March 10, 2014

John L. Anderson, Ph.D.
President
Illinois Institute of Technology
Office of the President
IIT Tower
10 West 35th Street, Ste. 1900
Chicago, IL 60616

Dear President Anderson:

At the February 2014 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the directors reviewed the Visiting Team Report (VTR) for the Illinois Institute of Technology, College of Architecture.

As a result, the professional architecture program Bachelor of Architecture was formally granted an eight-year term of accreditation.

The accreditation term is effective January 1, 2013. The program is scheduled for its next accreditation visit in 2021.

Continuing accreditation is subject to two reporting requirements.

First, all programs must submit Annual Statistical Reports (see Section 10, of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition, Amended). This report captures statistical information on the institution and the program. The next statistical report is due November 30, 2014.

Second, any program that receives an eight-year term of accreditation is required to submit an Interim Progress Report two years after a visit and again five years after the visit. This requirement is described in Section 11, of The 2012 NAAB Procedures. The first interim progress report is due November 30, 2015. Please see (Sections 10 and 11 of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition, Amended).

Finally, under the terms of the 2012 Procedures for Accreditation, programs are required to make the Architecture Program Report, the VTR, and related documents available to the public. Please see Section 3, Paragraph 8 (page 22), for additional information.

The visiting team has asked me to express its appreciation for your gracious hospitality.

Very truly yours,

Shannon B. Kraus, FAIA, NCARB, MBA, FACHA
President-elect

cc: Robert J. Krawczyk, Associate Dean
    Nestor Infanzon, FAIA, Visiting Team Chair
    Visiting Team Members
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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

On behalf of the visiting team, I would like to express our sincere and heartfelt thanks to Dean Wiel Arets, Associate Dean Robert Krawczyk, Associate Dean John Ronan, and Associate Dean Vedran Minica for their warm welcome and their extremely collegial and informative exchange in all our meetings, but more importantly for their honesty and assistance during our visit.

We would also like to extend our most sincere thanks to the university president, Mr. John L. Anderson, and Provost Alan W. Cramb for their open and frank discussion, which allowed this team to better understand the support they provide to the program, the value this program brings to the institution, and how this program fits into the long-range plans they have charted for IIT.

The visiting team had the opportunity to see the wide breadth of educational offerings this program provides to its students and to engage the students, staff, and faculty in discussions about the program and its offerings. As a result of our meetings and observations, the team would like to share its findings:

1. We found a group of students, faculty, and administrators who are passionate, excited, and committed and who are positive advocates for the education of an architect. This sentiment was felt all the way from the president's office to the students at their desks.

2. We found a faculty that is equally committed to the practice of architecture, and especially driven by the context of a city that is rich in its architectural history and design.

3. We found a program that continues to be deeply rooted in the community and yet still strives to become an international model for others to follow.

4. We found a program that continues to enrich the academic experience of its students by balancing their educational experience with the use of both full-time and adjunct faculty as a means to providing the array of skills and knowledge needed to become an architect in the 21st century.

5. We found a program that has begun to promote top down as well as bottom up accountability as a core value in its operations and pedagogy.

6. We found a program willing to reach out to its alumni and professional colleagues in order to keep them involved in the program through teaching and mentoring opportunities.

7. We found a program where the head librarian, Ms. Kim Soss, is extremely passionate and has a heartfelt commitment to enhancing and integrating the library resources within the academic framework. She appreciates the value of research and precedent in an 9FSZZ architecture education.

8. We found a program that is transforming itself into a risk taker, willing to improvise and adjust its academic offerings to enrich the knowledge base of its students and the profession.

9. We found a program with an internationally recognized architecture philosophy, and a viable legacy. Although the students' work is incredibly diverse, fresh, and at times innovative, it still promotes the sound foundations and expectations of the institution's core vision set forth by Mies van der Rohe.

10. We found a program with an extremely charismatic and insightful leader—one who is searching for the next level of excellence for this institution.

The team room exhibits were minimal at best, as the institution was committed to using iPads to complement the exhibits as well as replace the use of course binders as part of the team exhibits. The NAAB team found this approach interesting but at times challenging. Associate Dean Krawczyk was extremely responsive when asked for additional material. Overall, the meetings with the staff, faculty, and students were extremely informative and filled with frank discussions. The meetings with the alumni and local supporters provided a different but yet insightful view of
the program. The staff was courteous and helpful. Personally, I would like to thank both Associate Dean for Undergraduate Academic Affairs Robert Krawczyk and Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs Catherine Wetzel for their diligent coordination, assistance and watchful eye through all the preparation efforts the administration and I encountered during the months before our visit.

2. Conditions Not Met

A.10 Cultural Diversity: M. Arch only
B. 7 Financial Considerations: B. Arch and M. Arch
B.10 Building Envelope Systems: B. Arch and M. Arch
C. 4 Project Management: B. Arch and M. Arch
C. 5 Practice Management: B. Arch. only
C. 7 Legal Responsibilities: B. Arch. only
II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: B. Arch. only

3. Causes of Concern

As a result of our meetings, discussions, and observations of the program the NAAB team would like to share our discoveries:

A. Crowded studio space: this problem was identified during the visit in 2007 and continues to be an issue. This issue will increasingly challenge the program once the expected growth materializes. The university administration seems committed to resolving/addressing these needs, but a clear plan has yet to be developed. The university as a whole is extremely aware of the space requirements and needs for this program and what steps must be taken if the student population continues to grow.

B. A dynamic change within the program due to the arrival of the new dean: The school is in the early stages of a substantial overhaul to its leadership structure, studio leadership, and academic pathways within the program. There are many factors at play, at many levels, that affect the faculty as well as the students. This change as articulated by the dean and the administration presents both a great opportunity and risk for the program and requires diligence and monitoring to manage the dynamics of the changes being implemented.

C. Studio culture: We found a general lack of awareness of this requirement by both the students and the school’s faculty on the published policy.

D. Diversity: Lack of measurable outcomes/improvement for meeting the current diversity of the student population as well as the faculty in order to provide adequate representation and role models for the students; the team realized that there may be no substantial improvement in the near future. The university administration is committed to having a diverse student body and equally as important a diverse faculty as well.

E. Governance/leadership: The program is in the process of migrating from a dean-centered structure to a leadership team–centered structure, in which the program is managed by a handful of associate deans under the guidance and stewardship of Dean Arets. This method of governance is a totally new adjustment for the program, and it has exposed some procedural stresses as well as personnel challenges in the program. These stresses will only require simple improvement and as a result they will become less of a challenge than they are at this moment; at the end of the day it is just a different model.
F. Communication (re: accreditation): The team was disappointed at the level of participation in the accreditation visit and process. Specifically, the team experienced a low turnout at the initial all-student meeting, faculty meeting, and the reception (which was supposed to emphasize alumni and local practitioners), a symptom that was observed throughout our visit.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2007)

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

Previous Team Report (2007): IIT is to be commended for the Crown Hall restoration, which has been executed beautifully. Further, the institution has provided expanded facilities at 3410 S. State, increasing the available area for studio, classrooms, and other teaching support spaces. In response to the mandated program growth, IIT gave the college the Minerals and Metals Building (M&M)—but this is an area for concern regarding some life safety issues.

The team understands that the M&M building was made available by the facilities department of the institute in order to accommodate the increased enrollment of the architecture student body. It appears that code violations may exist at M&M. Our main areas of concern are with the lack of fire alarm systems, non-compliant egress from the 2nd floor mezzanine, which is being used by both faculty and students, as well as non-compliance with ADA codes. These issues need immediate attention by the university to ensure students are housed in a code-compliant space. The team found that the institute is aware of this situation and is in the process of developing plans for renovation. Be that as it may, the current condition of the M&M building makes this condition for accreditation not met.

The team also noted some concern regarding the heating and cooling capacity of the M&M building as expressed by students. There is a stated concern for some lack of "pin-up" space by the faculty, but not so much by the students. However, a plan for permanent exhibition space should be addressed so that more students' work can be displayed and viewed by all.

Perhaps a formal facilities planning document for the M&M building is needed for both a short-term (immediate) code-compliance analysis and upgrades, and a long-term restoration of the architectural landmark (Mies's first building on campus) from an industrial building to a classroom and design-build laboratory. This is a great opportunity for an adaptive use of a historic structure.

The concern for the availability for faculty offices is that the existing facilities are underused and not maximized. Perhaps with the existence of so many practitioners, a hoteling or café type office environment might be provided for faculty members who just need to plug in a laptop, print out a quiz, or hang up their coat. A lack of faculty-only printers seemed to be an issue expressed by some of the faculty.

As part of the ongoing improvements in the college, the library is about to undergo a substantive upgrade with more space and an increased collection. The renovation is scheduled for completion for the fall 2007 semester.

2009 Focused Evaluation Team Assessment: The program has put a Facilities plan in place that meets the intent of the Focused Evaluation, but requires attention to some Physical Resources that continue to require attention. The fire alarm system installation, adjustment to HVAC systems, pin-up panels, lighting, Library, "Super Shop" in the Materials and Mining Building, and "smart classroom" enhancements address the Condition. The change of use for the
mezzanine from student use to faculty use only may result in a reduction in the occupant load. However, no documentation was provided to demonstrate that both students and faculty are provided equal access to the facilities and equipment. Additionally, the Faculty Office situation would benefit from additional clarification—all full time faculty should be provided with individual office space, adjunct faculty may share spaces.

It is clear that definite progress toward improvement of physical resources has been achieved; however, compliance with the standards of accessibility has not been demonstrated by the FE Report. Accordingly, the team recommends that, based on substantial compliance in nearly every area, the condition is now met. As a result, the team recommends that the Program be relieved of continued reporting in the narrative of the Annual Report for the following areas:

1. Life safety systems in the Material & Metals Building
2. Building systems in the M&M building
3. Presentation space (pin-up space)
4. Lighting in the M&M building
5. Library

The team further recommends that the Program continue to annually report on progress in the following areas of Physical resources:

1. Compliance with accessibility standards
2. Provision of office space for both full-time faculty and adjuncts
3. Progress on the renovation of the M&M building (shops)

2013 Visiting Team Assessment: Our team would like to commend the IIT university administration and the administration of the College of Architecture for their continuous effort in renovating and adapting their facilities to comply with the comments set forth by the 2007 NAAB team visit. Since the arrival of the new dean, the university administration has provided additional funds to further expand the facilities at Crown Hall by expanding the library and renovating part of the studio floor and for the completion of the renovation of the College of Minerals and Metals Building (M&M) for their shops and the expanded facilities at 3410 S. State.

Although the renovation has brought a new sense of life and a new space for use by the students and the faculty for years to come, the college and the university as a whole appear to be facing a space challenge. On paper, the current facilities tend to have the necessary area to serve the current student/faculty population as well as a potential increase in students. Unfortunately the program still has a challenge in providing private offices for the faculty. The following areas were identified as issues during the 2007 visit and were the subject of additional information in Annual Reports:

1. Life safety systems in the Material and Metals building
2. Building systems in the M&M building
3. Presentation space (pin-up space)
4. Lighting in the M&M building
5. Library

From the above list, item 3—presentation pin-up space—seems to still be an outstanding issue.

The 2009 Focused Evaluation Visit requested additional review to follow:

1. Compliance with accessibility standards
2. Provision of office space for both full-time faculty and adjuncts
3. Progress on the renovation of the M&M building (shops)
In the opinion of the visiting team, the only item that is still outstanding is the ability to provide office space for full-time and adjunct faculty. Because of the building's plans and configuration, the opportunity to add additional space will continue to be a challenge for the program and the institution. The original design and intent for Crown Hall was to be an open atelier space, and partitioning this space will diminish the impact it has as a building and as an academic space.

The availability of private faculty offices is still a concern by faculty and was pointed out to members of the visiting team. Unfortunately the existing facilities are slightly underutilized due to the basic planning and floor plan design of Crown Hall. The dean's new long-range plan for the open space will begin to develop a distinctive solution to work spaces for faculty as a type of hoteling or café style office environment that might be provided for faculty members who just need to plug in a laptop, print out a quiz, work with students, or simply hang up their coat.

As part of the ongoing improvements in the college, the library has undertaken a substantive upgrade with more space and an increased collection. The renovation is completed and is part of the university's commitment to advancing the architecture program.

This type of condition and/or challenge is well understood by both the president of the institution and the provost. Like most academic institutions, maintenance and operating budgets are in short supply. Both the president and the provost are committed to enhancing the facilities as required when and if the need arises.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation
(Note, every assessment should be accompanied by a brief narrative. In the case of SPCs being Met, the
team is encouraged to identify the course or courses where evidence of student accomplishment was
found. Likewise, if the assessment of the condition or SPC is negative, please include a narrative that
indicates the reasoning behind the team's assessment.)

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

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

[X] The programs have fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2013 Team Assessment: Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT) has a long history of educating students for
increasingly complex roles in engineering, science, and technology. Armour Institute of Technology and
Lewis Institute, IIT’s academic predecessors, were founded in the 1890s with missions to educate first-
generation Americans of modest means and social position.

As the 20th century drew to a close, first-generation students increasingly attended community colleges
and public universities. This change, combined with emerging fiscal challenges, led IIT’s Board of
Trustees and administration to reevaluate the institute’s historic mission. A “National Commission for IIT”
was created to consider how IIT should move forward, resulting in recommendations for increasing the
quality of the institute, a revitalization of the main campus, and a variety of ways to differentiate the
institute.

From the beginning, the study of architecture has been a part of the Institute’s historic mix. In 1890 the
field of architecture was part of the Armour Institute. In 1895 the Armour Institute and the Art Institute
combined their individual studies in architecture to create the Chicago School of Architecture, which was
a part of the Armour Institute.

In 1938 Ludwig Mies van der Rohe was appointed the program director for architecture. Soon after Mies’s
arrival, the Lewis Institute merged with the Armour Institute to form IIT. Mies was commissioned to plan
the Institute’s campus, and over time he designed 20 of its buildings. Perhaps the jewel of the project is
his design of Crown Hall, the home of the architecture program.

More recently, from 1996 to 2012, Donna Robertson, FAIA, served as dean of the college. Under her
leadership the college maintained its successful tradition of bringing understanding of technology, building
systems, and integrative practice into core student learning. At the same time, she spearheaded the
integration of critical thinking and research-based design into the curriculum. IIT maintained its historic
traditions while fully engaging new modes of education and critical inquiry.

Following Dean Robertson’s successful tenure, an international search for a new dean was conducted.
The result was the hiring of Wiel Arets, a Dutch architect, educator, and administrator. Dean Arets brings
a fresh approach that will “reboot” the architecture program as it considers the legacy of Mies in the 21st
century, uses Chicago as a laboratory, and maintains a strong emphasis on tangible, practice-based
learning that engages real-world problems. At the same time, the program clearly educates the whole
person through the inclusion of liberal arts courses.

The institute and the college each benefit from the contributions of undergraduate students in the
institute’s Inter-professional Project (IPRO), which is a component of general education. These industry-
sponsored interdisciplinary team projects are a point of pride for the institute. Similarly, the institute and
the college each benefit from the participation of college faculty in cross-curricular activities such as the
development of a minor in urbanism.
I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

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

[X] The programs have demonstrated that they provide a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The programs have demonstrated that they provide a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2013 Team Assessment: The visiting team was able to verify each of the requirements identified on pages throughout the APR regarding Learning Culture and Social Equity. This was also accomplished through meetings, conversations, and direct observation of the students, faculty, staff, and the university administration. The existence of an excellent learning and socially equitable community was special. The leadership of the current and former deans needs to be specifically noted for the supportive culture it continues to promote by a dissimilar faculty and student body. Governance structures and participation at virtually every level are evolving as the program transitions its culture, and it is apparent that the new leadership is passionate and committed to become equally as diverse as the students it serves. We found that this administration operates on a “lets figure out how we can do this” approach in meeting challenges—an approach equally observed from the university administration.

The intimacy of the program created by its open studios and extremely personal faculty has allowed faculty and students to create an environment of respect and commitment toward the education of an architect in a holistic manner. They share openly with each other, as well as intermingle within the community they serve. The admission of candidates is performed by the central university admissions unit of the university, and they share information regarding potential students with the faculty. IIT is committed to ensuring that every student who enters the university is capable of mastering any program and degree the institution offers. The university administration as a whole maintains a close watch on the student and faculty diversity balance in order to meet its goals.

The five-year trends indicate a lack of new faculty tracks, a situation the university is currently correcting (five new tenure-track positions are currently being advertised) as well as the recent
submission of documents for tenure review by one of its faculty members (African American faculty).

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

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: The team found excellent evidence. The IIT architecture program is well regarded within the structure of the university and laterally across the architecture community. It is a distinctive program marked by its ability to claim an authentic history. The candidate pool for the most recent dean search provides significant evidence that the draw and prestige of the leadership role in this program is in the context of global architecture. IIT and Chicago as a wellspring of modernist architecture in the U.S., its legacy of strong leadership and connectivity to a broad professional and global network inject the program with regular and potent discourse.

Students manifest returns from this dialogue. They are engaged in many curricular and external activities for design research, practice, and leadership. Students' recognition in areas of highly published academic competitions, their ability to garner much-sought-after internships, and their leadership roles in national organizations are only a few such examples. Many passionate faculty members are award-winning, highly acclaimed architects who balance the responsibilities of teaching, mentoring, and design research. All add to the diversity of dissemination and proliferation of the significant work undertaken in this program. Program lecture series, symposia, and dissemination of architectural endeavors are vetted under a global watchful eye.

The program portrays a commitment, sensitivity, and relationship to greater public and humane concerns that seek tactical and relevant physical solutions. This was evident in conversations with alumni, board of overseers, and leaders of the architecture community in Chicago. Architectural knowledge harnessed in the program is disseminated via new publication and media initiatives launched by the new dean. These initiatives are expected to reach sound and established audiences. This is a process that is much welcomed. A renewed critical cycle of assessment will take place to evaluate the overall values, strategies, and efficacy of the cumulative architectural knowledge produced by this program.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: The students at IIT's College of Architecture enjoy an open and respectful studio environment where collaboration and the exchange of ideas can occur. The participation of notable faculty and practicing architects gives students a diverse and engaging mix of studios and classes to experience. The students' journey toward becoming registered architects is only enhanced by their proximity to Chicago and its great architectural tradition, especially in the shadow of Mies's legacy.

With a new era in the school's future occurring, balancing a vocal student body with a new administrative and curricula direction is a concern. The team is concerned that consistent communication about the status of the school's direction and governance is an issue. As the school moves forward with "Nowness," the inclusion of students as stakeholders in the evolution of the school will need to be balanced.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met primarily through course work as described in the individual items below at both the B. Arch. and the M. Arch. levels. It is clear that the program provides a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments. Further, the high percentage of licensed architects on the IIT faculty contributes to an understanding of the role of the registration board for Illinois. The relationship of the architecture program with the richly available professional community provides students an opportunity to learn from multiple licensed architects. Through the use of adjunct professors and the availability of projects performed in collaboration with local professionals, the school facilitates the transition to internship and licensure. Finally, students have access to a faculty member IDP coordinator, are required to attend an annual IDP workshop, and are thus provided with the information needed to enroll in the IDP before the earliest point of eligibility.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: A core strength of the architecture program at IIT is the preparation of students to enter professional practice. Full-time and adjunct faculty members, along with numerous active alumni, are engaged in significant local and national practice. A large component of licensed faculty increases the potential for students to achieve work lives as fully enabled professionals.

The institute's Inter-professional Project (IPRO), which is a component of general education, is comprised of industry-sponsored interdisciplinary team projects that bring students across different domains together. This project introduces students to the collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines, an essential component of practice in the 21st century.
Students are also exposed to divergent communities; for example, the undergraduate project “Studio Ghana Library” and the graduate studio “Barack Obama Presidential Library,” located in the Clarendon Park area of Chicago.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: The students demonstrate their understanding of this perspective through their core curriculum focus, which includes exploring the city of Chicago as a living laboratory as they study the urban context for design and original research in a combination of theoretical and market-driven building types. The undergraduate and graduate curriculum requires students and faculty to focus on the rich architectural history of the city as well as its social challenges.

By exploring projects that focus on low-income housing and complex urban mixed-use projects, the students learn to understand the social needs, environmental or sustainable challenges, political influences, and economic demographics.

The program’s commitment to serve as the steward of the Miesian tradition in Chicago (and the Americas as well) serves as a distinct public service function beyond just its academic mission. Professor Marshall’s project, to look at a potential site for the Obama Presidential Library as a potential element for urban reconstruction, allows the student to be more engaged in the city’s socioeconomic challenges. In addition, students are inspired by the work of the teaching staff who are also in private practice, providing more avenues to connect and illustrate the responsibilities we have as architects in our communities.

In addition to the existing opportunities, Dean Arets is in the process of focusing on the academic and studio for the use of the city of Chicago as the central focus of student’s projects as well as public engagement, from works to research and educational opportunities.

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

[X] The programs’ processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2013 Team Assessment: The APR provided substantial information and background for the team to make an in-depth evaluation and gather the necessary evidence to meet this criterion. In addition, since the installation of Dean Arets, the institution has published a document titled "OWNNESS," which illustrates and discusses in detail the department’s new long-range strategies for its curriculum, pedagogical biases, and its desire to focus its vision of the city—an introspective analysis of the world through the exploration of Chicago.

Additional information was gathered through our visit with central administration in discussing IIT’s own long-range plans. During our visits with staff, faculty, and administration the team was able to confirm that they can articulate the long-range plan for the program. In addition, through discussions with the
As a whole, the university's administrative leadership has a commitment to a clearly defined strategic plan, with long-range planning and clear benchmarks, and the School of Architecture has aligned its goals within this plan.

1.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

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

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

[X] The programs processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2013 Team Assessment: The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), which is responsible for the university's accreditation, revised its process to include continuous evidence-based self-assessment of learning outcomes. The College of Architecture is in the process of implementing new self-assessment mechanisms to comply with university and NCA requirements.

Self-assessment procedures within the College of Architecture are also changing due to new program leadership. It is a stated goal of the program to develop its identity around the notion of the "Metropolis," the strengths of its legacy and continued successes, and its widespread support from the local profession.

The team recognizes that the College of Architecture had from its previous administration all of the necessary processes in place, but since the arrival of the new dean the department is still reworking the development of new and appropriate mechanisms to communicate changes in assessment procedures and to solicit faculty and student input as new self-evaluation policies are put into place.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

1.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The team found evidence. The program is supported by the institution and the college. Policies were available. Updated policies and protocol are currently being consulted and drafted. The team found that EEO/AA policies were available. Despite a noticeable shift in leadership with the incoming dean, which caused some concern over the balance of job descriptions, teaching responsibilities, and other areas, the majority of faculty and staff have put forth passion, dedication, and patience to serving the institution and the students at this time. The new dean has placed three associate deans into positions of oversight.

Tenure-track faculty members have reported that they are sufficiently supported in terms of time, research start-up compensation, and salary. This support allows for early productivity. Tenured to adjunct faculty have been given adequate opportunity to develop proposals that allow for advancement in their position and responsibility if so desired. In the new curricular matrix, accountability and personal development resides in the synthetic overlay of teaching, research, and service commitments to the course and community of core educators. This matrix obligates a check and balance of one’s work.

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

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

---

2 A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
2013 Team Assessment: The team verified processes for admissions policies and procedures outlined in the APR through meetings with the faculty, administration, and staff responsible for the admissions policies and procedures in the department. Detailed accounts and records of procedures and working relationships demonstrated excellence with students. Their activities are inclusive and not limited to admissions, transfers, financial aid, and course placement evaluations for each student on the program. Any additional issues that may arise with the students are sent to the university's own counseling and admissions teams.

Student achievement is evident in the academic standards of admission at the university and at the school level review committees. The university as a whole has a very select cap for entering freshmen, and the School of Architecture receives its share of qualified applicants for an entry class during the academic year. The university has begun to implement a rigorous SAT and GPA requirement and has secured an outside consulting service to assist it in reaching a more diverse pool of applicants every year in order to ensure quality admissions to IIT.

The school provides excellent student support counseling and enrichment programs through exhibitions, lecture series, and regional and international travel programs. Each is an integral component of the student experience. On-campus and school organizations are extensive and are encouraged. In addition, the Peer Counseling program is also very effective in support of the learning environment, which is very interactive with clear and open access of the students to the faculty, staff, and administration. Students are provided opportunities to participate in the scholarly research of individual faculty through the efforts of the close-knit system that the studio has created.

1.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the programs

2013 Team Assessment: The accredited degree programs are administered by the dean, three associate deans, and a series of curators and directors, one for each year of each program. Administrators are encouraged to work collaboratively within a philosophy and framework established by the dean. Also, within the framework, administrators are expected to develop appropriate and more detailed plans for their charge. In conversations with the dean and the associate dean of academics, it was clear to the team that this model encourages a high level of participation at all levels of the faculty. It is noteworthy that faculty and administrators are not micromanaged and are expected to participate in the development of their domain.

An organization chart provided to the NAAB team confirms the dean's organizational strategy. This administrative structure provides sufficient autonomy to conform to the conditions for accreditation.

The team notes that the dean's philosophy and framework are new to the college and that full implementation does not occur overnight. Conversations with faculty, staff, and students confirm this gradual process.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the programs
2013 Team Assessment: College faculty participates in university-level governance through the Undergraduate Study Committee, Graduate Study Committee, and University Faculty Council. Faculty participates in promotion and tenure procedures. College committees address curriculum, administration, and resources. Ad hoc committees are formed as appropriate to attend to other initiatives.

The team found the administrative structure and governance sufficient to provide the support needed to fulfill the conditions of accreditation.

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

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

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the programs

2013 Team Assessment: The College of Architecture at IIT has recently finished a substantial renovation of Mies’s landmark building, S.R. Crown Hall. This renovation has restored much of the grandeur and originally intended use of this mid-century modern masterpiece, with a number of upgrades, including the expansion of the library facilities in the lower level. There is, however, an acoustical and space issue, given the open nature of Crown Hall and lack of storage, offices, and support spaces. In addition, the expansion of the M&M building as a “super shop” has been a great asset to the school, with ample space and equipment, including multiple routers, laser cutters, and 3-D printers. The lack of staff to supervise such a large space properly is also an issue. The team recognizes the college’s limited resources to address ADA compliance issues in the M&M building. The office at Building 3410, which houses temporary administrative offices and some studio and meeting space, lacks sufficient and proper organization to fulfill the needs of the school. In our conversations with the dean and university president, we learned there is a plan to address these needs, although questions concerning the phased timeline and funding needs remain before they can be implemented.

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

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the programs

2013 Team Assessment: Financial resources appear to be adequate for the program. The APR included the necessary documentation to demonstrate that the program has appropriate institutional and financial resources. The institution has adopted the RCM model. The budget is allocated to the dean, who is responsible for the income stream and expenses balance at year's end. The architecture program’s budget has grown from 2007 to 2012 by 157% overall. The architecture program’s support per capita has grown from $7,964 in 2007 to $14,473 in 2012. This was a result of a rise in graduate student enrollment.

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The College of Architecture has recently renovated and expanded its library, adding additional computer terminals and limited printing equipment. The public and private databases are under the purview of the dean of libraries, who gives access to students for data-driven projects, articles, and general research. The budget for acquisitions is limited given the relationship between the architectural library and the university library system, which appears to limit the librarian’s ability to acquire new study material and contract with additional databases or other services. As well, given the volume and size of the student body, the library is currently understaffed. The Library currently has a para-librarian position that recently was classified as a full position.

The university administration understands the uniqueness of the program, but at the same time it is in the process of implementing policies throughout the entire library system that have implications for the architecture facility. The architecture library is also well poised to receive hundreds of volumes of print work from the main library as it begins to consolidate the design section with the architecture sections.

It is the team’s opinion that Ms. Soss is a jewel within the program because of her vision, passion, and commitment to create a library that truly meets the unique needs of the architecture student. Her passion will allow the program to truly integrate the traditional resources found in a library and expand the access to these resources for students and faculty as a whole. She is an invaluable asset for this program.
PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

1.3.1 Statistical Reports\(^3\). Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

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

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The team found all required statistical reports in the APR and validated them through informal discussions with the administration. The need for a well-balanced set of role models and a diverse faculty composition that is well reflective of student demographics was discussed and understood by the administration and the dean.

There are strategic efforts to increase faculty diversity in terms of gender and race; a more diverse faculty will also provide additional support as role models.

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

---

\(^3\) In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

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

2013 Team Assessment: The visiting team found the Annual Reports in the Team Room. The 2009 Focused Evaluation Report results were provided in the APR. Additional discussions with Associate Dean Robert Krawczyk provided additional validation of this criterion.

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

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The faculty exhibit was set up near or in the team room and illustrates the depth of practical experience of the staff. A large portion of the faculty is composed of active architects engaged in part-time teaching. The full-time faculty again is also engaged in practice on an ad-hoc basis.

The APR and the faculty exhibits presented the team with a well-documented array of materials to attest to the program's compliance with the identified criteria. Faculty credentials and achievements documented in the APR for FT and PT faculty illustrate a well-rounded and sound faculty who are qualified to educate the students in the arts and sciences of architecture.

There appears to be a healthy mix of courses and distributions between FT and PT faculty and courses. This balance of FT and PT faculty is a great asset and one of the program's strengths the team discovered. The dean and staff are able to recycle the PT faculty through a multiyear system. This allows increased exposure to local and invited practice-based educators in addition to allowing faculty to stay fresh and diverse in their offerings.

The breadth and diversity of faculty achievement and competence is more than evident. The faculty exhibit demonstrated coherent and energetic research and related achievements; and displayed a wide selection of books and publications produced by faculty in addition to an actual built project. In addition, the ongoing emphasis on a research/practice-oriented project does not suffer from a complacent or stagnated faculty.

The desire and commitment by the administration and the dean to allow its faculty to pursue both research and practice is an asset for this program as a whole.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 4—POLICY REVIEW
The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

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

2013 Team Assessment: The policy documents were provided in the team room and were responsive to the requirements of the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 3. Such policies included but were not limited to:

- Studio Culture Policy
- Self-Assessment Policies and Objectives
- Forms for Evaluation located in the Team Room
- Personnel Policies such as description of special hiring initiatives to increase diversity.
- Statistical data on student-to-faculty ratios
- Admissions requirements were provided in the Team Room and discussed with faculty and administration
- Advising policies, including policies for evaluation of students admitted from other programs, were the subject of lengthy conversations with the dean and associate dean.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 — STUDENT PERFORMANCE — EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

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

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:
Architects must have the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This ability includes facility with the wider range of media used to think about architecture including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making. Students’ learning aspirations include:

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

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that undergraduate students had the ability to read, speak and listen effectively; evidence of this compliance was found in ARCH 321 Contemporary Architecture, and AURB 465 Principles of Urbanism.

This team found evidence that graduate students had the ability to read, speak and listen effectively; evidence of this compliance was found in ARCH 509 Topics in Advanced Technology.

Student presentations during studio reviews and student meetings with team members also revealed an ability to speak and listen effectively.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team found sufficient evidence and examples to validate the program’s compliance with the NAAB criterion. Examples to validate this criterion can be found in ARCH 114,
ARCH 201/202, ARCH 305/306 at the undergraduate level, and at the graduate level ARCH 543, ARCH 544 and ARCH 593 provided clear and insightful evidence that this criterion is met. The Columbia College Dance and Performance Center Project and the Barack Obama Presidential Library Project serve as two distinctive examples of this criterion.

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

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team found sufficient evidence to validate this criterion in ARCH 113, ARCH 114, ARCH 201, ARCH 202, and ARCH 305 for the B. Arch. program, and ARCH 506, ARCH 507, ARCH 542, and ARCH 543 for the M. Arch. program.

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

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team found sufficient evidence that validate the criteria of the ability to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design in the undergraduate BARCH program in courses Arch 305 Architecture Studio V and Arch 306 Architecture Studio VI.

The team found sufficient evidence that validate the criteria of the ability to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design in the graduate MARCH program in courses Arch 543 Structural Determinant Project and Arch 509 Topics in Advanced Technologies.

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

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found sufficient evidence that B. Arch students are achieving at the level of ability in investigative skills as demonstrated by work in
Arch 423, AURB 465, and in the Studio courses. Evidence of ability in this criterion at the M. Arch level was found in a number of courses, including Arch 502, Arch 543 and the Master Project.

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

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team found this ability developed in several courses. The team found evidence that undergraduates meet this criterion in ARCH202 Architectural Studio IV and ARCH305 Architectural Studio V.

Graduates meet this criterion in ARCH593 Master’s Project.

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

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team found adequate evidence that students have the ability to examine and comprehend the use of precedents in ARCH 202 and AURB 201. In addition, further evidence is found in studio presentations produced in ARCH 417-418-419-420 in the B. Arch. Program. In the M. Arch. Program, the team found sufficient evidence in ARCH 542, ARCH 523, and ARCH 545.

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

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team found sufficient evidence that validate the criteria of ability of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design in the undergraduate BARCH program in courses Arch 113 Architecture Studio I and Arch 110 Freehand Drawing II.

The team found sufficient evidence for this SPC in the graduate MARCH program in Arch 506 Visual Training in Digital Media.
A. 9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. There is an abundance of evidence showing understanding from students in historical traditions and global culture in both programs. This is primarily clear in Arch 100, AAH 119/120, AURB 201 & 465, and Arch 321. There is also evidence of M. Arch students meeting this criterion in Arch 500/501 in combination with 503/503. The team notes as a fine example of the global culture the Arch 417 studio "Prototype Library in Ghana, West Africa."

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

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion, Cultural Diversity, has been met at the B.ARCH level, with evidence from course materials for ARCH. 423. At the M.ARCH level, this criterion has not been met. Though there is evidence in studio work or course work as well as observed studio sessions, it is not always a required studio or assignment and cannot be validated.


B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion, Applied Research, has been met at the B.ARCH level, with evidence from provided course materials for ARCH. 417, ARCH. 418, ARCH. 419 and ARCH. 420. At the M.ARCH level, this criterion has been met, with evidence from provided course materials for ARCH.423, ARCH. 503, and ARCH. 509
Realm A. General Team Commentary: Overall the students in this program are exposed to a seamless and holistic program. The curriculum is based on the desire to have each student capable of fulfilling his/her role as architect and understand the need architecture must share with the community it serves. They are exposed and required to engage all of these criteria as part of their design process in such a fashion that the students are provided with a strong foundation.
Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

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

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

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team found sufficient evidence to meet this criterion throughout all of the studio exhibits. But the ability was best exemplified at the undergraduate level in ARCH419 Architecture Studio IX.

At the graduate curriculum the team found sufficient evidence to meet this criterion throughout all of the studio exhibits but the ability was best exemplified in ARCH544 Comprehensive Building Project.

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

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found adequate evidence of student ability meeting this performance criterion in both B. Arch and M. Arch tracks, primarily in the drawings produced for Comprehensive Design Studios.

B. 3. Sustainability: Ability to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction and operations on future generations through means such as carbon-neutral design, bioclimatic design, and energy efficiency.
2013 Team Assessment: In the B. Arch. program the team found sufficient evidence to meet this criterion in studio work from ARCH 417-418-419-420. An ability to reduce the environmental impacts of high-rise buildings is found in the studio work from Sanaz Saeedi, Homero Rios, and Azin Eftekhar.

In the M. Arch. Program, the team found sufficient evidence in the student work produced in ARCH 505. In addition, the ARCH 593 project "Edge Effect" (no student name was visible in the project) provides an example of successful understanding of on-site sustainable water management issues.

Because this criterion requires an ability to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, the courses ARCH 403 and ARCH 404 (B. Arch. and M. Arch. programs) did not provide adequate evidence to satisfy this criterion using the work produced in these classes.

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

2013 Team Assessment: The team found abundant evidence that validate the criteria of ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design in the undergraduate BARCH program in courses Arch 417, 418, 419, 420 Architecture Studio VII, VIII, IX, X.

The team found abundant evidence that validates the criteria of ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design and assignments in the graduate MARCH program in Arch 505 Ecology, Sustainability and Site.

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

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found adequate evidence of student ability meeting this performance criterion in both B. Arch and M. Arch tracks, especially in the drawings produced for the Comprehensive Design Studios and Arch 593 Master's Project.

B. 6. Comprehensive Design: Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student's capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following SPC:
### A. Design Thinking Skills
- A.2. Design Thinking Skills
- A.4. Technical Documentation
- A.5. Investigative Skills
- A.8. Ordering Systems
- A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture

### B. Accessibility
- B.2. Accessibility
- B.3. Sustainability
- B.4. Site Design
- B.7. Environmental Systems
- B.9. Structural Systems

#### B. Arch
[X] Met

#### M. Arch
[X] Met

**2013 Team Assessment:** The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio course work to demonstrate a level of ability and therefore comply with this criterion.

At the undergraduate level the studio sequence that culminated in the comprehensive studio provided sufficient evidence of the students' ability to face an architectural challenge and develop the appropriate strategy, come to a series of alternates that consider different points of view, test alternatives, and generate well-reasoned solutions. It is also apparent to the team that special consideration must be placed on the students' abilities when it comes to dealing with accessibility issues as well as life safety issues in order to create a constant benchmark throughout the solutions.

At the graduate level the three-year studio sequence illustrated the same level of evidence to meet this criterion.

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

#### B. Arch
[X] Not Met

#### M. Arch
[X] Not Met

**2013 Team Assessment:** The team did not find sufficient information in the team room, course folders and/or any project examples exhibited in the student displays to validate the program's compliance with the NAAB criterion for either the undergraduate or graduate program. Courses listed as the place to find this criterion did not provide the material backup to validate items and topics described in the syllabus.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. There is ample evidence of the student understanding of the principles of environmental systems design. This is very clear for both the B. Arch and the M. Arch programs, illustrated in the technological classes Arch 403/404 and in the Comprehensive Studios.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team was able to find sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio course work to demonstrate the students' capacity to use structural systems as key form-giving elements in their design and therefore comply with this criterion.

At the undergraduate level the studio sequence from third year to fifth year provided sufficient evidence of student understanding of how structural systems behave, integrate, and inform the design solution.

At the graduate level the combination of courses ARCH 485, ARCH 486, ARCH 443 and ARCH 544 have the same level of evidence to meet this criterion. In some of the exhibited projects the students began to illustrate how joints are integral to the experience of the building as well as using the structure as an ordering element.

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

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team did not find sufficient information in the team room, course folders and/or any project examples exhibited in the student displays to validate the program's compliance with the NAAB criterion for either the undergraduate or graduate program.
B. 11. Building Service Systems Integration: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: In the B. Arch. and M. Arch. Programs, this criterion was met with work from ARCH 403 and ARCH 404. In addition, the team found evidence in studio work produced in ARCH 306, ARCH 417-418-419-420 in the B. Arch. program and ARCH 544, ARCH 593 (in the M. Arch. program).

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

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been well met. The team found evidence that B. Arch students are achieving at the level of understanding in Building Materials and Assemblies Integration. Student examinations from ARCH 230, 334, 335 (the Structural series), and design work from the integrated Design Studios demonstrate this understanding. On the M. Arch level, course work in a number of required classes, including ARCH 485/486, and 542/543, demonstrate this understanding.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: Overall the students in this program are exposed to a more intensely holistic program that emphasizes the technical aspect of the academic training an architect must undertake to meet the requirements of our profession. The students are being taught by a mixture of full-time faculty as well as a wide range of practicing faculty, a rich training environment. Unfortunately at times the actual documentation of steps, such as cost data, appeared in the syllabus but was not clearly illustrated in the results. The lack of consistent documentation of these steps in the process was one of the most critical deficiencies.
Realm C: Leadership and Practice:
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

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

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion, Collaboration, has been met at the B.Arch level with evidence from observation of current studios and with evidence from course materials for ARCH. 114 and ARCH. 423. At the M.Arch level, this criterion has been met with evidence from course materials for ARCH. 585, ARCH. 545, ARCH. 485, and ARCH. 593 but little or no evidence was found in the team room due to the Miesian use of appropriate labeling.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team found sufficient evidence that validates this criterion in the assignments in the undergraduate BARCH program in course Arch 423 Architectural Programming.

The team found sufficient evidence that validates this criterion in the assignments in the graduate MARCH program in course Arch 523 Master Project Preparation.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence for the B. Arch program in required course ARCH 423 Architectural Programming, and in some instances in Architecture Studio classes. Arch 523 Master Project Preparation demonstrates an understanding of this criterion on the M. Arch level.
C. 4. Project Management: Understanding of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team did not find sufficient information in the team room, course folders and or any project examples exhibited in the student displays to validate the program's compliance with the NAAB criterion for either the undergraduate or graduate program.

In the B. Arch. program, an elective course (ARCH 424) taken by a small percentage of the student body offered student work examples relevant to this criterion. However, given that this is not a required professional course taken by all graduating students, it cannot be used to satisfy this criterion.

In the M. Arch program students are required to take one of the three professional practice electives offered by the program (ARCH 561-562-563). The student work produced in ARCH 563 provided examples relevant to this criterion. However, given that not all the graduating M. Arch students are required to take this course, it cannot be used to satisfy this criterion.

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

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team did not find sufficient information in the team room, course folders and or any project examples exhibited in the student displays to validate the program's compliance with the NAAB criterion for the undergraduate degree. On the other hand at the MARCH level, this criterion has been met with evidence from course materials for ARCH. 563 and ARCH. 560.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. Evidence exists in the course syllabus for Arch 413 and in conversations with faculty of the understanding of the leadership techniques and skills of architects in collaborative work studied at the B. Arch level. At the M. Arch level, Arch 561, 562, and 563 demonstrate student understanding of complex situations that involve a combination of environmental, social, and aesthetic issues.
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.

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team agrees that this criterion in the undergraduate BARCH program is not in the locatable course of Arch 413 Professional Practice but the team was able to find limited validation through various conversations with faculty, and dispersed among many other courses.

The team found adequate evidence of this criterion in the graduate MARCH program in courses Arch 561 Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Architecture.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. Evidence exists at the B. Arch level in the course syllabus for Arch 413 and in conversations with faculty. Evidence is found at the M. Arch level in courses Arch 403, 523, and 545.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met at the B.ARCH level with evidence from observation of current studios in progress at the school and in provided course material for AURB. 201, ARCH. 423, ARCH. 321, ARCH 418 and ARCH. 419. At the M.ARCH level, this criterion has been met with provided course material for ARCH. 500, ARCH. 505, ARCH. 520, and ARCH. 545.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The team was able to identify and validate that the essence of this realm has been met and that more informal information has been communicated to the students through the school's active participation in real-time community-based projects. This allowed the students to appreciate the value architects and architecture bring to a community, and the community's expectations for the architect.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is met because IIT has been accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). The Report of a Comprehensive Evaluation Visit, Assurance Section, issued on 1/3/2007 by the Higher Learning Commission, included in the APR, notes IIT’s term of accreditation through 2015.

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

[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is not met for the B. Arch. degree program. While the APR lists 49 credits of general studies, 12 of those credits (ARCH 125, ARCH 230, ARCH 334, and ARCH 335) are taught by College of Architecture faculty to meet professional studies requirements. While these courses meet IIT’s own general education requirements, they do not meet NAAB’s intent as stated in the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation, the architecture degree must include at least 45 credit hours outside of architectural studies either as general studies or as electives other than architectural content.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This condition is met based on evidence found in both the APR and in discussions with faculty and administration that describe the process in place for curriculum review and development. Evidence was also provided in discussions indicating the inclusion of licensed architects in the program’s curriculum review and development process.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is met with regard to the college’s administration process at the graduate level, evaluating student's ability to complete the degree program. They grant advanced standing individually, with an established yet flexible process that gives students the opportunity to prepare appropriate material or appeal if necessary. At the undergraduate level, the university administers admissions through a data-driven database, which is intended to meet uniform student requirements. In the past, the College of Architecture has evaluated high school student transcripts and portfolios.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met, with the statement on NAAB-accredited degrees in the student handbook on page 74 as well as the school's current website, which is due to change. However, not all of the program's advertisements display the statement.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criteria is met on the website under tab "Accreditation"
http://www.illinois.edu/arch/about/accreditation.shtml

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:

- www.ARCHCareers.org
- The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
- Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
- The Emerging Professional’s Companion
- www.NCARB.org
- www.eia.org
- www.aia.org
- www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is met, with numerous events and programs available to students through the school's faculty, student groups, or alumni base. The program is in the process of rebranding its departmental website, and a number of the required links listed above are either difficult to find or not functional. This redesign is part of the dean's new ongoing program.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs
In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:

- All Annual Reports, including the narrative
- All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
- The final decision letter from the NAAB
The most recent APR
The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This condition is met. The program has a hard copy that can be accessed in the architecture library. In addition, the dean's office stated that a copy of the APR was emailed to all the current students.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team reviewed the program's website, and found the link to ARE passing rates available and functioning, as required.
III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

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

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

Reference Illinois Institute of Technology, APR, pp. 1-3

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

Reference Illinois Institute of Technology, APR, pp 3-8

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference Illinois Institute of Technology, APR, pp. 16-17

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference Illinois Institute of Technology, APR, pp. 17-19
2. Conditions Met with Distinction

A. 3. Visual Communication Skills

The visiting team found a high level of graphic sophistication in studio work throughout the entire program. The visiting team wishes to commend the work done in ARCH 113, ARCH 114, ARCH 201, ARCH 202, ARCH 305, ARCH 506, ARCH 507, ARCH 542, and ARCH 543.

B. 12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration

The visiting team found a high level of skills with this criterion. The student work illustrated a distinctive passion for and understanding of how buildings go together.

Special distinction must be given to the work Prof. Land, who in his attempt to illustrate how technology and structural elements can influence the shape of a building has shown how these can become highly sustainable elements in our environment.

B. 4. Site Design

The visiting team found a high level of abilities in dealing with site design issues, and therefore this SPC is met with high distinction. Work in both the undergraduate and graduate programs illustrates the crafting of solutions over multiple courses in the studios and coordinated with ancillary courses.
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Comments on Draft Version

2. Conditions Not Met

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion, Cultural Diversity, has been met at the B.ARCH level, with evidence from course materials for ARCH. 423. At the M.ARCH level, this criterion has not been met. Though there is evidence in studio work or course work as well as observed studio sessions, it is not always a required studio or assignment and cannot be validated.

Response: acknowledged; will be addressed to demonstrate such competency

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

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team did not find sufficient information in the team room, course folders and/or any project examples exhibited in the student displays to validate the program’s compliance with the NAAB criterion for either the undergraduate or graduate program. Courses listed as the place to find this criterion did not provide the material backup to validate items and topics described in the syllabus.

Response: acknowledged; will be addressed to demonstrate such competency
C.4, C.5 and C.7 are grouped together

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

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team did not find sufficient information in the team room, course folders and or any project examples exhibited in the student displays to validate the program’s compliance with the NAAB criterion for either the undergraduate or graduate program.

In the B. Arch. program, an elective course (ARCH 424) taken by a small percentage of the student body offered student work examples relevant to this criterion. However, given that this is not a required professional course taken by all graduating students, it cannot be used to satisfy this criterion.

In the M. Arch program students are required to take one of the three professional practice electives offered by the program (ARCH 561-562-563). The student work produced in ARCH 563 provided examples relevant to this criterion. However, given that not all the graduating M. Arch students are required to take this course, it cannot be used to satisfy this criterion.

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

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team did not find sufficient information in the team room, course folders and or any project examples exhibited in the student displays to validate the program’s compliance with the NAAB criterion for the undergraduate degree. On the other hand at the M.ARCH level, this criterion has been met with evidence from course materials for ARCH 563 and ARCH 560.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team agrees that this criterion in the undergraduate BARCH program is not in the locatable course of Arch 413 Professional Practice but the team was able to find limited validation through various conversations with faculty, and dispersed among many other courses.
The team found adequate evidence of this criterion in the graduate MARCH program in courses Arch 561 Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Architecture.

**Response:** acknowledged; the purpose of ARCH 413 is exactly these issues, but we do recognize the course and the student work did not demonstrate that and corrective action has already been started as it is offered this semester; same for the MArch issues within the ARCH 565 and ARCH 560 course

---

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

B. Arch
[ ] Not Met

M. Arch
[ ] Not Met

**2013 Team Assessment:** The team did not find sufficient information in the team room, course folders and/or any project examples exhibited in the student displays to validate the program's compliance with the NAAB criterion for either the undergraduate or graduate program.

**Response:** acknowledged; but wish to note that this criterion has been addressed in the following required courses; the Team has a copy of our material on a memory stick:

ARCH 403.1 UGrad Mechanical Electrical Building Systems I 3 High
Comprehensive analysis of energy transfer through wall assembly, full building heat loss and gain calculations.

ARCH 403.2 Grad Mechanical Electrical Building Systems I 3
Comprehensive analysis of energy transfer through wall assembly, full building heat loss and gain calculations.

ARCH 417.418.419.420 004 Advanced Architecture Studio 3 High
Detailed building section.

---

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

[ ] Not Met

**2013 Team Assessment:** This criterion is not met for the B. Arch. degree program. While the APR lists 49 credits of general studies, 12 of those credits (ARCH 125, ARCH 230, ARCH 334, and ARCH 335) are taught by College of Architecture faculty to meet professional studies requirements. While these courses meet IIT's own general education requirements, they do not meet NAAB's intent as stated in the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation, the architecture degree must include at least 45 credit hours outside of
architectural studies either as general studies or as electives other than architectural content.

Response: acknowledged; we request that the VTR also include that the 2009 Conditions of Accreditation, states:

"The number of credit hours for each degree is specified below. Every existing accredited program must conform to the following minimum credit hour requirements by January 1, 2015."

We do agree that the evolution of the ARCH 125, our introductory digital course, has over time changed to no longer satisfy this criterion.

We suggest that the Structure sequence of ARCH 230, ARCH 334, and ARCH 335 be reconsidered on the following basis. Before 2006, this engineering math-based sequence was taught in the College of Engineering, Civil Engineering Department by their faculty. At that time we were one of two programs in the country that did not teach structures in our own College by our own faculty. Professors Chris Rockey and Steve Kibler are both registered structural engineers and continue to teach the courses with a primary engineering focus, no different than the Civil Engineering department once did. If these three courses were still listed as CAE courses, they would be counted as non-architecture content credits. We wish these three to be reconsidered as engineering courses that would fulfill the credit hour requirements.

We consider these three courses to be in the same category as required MATH and PHYS courses. Furthermore, in most University courses taken by our students outside of our College, the instructors normally attempt to relate the material to architecture, design, or planning. Strict application of this requirement would rule out a number of Sociology, Psychology, Business, Law, ID, IPRO, and even engineering courses for our students. We expect our students to take their architectural knowledge and contribute their unique perspective to other courses in the University; so application of their architectural studies is quite common.

If our reconsideration is not accepted, we will need a clarification to this requirement, such as, since 37 of the 49 hours were acceptable, we would have to convert 9 existing hours to free non-architectural electives. Or could we move these structure courses back to the Civil Engineering Department?

3. Causes of Concern

As a result of our meetings, discussions, and observations of the program the NAAB team would like to share our discoveries:

A. Crowded studio space: this problem was identified during the visit in 2007 and continues to be an issue. This issue will increasingly challenge the program once the expected growth materializes. The university administration seems committed to resolving/addressing these needs, but a clear plan has yet to be developed. The university as a whole is extremely aware of the space requirements and needs for this program and what steps must be taken if the student population continues to grow.

Response: With the new physical changes in Crown Hall and the planned changes in 3410, we will review all the options we have to be able to accommodate all the different courses we offer and determine what modification need to be made. We understand that the current renovations need to be fully completed and evaluated for actual use.

B. A dynamic change within the program due to the arrival of the new dean: The school is in the early stages of a substantial overhaul to its leadership structure, studio leadership, and academic pathways within the program. There are many factors at play, at many levels, that affect the faculty as well as the
students. This change as articulated by the dean and the administration presents both a great opportunity and risk for the program and requires diligence and monitoring to manage the dynamics of the changes being implemented.

**Response:** We continually evaluate changes in faculty, administration, and curriculum; we have increased Curator and Director meetings, as well as, faculty and student forums. This semester a Student Council is being redeveloped and reinstituted to be student run and include representation of all degree programs and related student groups, such as, AIAS, and NOMAS. A number of student town halls have already been held to discuss curriculum changes.

C. Studio culture: We found a general lack of awareness of this requirement by both the students and the school’s faculty on the published policy.

**Response:** The student representatives that participated in the Accreditation Review have already been asked to review the Studio Culture and discuss it with the faculty; the reinstituted Student Council will also participate in the developed and dissemination.

D. Diversity: Lack of measurable outcomes/improvement for meeting the current diversity of the student population as well as the faculty in order to provide adequate representation and role models for the students; the team realized that there may be no substantial improvement in the near future. The university administration is committed to having a diverse student body and equally as important a diverse faculty as well.

**Response:** We have immediate plans to budget more exposure in venues and publications that could increase diversity. Our Faculty Appointments and Retention Committee is committed to expanding its search for the positions we currently have open; as of this date we have had a greater diversity in applications with a total of over 190 candidates applying.

E. Governance/leadership: The program is in the process of migrating from a dean-centered structure to a leadership team-centered structure, in which the program is managed by a handful of associate deans under the guidance and stewardship of Dean Arets. This method of governance is a totally new adjustment for the program, and it has exposed some procedural stresses as well as personnel challenges in the program. These stresses will only require simple improvement and as a result they will become less of a challenge than they are at this moment; at the end of the day it is just a different model.

**Response:** we acknowledge the challenges in this transition and are reevaluating and adjusting to them as we progress.

F. Communication (re: accreditation): The team was disappointed at the level of participation in the accreditation visit and process. Specifically, the team experienced a low turnout at the initial all-student meeting, faculty meeting, and the reception (which was supposed to emphasize alumni and local practitioners), a symptom that was observed throughout our visit.

**Response:** we recognized the same and have begun to increase our promotion of activities in the College to better engage our own community as well as the city of Chicago and its professionals. We are also asking faculty and students to more fully participate in the affairs of the University and the region at large. The upcoming Mies Crown Hall Prize of the Americas and the Louis Vuitton SPARK Award this semester will offer such opportunities, as will a redeveloped Open House in May. The Cloud Studio after
its initial semester has also extended our reach into the city of Chicago with municipal and professional participating.

Submitted by:

Robert J. Krawczyk, Professor
Associate Dean of Academic Affairs