will include appropriate size and complexity of program selection, and greater oversight of the prerequisites and preparation for Track III students prior to enrolling in Comprehensive Design.

Continuous improvements have been made to the *Comprehensive Design* course based on formal faculty and administrative review of each annual course assessment. Most recently, in preparation for spring 2022, *Comprehensive Design* faculty worked to refine course assignments, clarify the course objectives and deliverables, and strengthen the pedagogy and process to directly address SC.5 content. Specific issues related to SC.5 that can be improved include appropriate program type, complexity and size, greater clarity on productive process with focused scope and clear deliverables, greater emphasis on options and positions developed, and greater clarity on student work evaluation protocols for studio and lab faculty. Specific to the ARC 5126 students, improvements are needed in their preparation prior to enrollment in Comprehensive Design, including greater emphasis on individual work in prior studios, and improved oversight on their technical skills and knowledge.

The CoAD has evaluated the assessment data for implementation of SC.5 which indicates that the overall student performance is meeting or exceeding initial benchmark expectations for the four learning objectives assessment rubric items that comprise support for SC5. It appears that benchmark expectations can be confidently raised for SC.5-01, 02, and 03, and closely monitored for SC.5-04, following a successful spring 2023 delivery and additional assessment of the *Comprehensive Design*

(ARC 4126 & 5126) course. Improvements made to the course in spring 2022 and proposed for spring 2023 indicate a positive trajectory for continued student success in response to the criteria of SC.5.

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)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The conditions of Building Integration are strategically addressed throughout the design studio sequence. Students experience specific SC.5 content that is selectively introduced in the beginning design studios, then reinforced in the intermediate studios, and emphasized holistically within an advanced level capstone studio where it is formally assessed with four specific learning objectives. The capstone studio, *Comprehensive Design (ARC 4126 & 5126)* is required by all students regardless of M.Arch. track allows for the learning objectives to be emphasized through individual studio work.

The visiting team observed one meeting of the *Comprehensive Design* studio, and thoroughly reviewed the provided student work for compliance with all student work indicating at an ability level to make design decisions that support the project design intent and measuring the outcome of building performance, while supporting the integration of building systems, including, structural, building envelope and assemblies, environmental control, and life safety.

Formal assessment protocols for the Building Integration criterion content have been in place since 2021 and formal assessment has been conducted for the *Comprehensive Design* course on an annual basis since 2014. Assessment methods include assignment rubrics for each of the learning objectives, as well as instructor and student self-assessment reports based upon the individual studio project. A preliminary benchmark of 70% for SC.5 was established in 2021 to provide a performance baseline for evaluation and improvements. Results of assessment, interpretation, and continuing improvement actions are summarized below for each of four learning objectives.

- Students met or exceeded expectations. Benchmark could be raised to 80%.
    - SC.6-01 Performance Outcomes: assessment 94%-100%.
    - SC.6-03 Limited Range of Systems: assessment 93%-100%.
- SC.6-02 Design-specific Conditions: assessment 69%-100%. The program believes the benchmark expectations for SC.6-02 should remain at 70%, with minor adjustments made to improve student success. Also,the program notes that the percentage of students not meeting the benchmark was interpreted as due to weak preparation for some Track III students.
- SC.6-04 Broad Array of Systems: assessment 69%-93%. The program believes student performance should be closely monitored for SC.6-04, following the spring 2023 delivery and assessment of the *Comprehensive Design (ARC 4126 & 5126)* course, with specific attention paid to addressing current issues with ARC 5126 student performance. Improvements made to the course in spring 2022 and proposed for spring 2023 indicate a positive trajectory for improving student success in response to the criteria of SC.6.

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

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

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

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

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

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
Lawrence Technological University is, as stated "accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC Institution ID # 1339) and is a member of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). The institution's original accreditation date is 1967." The program also include a link with copies of "2020 HLC Visit Team Report," "LTU's 2020 Reaccreditation letter" and "Interim Report Acceptance" on the Academics and Majors Accreditation website page.
https://www.ltu.edu/academicsandmajors/accreditation.asp

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.** *(not applicable intentionally omitted)*

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**. *(not applicable intentionally omitted)*

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
LTU offers a Master of Architecture (M.Arch.) degree, through four (4) different tracks. The visiting team observed that each of these tracks was in compliance with this criterion. The M.Arch. degree has multiple opportunities for students to enter and exit (on-ramp and off-ramp) the program, depending on their previous education experience and desired professional goals. The foundation for the M.Arch. degree at LTU is Track 1, which was established out of the previous NAAB accredited B. Arch. program in 1997, and has generally maintained its format since the 'direct entry' approach began in 2014. The LTU M.Arch. program began offering NCARB's Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) program in 2016, allowing students from any track to apply. The entire graduate curriculum (studios and lecture courses) are taught on-line at night only, to accommodate students working full-time.

- M.Arch. Track I - LTU BS in Architecture (133 cr.) + M.Arch. (36 cr.) = 169 cr.
    - Track I is intended as a 5+ year M.Arch. degree for students starting as a freshman undergraduate. Students are also able to transfer into this track as an undergraduate transfer. Track 1 allows undergraduates to have "direct entry" into the graduate curriculum without submitting a formal graduate program application, as long as the minimum GPA is maintained. Undergraduate students who choose not to pursue an M.Arch. degree from LTU, can graduate with a B.S. in Architecture. As expected, 90% of the students in this track graduate within 5-6 years.
- M.Arch. Track II - B.S. in Architecture (credits vary) + missing PC's and SC's (11-12 cr.) + M.Arch. (36 cr.) = 169 -170 cr.
    - Track II is intended to capture students from other institutions who have an undergraduate degree in architecture. This track is also viewed as an advanced standing to Track I, however, the majority of these incoming students have deficiencies in their undergraduate curriculum when compared to the LTU B.S. in Architecture degree students. Thus the incoming students are required to take the capstone studio (Comprehensive Design), as well as advanced structures and architecture history courses before pursuing the remaining 36 credits of the graduate curriculum. As expected, 85% of the students in this track graduate within 2-3 years.
- M.Arch. Track III - Bachelor's degree (any field or institution - credits vary) + M.Arch. (89 cr.)
    - Track III captures students who have an undergraduate degree in a field other than architecture or environmental design. Incoming students have the ability to compress the required credits into as little as 3+ years, however many students are considered part-time, taking only 1 or 2 courses a semester while balancing work/life obligations while pursuing a professional degree, and thus delaying the time to graduation.
- M.Arch. Track IV - Bachelor's degree (allied design degree - credits vary) + M.Arch. (79 cr.) or (60 cr.) for LTU BSID graduate.

- Track IV captures students who have an undergraduate degree in non-architectural environmental design fields such as interior design or landscape architecture. This track is also viewed as an advanced standing to Track III, as many of the students in this track have some general foundation in design and visualization courses as part of their undergraduate degree. additional advanced standing is provided to students who hold an LTU B.S. degree in Interior Design. This track has only recently been identified as an approach to pursue the LTU M.Arch. degree. At the time of the visit, no students from Track IV have graduated from the program.
- **NOTE:** At the time of the visit, LTU had not formally identified Track IV as an approved track to the M.Arch. degree with NAAB. As noted within the 2020 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (page 31), substantive changes by a program must be reviewed by NAAB before implementation by the program or institution and if approved, may not be applied retroactively. With that said, it is unclear within the 2020 NAAB Procedures what defines a "track", and the 2023 visiting team does not see Track IV as a substantive change to the program, it really is advanced standing to Track III which was approved by NAAB in 2008.

Professional: The M.Arch. degree program features a rigorous curriculum of professional studies and general education intended to develop the creative, practical, and professional acumen for LTU graduates. The curriculum is categorized as history, theory, social, technical, professional, and design. The M.Arch. degree is the only professional degree in the CoAD.

General: General studies is a set of classes taken by all LTU undergraduates, the college of Arts and Sciences (CoAS) is responsible for its delivery. The core curriculum consists of 36 credit-hours of coursework in literature, history, philosophy, mathematics, science, and the arts.

Optional: Flexibility within the M Arch. program comes in the form of electric courses on topics ranging from digital practice to urban design and work in the public realm. Undergraduate students are encouraged to take elective courses from any design program in the CoAD. At the graduate level, the Advanced Design Studio allows students to choose from a number of topical options, which vary over time, framed around inquiry and practice. Alternatively, graduate students may choose to prepare a thesis, which gives them the freedom to pursue two semesters of design-based research on a topic of individual interest. LTU does offer students the opportunity to pursue a dual-degree, as well as minors, and/or certificates. However, due to the rigor of the M.Arch. degree, these opportunities to further expand one's educational specialty are rarely encouraged or pursued by students.

All four (4) M.Arch. tracks require a minimum of 30 credit hours of graduate course work and 168 total credit hours as mandated by NAAB and are regularly assessed and evaluated to ensure that all M.Arch. students – regardless of track – are demonstrating the requisite learning outcomes and meeting all necessary accreditation criteria to permit them to successfully enter the profession of architecture.

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

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

4.3.1 A program must document its process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria when it admits a student to the professional degree program.

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

4.3.3 A program must demonstrate that it has clearly articulated the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content in the admissions process, and that a candidate understands the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program before accepting an offer of admission.

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The program outlines the admissions process in materials provided to prospective students. Transfer credit for students is reviewed by the admissions committee and faculty curriculum coordinators as required. Applicants are required to submit a portfolio of work to demonstrate competencies required in courses for which they seek transfer credit.

An application assessment is provided for all transfer students. The application worksheet review includes general information, portfolio, letters, essay, and SPCs/transcript. A scoring rubric is provided for each of the pieces of the application, ensuring a fair and equitable scoring process is in place for all transfer students. Furthermore, all NAAB PC's, SC's, and perspectives are individually spelled out for review and acceptance for credits earned for pre-professional courses at another institution.

The CoAD currently has twelve articulation agreements with institutions in the U.S. and Canada (eight of these are for Architecture). These agreements are reviewed and updated regularly to account for changes to courses at either institution, as well as changes to NAAB criteria.

If the requested transfer credit was received at a previous institution that is also NAAB accredited (Track II only); LTU will review the previous institution NAAB Visiting Team Report, as well as that program's SPC matrix, if available, to verify satisfaction of PCs and SCs. Given that criteria have changed between the 2014 and 2020 Conditions, LTU has developed a conversion process, to ensure all of the learning objectives taught at LTU are covered.

If information is not available or inconclusive, or for course work at a previous institution that is not NAAB accredited, the admissions committee reviews course descriptions, design portfolios (if provided), and course syllabi. Reviews are tracked by undergraduate degree and create a standard for future applicants holding the same degree, to ensure consistency of placement.

LTU posts admission requirements and its transfer policy on their CoAD admissions website. The CoAD makes information regarding the transfer credit application process, portfolio requirements, and the Track I-IV flowchart available for prospective students. Once admitted, students are assigned a faculty academic advisor who provides guidance on the student's placement, and the resulting length of their degree program.

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:
The university administration supports the college in carrying out its mission. Provided policy documents and conversations throughout the virtual team visit reinforce an effective administrative structure. Similarly, Dean, Karl Daubmann, AIA, FAAR is committed to creating opportunities that ensure students, faculty and staff are involved in program and institutional governance.

LTU is organized as a non-stock, non-profit, trusteeship corporation whose purpose is entirely educational. It is governed by a Board of Trustees that oversee all operations of the university. Currently there are 18 trustees and the university president, Dr. Tarek Sobh, who serves ex officio with a vote. The Board holds regular meetings three times a year. Typically, the Board operates with four standing committees: academic affairs, executive, finance, and strategic planning, and an ad-hoc nominating committee.

The Dean of the College of Architecture and Design (CoAD) is the primary liaison between the college and the university, communicating through the office of the provost. The architecture program chair reports directly to the dean, and forms part of the CoAD's administrative council.

The CoAD Faculty Council consists of 5 faculty members elected by college faculty to 2-year terms, and faculty may serve up to 2 consecutive terms. The LTU Faculty Handbook, adopted April 8, 2022, outlines the structure of Faculty Council in section 6.2.2. The CoAD Faculty Council maintains standing committees on curriculum, as well as lectures and exhibitions. Furthermore, faculty coordinators are appointed by the department chair for required subject areas (design, technology, history, etc.) within the professional curriculum to deliver the curriculum across many class sections in a consistent manner.

Each college staff member provides significant leadership in one or more areas, such as administration, budget, upper division/graduate admissions, student services, recruitment, social media and outreach, academic initiatives, alumni development, labs management, printing and software support, fabrication and maintenance. Currently, two members of the CoAD staff serve on the Staff Senate Board at the university level.

The student body is represented by a student leadership council that meets with the college dean and chair each semester to identify areas of success and areas for improvement. In addition to issues of curriculum, students have an opportunity to share their ideas, concerns, and suggestions about all aspects of college life. These meetings are used to update students on program changes, responses from past concerns, and any issues that need to be disseminated to the student body. The students have the opportunity to join professional student organizations within the college, as well as university-sponsored groups and organizations across campus.

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

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

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

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

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
The CoAD 2022-2025 strategic plan addressing academic culture, revenue streams, and increasing profile. Per the request of the new president, the college indicates that it is currently in the process of creating a CoAD Strategic Plan that will identify "north star" goals and will align with NAAB conditions.

Prior to the launch of the 2020 NAAB Conditions, outcome-based self-assessment had already been embraced by both LTU and the College of Architecture and Design (CoAD). The program has a robust approach to making adjustments to the curriculum. Changes occur in a constructive and supportive manner and remain critical to the success of the program's mission to be "Focused on Design, Immersed in Technology, and Grounded in Practice." The faculty understand how alterations to the assessment of particular learning objectives can impact the overall curriculum.

As a direct outcome of the analysis of the self-assessment process over the last two years the Studio Lab and Building Technology Sequence to date has been focused at the end of the curriculum leading up to the capestone studio, Comprehensive Design. In the near future, the program anticipates beginning the Building Technology Sequence earlier in the students' education, allowing for a greater scaffolding approach of introducing, reinforcing, and emphasizing the content area throughout the curriculum.

The visiting team observed that the CoAD utilizes several different measurement indicators to evaluate their performance including a separate survey of student opinions that addresses issues such as employment while attending school, student preferences for communication, student satisfaction with the curriculum in general and as regards specific courses. Mandatory course evaluations are conducted each semester and mid-semester for student input; the surveys are managed by LTU Institutional Research.

The program states that student enrollment, retention, and graduation are significant indicators of the program's health and its attractiveness. The program is tracking their students' success on the NCARB exam, as well as tracking its improvement in the area of diversity. The visiting team observed that regional reputation and the online graduate program are both seen as strengths to the program. The program has increased enrollment 43% over the last two years and the number of students employed while pursuing their graduate degree and plan to become licensed architects is notable.

Challenges include expanding and refining the online graduate program, student and faculty diversity, and program staffing. Additionally, the program feels they are challenged by trying to balance the equivalence between the four M.Arch. tracks and the reality that many of the graduate students live apart creates difficulty in achieving a strong "studio culture."

Opportunities described as better coordination with the university to attract and retain diverse students and faculty candidates, lessons learned from hybrid supplementation, asynchronous assignments, group work, model making, etc., can be integrated into the LTU on-campus classes this year.

The program described their soliciting input from outside individuals, including practitioners, alumni, academics, and industry professionals as part of their long-time tradition. The CoAD's Advisory Board recently moved to an alternative model where they are getting more contact and active participation from practitioners and alumni. The program acknowledges as opportunity exists at increasing alumni engagement and alumni giving as a result of the university improvements and a full-time director of Philanthropy and Alumni Engagement.

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:
CoAD has established a program to assess its curriculum based on a combination of the NAAB and LTU's criteria and developed in three levels. First, for the assessment of NAAB SCc and PCs the faculty of the assigned courses has completed a rubric that breaks down these criteria in a series of sub criteria during the last two academic years. These sub criteria have been given specific performance levels (Introduce, Reinforce or Emphasize). Second, the students' course evaluations are collected twice a year, and are managed by LTU Institutional Research. And third, the "Fine Grain Semester Review," which focuses the attention of a faculty-wide discussion on one specific area of the curriculum at the end of each semester.

Following these assessments, the architecture program has introduced several changes in its curriculum to clarify the different tracks, and to ensure consistency among them. Some of the specific measures were removing courses, such as *ARC 6833 Practice Portfolio*, or making existing courses required, such as *DES 5112 Design Leadership*, for graduate students. The most relevant change was the creation of a new Track IV for students coming from other design fields.

During the visit the team observed a clear articulation by the program chair and faculty of these curricular changes, as described in the evidence and APR, and the data collected in the assessment.

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.

☒ Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
The CoAD has assigned standard workload percentages (Teaching/ Research/Service) for each type of faculty, with teaching percentages ranging from 60% on Tenured and Tenure-track faculty, to 80% for non-tenure-track faculty, and 100% for non-tenure track instructors. Within these ranges, each faculty member gets assessed on their self-reported activities, receiving comments from the chair and dean.

Professor of Practice Eric Ward, RA has served as the NCARB Architect Licensing Advisor for LTU since 2016, as well as the Coordinator for LTU's IPAL program. During the visit the team witnessed how students were aware of both of Prof. Ward's roles.

As described in the APR, there are several programs at CoAD to fund faculty's research and travel for scholarly dissemination, with different amounts for tenure-track, tenured and non-tenure track faculty. There are different instances of institutional support for faculty research, such as the Office of Sponsored Research and Institutional Grants, or the Center for Teaching and Learning. During the visit, the faculty expressed that they feel generally supported in this regard, although there is a growing demand to pursue funding research from LTU's administration. On the other hand, some of the curriculum electives make it possible for selected faculty to implement research activities as part of their teaching loads.

All full-time employees are offered professional development opportunities, such as the Tuition Waiver Program. In fact, several members of the CoAD's staff have been recently promoted within LTU. This turnout shows the possibilities for Professional Development offered by CoAD, but it also exacerbates some of of the architecture program's growing staff needs.

All full-time faculty are advisors, except for those without service activity. Undergraduate students are required to meet with their academic advisor at least once in the fall and spring semesters to discuss their progress and upcoming schedule. graduate students have the option to meet with their academic advisor each year. However, as a result of recent student feedback, meetings with the academic advisor each semester may become mandatory for graduate students rather than optional.

Faculty and staff in the CoAD are attuned to the mental well-being of the students and act in cooperation with the university's Clinical Counseling Service, which offers individual counseling, diagnostic screening, crisis intervention, and referral services for students, and educational outreach for the university community. CoAD faculty and staff who have concerns are encouraged to contact Clinical Counseling Services. The CoAD also work with LTU's Disability Services, which makes reasonable accommodations to permit students with disabilities to fulfill academic requirements and provides effective auxiliary aids to ensure that they are not excluded from programs because of their disabilities."

Career guidance, internship, and job placement is primarily handled more informally by faculty who are in direct contact with the working profession. Nearly all students are working concurrently while pursuing their M.Arch. degree. Furthermore, the LTU's Office of Career Services offers a range of resources for students, from advice on job searches to employment negotiations. Career Services provides all students with a free Handshake app account for job searching, researching, and connecting with potential employers, and making appointments with career advisors. Every spring semester, Career Services organizes and runs a Career Fair tailored specifically for the CoAD majors, which is offered both on campus and virtually.

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:
The CoAD indicates that it works with the recently established LTU Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, with faculty, staff and students–as well as with outside organizations when appropriate– to achieve its goals in this area. The college recently dedicated financial resources to DEI-related faculty training and has provided individuals to speak to faculty and students about issues related to the LGBTQIA2S+ community. The CoAD publishes a list of scholarships, including external scholarships that are dedicated to minority students.

The CoAD has several faculty and administrators dedicated to DEI-related initiatives. Specifically, a new associate dean who is dedicated to developing and supporting the CoAD DEI initiatives has recently been hired providing a new female voice to the college's administration and supporting the CoAD's Black student population.

Since the previous NAAB visit, the program has made a concerted effort to improve the diversity of their faculty and students with little success. Dean Karl Daubmann is committed to increasing faculty and student diversity. The college reports that they are seeing a steady population of non-White architecture students. However, retention rates for non-White students tend to be lower than for White students. The CoAD is attempting to better understand the challenges that BIPOC students face in order to develop strategies to support their academic success. The architecture program is showing a balance between male and female students. Since 2019, the architecture program has hired six full-time, tenure-track faculty members: females have been among the final candidates in every search, and three of the six new hires (including the last two) were female. With full support from the university there are plans in place, with faculty searches currently underway, to right size and balance full-time and adjunct faculty. The architecture program has an opportunity to further align their educators with the foundational ideals and expertise that supports the programs' pedagogy.

Recruiting diverse students is being done through several educational interventions by providing exposure to architecture and design, by creating alternative paths into higher education and by offering scholarship support. Also, the CoAD has been running high school dual enrollment programs in partnership with the Detroit Public Schools since 2015. As noted within the CoAD 2022-2025 strategic plan the team noted that as the program continues to expand its enrollment, there are opportunities for student organizations and faculty advisors to strengthen the engagement with high-school outreach within the region.

Student organizations, particularly those dedicated to minority students and DEI initiatives, are healthy and active. The CoAD's NOMAS chapter has recently organized events including a design community networking event hosted by LTU architecture students, and has been working to create a peer-to-peer mentoring program to benefit younger students and help them navigate the challenges of architectural school.

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:
The primary evidence of the required physical resources is found in the APR narrative, the video tour of facilities and discussions with students, faculty, and staff. The program occupies two connected buildings which accommodate the entirety of the on campus CoAD programs.

On-site and virtual studio-based learning is provided. The Architecture Building and the UTLC house the on-site studios, and the team observed three virtual learning breakouts. The physical facilities include: The library, classrooms, wings of studio bays, a multipurpose gathering space, a small lecture room, faculty offices, the college's administrative suite, a large auditorium with 200+ seats, a smaller auditorium with 129 seats, the university gallery and various lab spaces for materials, printing, lighting, and robotics.

Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities was observed in the site video and confirmed by faculty and staff. Also, seen and confirmed was faculty access to a wide variety of equipment, software, electronic resources, and support for help in creating and delivering their classes. Additionally, all full-time faculty and CoAD students are eligible, through the university's Laptop Computer Program, to receive a computer with software specifically selected to support the curriculum.

The virtual portions of the M.Arch. program are connected by technology, and the team observed students from several different countries in the visiting team meetings and in the studio breakout sessions. The staff confirmed that support for off-site students is available if they do not have access to computers, and most importantly for the virtual students. The "Help Desk" was given high marks by both undergraduate and graduate students alike.

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 APR, discussions and a follow up email during the team visit confirmed the institutional process for funding allocations. A budget proposal is submitted to the university, each spring, for the following fiscal year to support ongoing activities, changes in enrollment, and for new initiatives. Operating funds are then budgeted to support the direct expenses. The chair of the Department of Architecture has a discretionary budget that is allocated to support program and faculty needs. As of fiscal 2023, CoAD maintains a $4.76 million dollar budget funded by the university with an additional $200,000 allocated by the university to the college for capital expenditures.

Various expense and revenue categories that the CoAD influenced were provided to the team, and the college indicated that the Department of Architecture receives a share of the college-designated revenue budget, allocated approximately in proportion to its share of the total college enrollment.

The program indicated to the team that they had no pending enrollment reductions or increases, although we welcome enrollment increases, particularly in our graduate program. Additionally, there are no plans to reduce or increase program funding currently.

Additional data provided to the team states that there have been two changes to faculty compensation since 2014. The compensation rate for adjunct instructors and a market adjustment for full-time faculty pay based on comparisons with faculty salaries around the country. There have been no changes in funding for instruction, overhead, or facilities.

In addition to funds allocated directly and indirectly from the university, the college benefits from endowed scholarships and discounts via the Five Images Scholarship Competition, the Portfolio Scholarship, Merit-based scholarships, and noted is that students receive on average a 25% discount rate against tuition provided by LTU with additional tuition reductions possible with external scholarships.

The team verified through the APR, and conversations with leadership that the CoAD now has a full time Director of Development with a sole responsibility is alumni engagement and fundraising. Future Fundraising and Capital Campaigns are anticipated under LTU's new president. In addition, LTU fundraising is getting an overhaul with the creation of ambitious goals to be raising about $10M per year by 2027. The university has already committed $200K for this work from the general fund with additional funds being pursued from donors and foundations.

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 team found evidence of achievement in the APR, site video, and links to the LTU library. The University Library has been recently renovated, its collection is broad in its scope, with about 20% of the books and bound volumes dedicated to architecture. The total library holdings consist of more than 1,200,000 print or electronic items. In addition, there are 1,029 unique online architecture journal titles and 165 print titles in bound volumes.

Within the library is a separate special collection, the 3,000-book personal library of the celebrated early twentieth-century architect Albert Kahn. The library maintains print copies of the Master of Architecture theses from the College of Architecture and has online resources available to all faculty and students.

The college relies on information resources and LTU provides support for this through the University Library, eLearning Services, Information Technology Services, the Computer Help Desk, and Media Services. The eLearning Services supports the colleges and academic departments in the use of digital technologies and strategies for teaching and learning. Additionally, the Help Desk distributes and maintains laptop computers and assists with the provision of software. It serves as a central campus location for instruction and documentation to help faculty, students, and staff navigate the computing environment at Lawrence Tech. Noted during the team visit were extremely positive comments about how helpful the Help Desk was, especially for the virtual students and those in other countries.

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.

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:

The College of Architecture and Design (CoAD) website includes the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition, Appendix 2. Furthermore, this same language is provided in both the undergraduate and graduate catalogs, clearly articulating that the Bachelor of Science in Architecture program is a component of the Master of Architecture professional degree program, which is accredited by NAAB (through 1 of its 4 tracks).

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

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

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

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:

The College of Architecture and Design website provides working links for both the 2014 and 2020 Editions of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and the NAAB Procedures for 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:

Lawrence Technological University provides services in the office of services with events, career resources, co-ops, on-campus employment and career fairs. https://www.ltu.edu/career_services/

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

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

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

☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The College of Architecture and Design (CoAD) website provides working links for each of the accreditation reports and related documents, including statements and policies on learning and teaching culture found in *The Student Companion*, last updated in August 2021.

The LTU Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion provides the campus community with links to resources regarding LGBTQ+ resources, international students, student life, the Inter-Faith Lounge, diversity statistics, and the DEI Advisory Council, and other issues.

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:
As per APR and found on their website students are able to see and better understand Admission and Advising on how to apply to the program, admissions standards, forms requirements for the process, financial assistance and scholarships and the breakdown of student diversity at the university located on the LTU's Admissions website. https://www.ltu.edu/futurestudents/

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 demonstrated that students have access to current resources and advice for making decisions about financial aid. The 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. This is verified on the LU's Admissions and current students tab website as well.
https://www.ltu.edu/current-students/
https://www.ltu.edu/futurestudents/

V. Appendices

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

- PC.1 Career Paths
- SC.2 Professional Practice
- SC.4 Technical Knowledge

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

	Preparatory Education	Track I & II							Track III & IV					All Tracks																	Activity			
		ARC 1223	ARC 3823	ARC 2116	ARC 2126	ARC 3116	ARC 3126	ARC 4116	ARC 5823	ARC 5014	ARC 5024	ARC 5034	ARC 5044	ARC 1213 & 5813	ARC 3613 & 5613	ARC 3623 & 5623	ARC 4183 & 5063	DES 4112 & 5112	ARC 5643	ARC 2313 & 5313	ARC 2323 & 5323	ARC3423 & 5413	ARC 4443 & 5443	ARC 2513 & 5513	ARC 3513 & 5523	ARC 4543 & 5543	ARC 5013	ARC 5804	ARC 4126 & 5126	ARC 5913	ARC 5423	ARC 5814	ARC 5824	CoAD Lecture Series	Student Groups Gen'l	AIAS FBD H4H	Professional Employment
Shared Values		Visual Communication	Prototyping & Fabrication	Integrated Design 1	Integrated Design 2	Integrated Design 3	Integrated Design 4	Integrated Design 5	Simulation & Prototyping	Architectural Foundation Studio 1	Architectural Foundation Studio 2	Architectural Foundation Studio 3	Architectural Foundation Studio 4	Intro. to Visual Communication	History of the Designed Environ. 1	History of the Designed Environ. 2	20th Century Architecture	Design Leadership	Design Theory	Construction Systems 1	Construction Systems 2	HVAC & Water Systems	Acous., Elect. & Illum. Systems	Basic Structures	Intermediate Structures	Advanced Structures	Research Methods	Critical Practice Studio	Comprehensive Design	Professional Practice	Ecological Issues	Adv. Design Studio 1 / Thesis 1	Adv. Design Studio 2 / Thesis 2				
Design				■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■														■					■			
Env. Stewardship & Professional Respon.																														■					■
Equity, Diversity & Inclusion																		■											■	■				■	■	
Knowledge & Innovation														■													■						■			
Leadership, Collab. & Community Engmt.																		■										■						■		
Lifelong Learning																													■				■			■
Program Criteria																																				
PC.1 Career Paths																	■			■								■								
PC.2 Design				■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■														■							
PC.3 Ecological Know. & Respon.																						■								■						
PC.4 History & Theory															■	■	■		■																	
PC.5 Research & Innovation		■	■						■					■													■	■							
PC.6 Leadership & Collaboration																		■										■							
PC.7 Learning & Teaching Culture																		■																	
PC.8 Social Equity & Inclusion															■	■	■	■	■													■	■			
Student Criteria																																				
SC.1 HSW in the Built Environ.																						■	■						■							
SC.2 Professional Practice																						■	■	■					■							
SC.3 Regulatory Context						■	■					■	■									■	■													
SC.4 Technical Knowledge																						■	■	■	■	■	■	■								
SC.5 Design Synthesis																												■								
SC.6 Building Integration																												■								

Legend:

■ = Specific PC/SC allocations to courses

■ = Supportive Roll

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair

Ryan McEnroe, FAIA, ASLA, LEED AP, LFA
Associate
Quinn Evans Architects
Washington, DC
ryan.mcenroe@quinnevans.com

Richard McNeel, NCARB, AIA, IIDA, LEED AP, APEC
Chairman
JBHM Architecture
Jackson, MS
(601) 352-2699
rmcneel@jbhm.com

Courtney Sneed
Prairie View A&M University
B.Arch. 2023
Prairie View, TX
sneed635@gmail.com

Observer

David Franco, Ph.D.
Co-Director of Architecture Graduate Programs
Clemson University
Clemson, SC
francos@clemson.edu

VI.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ryan McEnroe

Ryan McEnroe, FAIA, ASLA, LEED AP, LFA
Team Chair

Richard McNeel

Richard McNeel, NCARB, AIA, IIDA, LEED AP, APEC
Team Member

Courtney Brianna Sneed

Courtney Sneed
Team Member

David Franco

David Franco, Ph.D.
Observer