National Architectural Accrediting

Visiting Team Report

University of Oregon
School of Architecture

B.Arch.

M.Arch.

Visit Dates: 02/14-16/2022

Visiting Team Report (VTR)

2020 Conditions for Accreditation
2020 Procedures for Accreditation

To be completed by NAAB Staff:

Institution	**University of Oregon**
Name of Academic Unit	Department of Architecture
Degree(s) *(check all that apply)* **Track(s)** *(Please include all tracks offered by the program under the respective degree, including total number of credits. Examples:* *150 semester undergraduate credit hours* *Undergraduate degree with architecture major + 60 graduate semester credit hours* *Undergraduate degree with non-architecture major + 90 graduate semester credit hours)*	☒ Bachelor of Architecture 231 quarter credit hours ☒ Master of Architecture Track 1: 144 quarter credit hours Track 2: 87 quarter credit hours ☐ Doctor of Architecture Track: Track:
Application for Accreditation	**Continuing Accreditation**
Year of Previous Visit	2013
Current Term of Accreditation *(refer to most recent decision letter)*	Continuing Accreditation (Eight-Year Term)
Program Administrator	Michael Zaretsky, Architecture Department Head
Chief Administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located *(e.g., dean or department chair)*	Michael Zaretsky, Architecture Department Head
Chief Academic Officer of the Institution	Patrick Phillips, Provost and Senior Vice President
President of the Institution	Michael Schill, President and Chief Executive Officer

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

- The team would like to thank the University of Oregon Department of Architecture for facilitating a meaningful visit for the NAAB Visiting Team. We have been the beneficiaries of a lot of very hard work as the program adapted to new – and very different – Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, as well as navigating preparation for a virtual visit during challenging conditions. We were made to feel welcome throughout the visit. Special thanks go to Head of the Department of Architecture, Michael Zaretsky, for all of his work on the logistics of the visit and ensuring that the team had everything we needed for our review. Finally, we want to thank all of the students, faculty and staff who shared with us and helped us gain an understanding of the programs and institution.
- The team found a program with a strong sense of community and respect, among the students, faculty and staff. Not only are the individual cohorts of students strong, but a combination of the vertical studios and research centers & institutes fosters a collaborative environment where students engage with one another, and the faculty, across the department and without regard to specific program. Faculty conveyed an overall environment of collegiality and respect. Students, faculty, and staff all cited the program culture and supportive environment as one of the great assets of the Department. Students particularly appreciate both the resources afforded by the Portland campus and the wealth of knowledge available as a result of the connection to practitioners, and the research opportunities and exposure afforded by the expertise and activities of the highly productive faculty.
- The team was particularly impressed by the program's commitment to sustainability and social justice. These themes are central to the ethos of the department, and are apparent in the curriculum, the student projects, and the research centers and institutes. It is clear that the Department of Architecture is a leader and critical link in the strategic initiatives of the University as it fulfills its mission as the flagship liberal arts institution for the State of Oregon.
- Faculty are dedicated to delivering a quality education. This commitment in the face of reduced tenure-track positions and the additional demands of the pandemic has come at the cost of research time and work-life balance. Although there is a current search for two new faculty members, it is concerning that recent losses of faculty lines and planned retirements are creating significant gaps in the depth and breadth of expertise. These losses have a potential to impact significantly the program options and study paths for students.
- Student access to practitioners affiliated with the program coupled with the number of licensed faculty members is commendable. These resources have not translated into the expected understanding of traditional practice among the students, however. Students appreciated the knowledge of the breadth of career paths presented by their degree but could not identify the program's licensing advisor. The greater emphasis on research applications over creative activities among the faculty has resulted in students largely learning about traditional practice from their own explorations and research.
- The facilities provide a range of opportunities for exploration and experimentation with a variety of media. Students noted however, that the cost and access for output options is an impediment at times. They noted that greater access to output facilities and materials would be helpful.
- Finally, it has been observed by previous teams that there is inconsistency in the delivery of the content of the terminal studios. Some inconsistency in quality of work among the students and between the sections of the terminal studios remains. Newly implemented assessment processes and potential curricular changes have the potential to address this issue.

b. Conditions Not Achieved (list number and title)

SC.2 Professional Practice (specifically knowledge of licensing advisor and path to

licensure): Not Met (B.Arch and M.Arch)

5.4. Human Resources and Human Resource Development (specifically 5.4.1 faculty workloads and 5.4.2 Architect Licensing Advisor): Not Demonstrated (B.Arch. and M.Arch.)

II. Progress Since the Previous Visit

2009 Condition 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.*

Previous Team Report (2013): The department provides information regarding the process, data sources related to long-term planning and discusses the five perspectives within the APR 2012. However, the actual long-range plan and the multiple-year objectives of the program are lacking. This is noted in the APR by identifying that the new department head is expected to develop a long-range plan in 2013. In the teams' various conversations with students, faculty, and administration several points have become clear. First, the changes in leadership at the university level have resulted in an unsettled context regarding direction and resources. Second, these changes appear to be promising in the near future, providing the department a propitious opportunity to engage in this activity. Third, recognized leadership in the area of building sustainability can be enriched and extended through collaborations within the department (areas of social and cultural sustainability) and beyond (e.g. Green Product Design Network), as illustrated by the Sustainable Cities Initiative. Fourth, both the University of Oregon and Portland State University are moving toward independent university boards providing the opportunity to move beyond past political economic challenges and create meaningful collaborations to further each other's missions and strengths, while serving the City of Portland and the State of Oregon.

Team Assessment: In the new Conditions, Long-Range Planning is now included as part of Condition 5.5.2 Planning and Assessment. This team found that this condition is now met.

2009 Student Performance Criterion A.9 Historical Traditions & Global Culture: *Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.*

Previous Team Report (2013): While there is evidence of some exposure to these themes in ARCH 201, ARCH 430/530, ARCH 450/550 and ARCH 610, the student work does not illustrate meeting the criterion.

Team Assessment: In the new Conditions PC.4 - History and Theory has largely replaced A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture. The department has made several significant changes to the programs in this area, and the visiting team has determined that both the B.Arch and M.Arch. have met the new PC.4.

III. Program Changes

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

Team Assessment: As noted in the APR (pp. 9-13), and confirmed during the team visit, there have been multiple changes since the previous visit, including both changes to the administrative structure of the College and Department, new leadership, curriculum, facilities, personnel, and educational delivery as a result of the pandemic.

The Department has noted that while the 2020 Conditions differ in form considerably from the 2009 Conditions, which were in effect at the time of the last NAAB Accreditation visit in 2013, the content of the program and student performance criteria do not differ significantly in terms of content requirements and expectations. What has changed significantly is the requirement for demonstration of continuous self-assessment and improvement in all aspects of the accredited degree programs and the department performance in general.

In order to comply with the new 2020 Conditions, the department has taken the following actions:

- Mapped the Program Criteria and Student Criteria onto the programs and courses that address each of the specific criterion. A NAAB PC-SC Matrix was provided to the Visiting Team.
- Specified performance indicators and benchmarks for each course identified. A NAAB Criteria Assessment Matrix was provided to the Visiting Team.
- Created PC and SC Assessment Forms for each course identified as the primary one in which a PC or SC is addressed. These forms include identifying assessment mechanisms, expected level of attainment, and percentage of students achieving attainment.
- Required the faculty teaching each course associated with these forms to provide the quantitative data specified in the form on an annual basis (or biannual in the case of courses which are taught biannually, such as some of the required courses on our Portland campus).
- Embarked on a visioning and strategic planning process.
- Developed and begun to implement a robust assessment process throughout the Department and curriculum.

IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

1—Context and Mission

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

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

[X] Described

Program Response:
The University of Oregon Department of Architecture expresses and upholds the values of our school, college, university and region. We are a research-active department in a research-active (R1) university, with numerous research institutes, substantial grant funding, and many important publications by our award-winning faculty. Our faculty and students are actively engaged in shared governance in the university, college, school, and department, and in participation in professional organizations and conferences within the region, the nation, and globally.

We embody collaboration and a non-competitive teaching and learning environment, with pass/no-pass studios, discursive design reviews, and regular group work in which team processes and team leadership are directly taught rather than presumed. Our University and our Department are both committed to leadership in environmental sustainability, through research, professional practice, and community engagement. Multiple aspects of sustainability are addressed not only in technical coursework, but in studio teaching and expectations at all levels of the curriculum. And the complex urban environments of Eugene and Portland commit us to working on behalf of design equity and social justice: through practices of hiring and mentoring junior faculty; through involving students in travel and in community support; and through teaching inclusive design practices, helping community partners lead the design process to determine, develop, and design solutions to the problems that they themselves have named.

The Department of Architecture is deeply engaged with our university, social and ecological environments, and we are committed to supporting the shared values of our institution, college and department.

Analysis/Review: Documentation provided, including the APR and supplemental materials, along with meetings during the visit confirm that the University of Oregon's Mission Statement, Purpose, Vision and Values align closely with those of the department. The University of Oregon is broadly committed to sustainable principles, with disciplinary and interdisciplinary degree programs in this area in design, business, law, the sciences, and environmental studies. The Department of Architecture has been recognized as a leader in the field of sustainability for a long time and is an exemplar as the university implements their vision and strategic initiatives. Faculty in the department are recognized leaders in their fields and actively engaged in efforts to reduce energy use, promote greenhouse gas reduction and

increase environmental stewardship in buildings and communities through research, policy formation and application to design and construction; the department is committed to sustainability in all its multiple aspects. This commitment is apparent in the course materials, research initiatives, and community engagement activities. Interactions with students, faculty, and administrators confirmed that these values are at core to the entire institution.

Meetings and observations confirmed that the University of Oregon Department of Architecture expresses and upholds the values of the school, college, university and region. The three major characteristics that define the department are the collaborative teaching and learning environment; environmental sustainability; and social justice. These characteristics clearly guide the curriculum and define the research centers. The connections between those centers and the curriculum are apparent in the nature of the student projects, which respond to the complex urban environments of Eugene and Portland as well as other challenges facing the built environment in the 21st century.

2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[X] Described

Analysis/Review:

Design (described): The Department of Architecture values human-centered and trans-species sustainable design that critically engages with the complexity of our current moment across every scale of the built environment while also anticipating the long-term multi-species impact and cultivation potential of our designs. The program emphasizes that faculty and students are holistic thinkers and ethical stewards of architectural practice and both the natural and built environments. The program's approach to design is intentionally collaborative and inclusive. The required foundation courses in the curricula articulate values

of the program and cultivate those values in their students. Over the course of their education, students learn to practice ecological and carbon neutral design, allow environmental impacts of different systems and materials choices to guide design, integrate passive and low-energy building systems to support human occupation, leverage design to reverse climate change, and evaluate material selections through the lenses of safety, life-cycle impacts, and embodied and operational efficiency.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility (described): From the beginning, the Department of Architecture has emphasized environmental awareness and responsibility. Their educational philosophy is dedicated to advancing the understanding, value, and quality of visual culture and the built, natural, and social environments through excellent and distinctive teaching, research, and creative endeavors. The program focuses on preparing designers as future professionals who are exposed to and have the ability to engage in design integration, design synthesis, building integration, and sustainability goals (as embodied by the AIA Committee on the Environment (COTE) Top Ten Competition / Framework for Design Excellence, and environmental stewardship values). The program feels that this approach is critical to the continuing relevance, influence, and value of architecture as a profession that serves society.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (described): The School of Architecture & Environment and the Department of Architecture are working to build a faculty cohort that offers diverse perspectives that are enriched by lived experience and its intersection with design and research. By including a broad range of voices in their academic discourse, they are positioning the school and department to take on the challenges of social and environmental justice in design. All of the departments within the School of Architecture & Environment broadly support this goal, and believe it is essential to bring in new voices for full representation to have the capacity to take on the breadth and depth of architectural issues.

Knowledge and Innovation (described): The Department of Architecture offers programs that help students develop innovative design responses to the rapidly changing global environment. Instructors and course content directly acknowledge the tumultuous state of the environment, the ever-changing nature of global cultures and material economies, and the increasing speed of technological innovation. The programs actively prepare students for an uncertain future and encourage them to design buildings and places that could be re-purposed for activities they may not anticipate. Faculty believe it is critical to teach students how to prepare buildings and communities for likely natural disasters. Design studios engage students in real environmental issues and opportunities to serve their communities. Advanced technical electives provide opportunities for upper-level undergraduate and graduate students to engage with faculty in specific technical research areas. The program offers opportunities to focus on innovation through their specializations, certificates and additional study opportunities. Several faculty are also practicing architects, researchers, and authors of scholarly works that are widely used and referenced. Finally, the program has multiple cutting-edge research facilities.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement (described): Students go deeply into both technical and humanistic issues of our discipline, and they iteratively engage this broad, human-centered and trans-species, sustainability-driven approach to design. The programs prepare students to be not just designers but engaged leaders in their personal and professional communities. The curriculum facilitates collaboration through group projects. Students can engage with their communities through multiple student organizations; however, since not all students elect to engage in these organizations, the required course work integrates community engagement and demonstrates examples of practicing architects engaging with their communities.

Lifelong Learning (described): Architectural education at the University of Oregon is conducted within a professional ecosystem of practitioners, alumni, and partners from allied fields who both engage with students on a regular basis and make use of the academic resources and programming efforts to further their lifelong paths of inquiry. Faculty members respond directly to student interests by facilitating independent study and supporting courses initiated and developed by students. These options allow students the opportunity to identify specific research goals, augmenting required coursework with intensive study into special problems.

3—Program and Student Criteria

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

3.1 Program Criteria (PC)

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

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence is found in the APR (pp. 34-37) and was affirmed during the visit through meetings and class observations. The primary course for exposure for both B.Arch. and M.Arch. students to the variety of career paths and the process of becoming a licensed architect is the team-taught Arch 417/517. In this course, students are assigned reading from the Architects' Handbook of Professional Practice, hear from practical experts from the field, and demonstrate learning through weekly quizzes and a term project. Most exposure for students in both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs is through extracurricular and co-curricular activities, such as participation in an active AIAS chapter, design engagement with K-12 institutions, and internships (Arch 409/609). Counseling occurs at the College level.

The plan to unify and synthesize the Eugene and Portland campus courses into one hybrid professional practice course (ARCH 417/517 *Context of the Architectural Profession*) should result in a more satisfying and coordinated experience for students and is recommended.

The ARCH 417/517 course is the primary assessment mechanism for PC.1. The term project is evaluated with a benchmark of 75% of undergraduates to achieve 70% or better and 75% of graduate students to receive 80% or better. Informal mechanisms include the career fair, active participation in AIAS, and the ARCH 409/609 Practicum course.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence is found in the APR (pp. 38-41), review of student work, and observations during the visit. The studio sequences (introductory, intermediate, vertical, and advanced) allow faculty and students to focus on appropriate design and technical knowledge for each studio. B.Arch. and M.Arch. students are mixed in the vertical studios. The building type, scale, and site of each studio's project is defined.

All studios conclude with a one-page evaluation of the student's performance by the instructor. This assessment evaluates the student based upon design process, quality of design project, and general progress criteria.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: The APR (pp. 41-47) and visit provided evidence that the program has incorporated important aspects of environmental concerns, sustainability and climate resiliency holistically into the pedagogies of design studios, lecture courses, research projects, and extracurricular activities. The pedagogies encompassed the entire span of the program, from introductory design to closing years of both the B. Arch. and M.Arch. For the B.Arch., the evidence can be found in following classes and activities: ARCH 283, Architectural Design 1; ARCH 470 and ARCH 471, Building Construction and Enclosure; ARCH 491/591 and ARCH 492/592, Environmental Control Systems I and II. For the M. Arch The evidence can be found in following classes and activities: Building Construction and Enclosure; ARCH 491/591 and ARCH 492/592, Environmental Control Systems I and II; ARCH 607, Contemporary Issues in Architecture; ARCH 681 & ARCH 682, Introductory Graduate Design.

It was a remarkable accomplishment that the annual HOPES conference, organized by students, has continued for 28 years. It is a testament to the program's commitment to Holistic Options for Planet Earth Sustainability.

The program also implemented comprehensive assessment processes to measure the outcome of the program criteria. Students' performances have significantly exceeded the program benchmark for success.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: The evidence for both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs was found in the APR (pp.47 - 50) and affirmed during the visit. The program requires two Architectural history courses (ARH 314 History of World Architecture I (Pre-history to 1400) and ARH 315 History of World Architecture II (1400 to the present)) for all B. Arch. students and two additional architectural electives. These courses cover Western and non-Western practices. All M. Arch students are required to take a minimum of three architecture history courses. M.Arch. Track 1 students take ARCH 610, and M.Arch Track 2 students are assessed to evaluate their history requirements. These topics in history and theory are also covered in other courses such as in their Design Arts sequence and electives.

The knowledge and materials are assessed based on the final grades of students from these courses. In the Graduating Student Self-Assessment Survey, this category was given a 3.02 out of 4, and although on the lower side, the conditions were met.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: For both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, evidence was found in the APR (pp. 50-56) and affirmed during the visit. The program demonstrates that research and innovation is deeply in the department's ethos and practice. This is shown in the nine active Centers, Labs and Institutes in the College of Design that are led by Architecture faculty, receiving funding for 23 research projects. In ARCH 440/540: Human Context of Design, students integrate research methods within a design process. Robust research learnings are fed back to the university community through large lectures, seminars and studios. In addition, there is a rich assortment of innovation topics including building materials and systems, digital fabrications and building health. Students participate in a larger area of research discourse outside of the university through research-based outreach and engagement through events including Reynolds' Symposium, Sustainable Cities Year Program, Urbanism Next, IHBE Build Health Consortium and the TallWood Design Institute.

Research and innovation is taught throughout the curriculum and within the numerous research centers and labs throughout the school, but is also assessed in three courses: ARCH 440/540: Human Context of Design; ARCH 491/591: Environmental Control Systems I; and ARCH 492/592: Environmental Control Systems II. In addition, there are eight other research-based courses provided with focuses including building enclosures, prototyping and fabrication, and building health.

Student assessment criteria is provided for each course. Research and innovation is also an evaluation criteria In the Graduating Student Self-Assessment Survey, with an average of 3.03 of 4.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: For both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, evidence was found in the APR (pp. 56-59), with detailed descriptions of specific courses and assessment process. Supplemental evidence included course materials for ARCH 417/517: Context of the Profession; ARCH 440/540; ARCH 470/570: Human Context; and ARCH 491/591: Environmental Control Systems I. Student collaboration was also observed during the visit, and it was notable that students take on leadership roles and organizations such as HOPES are completely run by students.

The program assess PC.6 in ARCH 440/540 Human Context of Design, ARCH 491/591 Environmental Control Systems I and ARCH 417/517 Context of the Architectural Profession through specific exam questions and projects in both courses.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence for both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs was found in the APR (pp. 59-64) and affirmed during the visit.

Studio evaluation occurs through written assessments and exit interviews: Student Experience Surveys and Instructor Evaluation Reflections provide opportunities for regular feedback and self-review and are the primary tool for assessment of this program criteria. These tools were implemented recently, and more time and participation is needed to determine their effectiveness for long-term improvements. In addition, the opportunities for graduate students to earn teaching certificates through the Technical Teaching Certificate Program, faculty who are recognized at the University level for exemplary teaching, and participation in the University's Teaching Academy demonstrate engagement, sharing and innovation. Benchmark criteria still needs to be established for the teaching culture.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the APR (pp. 64-70) and affirmed during the visit. The program requires three courses to be taken by B.Arch and M.Arch. students that address equity and inclusion (ARCH 440/540 Human Context of Design, ARCH 430/530 Architectural Context, and ARCH 417/517 Context of the Architectural Profession). The "Design for Spatial Justice Initiative" allows visiting faculty to teach and research these topics that influence both students and faculty.

Assessment is in the ARCH 440/540 Human Context of Design course which uses questions on the Midterm and Final exams to assess students' understanding of Social Equity and Inclusion issues. The Graduating Student Self-Assessment Survey (graduating B.Arch. and M.Arch. students complete) scored Social Equity and Inclusion as the highest result in the survey (3.75 of 4).

3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes

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

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: The program has demonstrated comprehensive curricula addressing key aspects of health, safety, and welfare, with a focus on human centered approach for both the B.Arch and M.Arch

programs. In addition to the APR (pp. 70-74), the evidence was found in the materials for following courses: ARCH 440/540: Human Context of Design; ARCH 461/561: Structural Behavior; ARCH 462/562: Structural Design; ARCH 470/570: Building Construction; ARCH 471/571: Building Enclosure; ARCH 484/584: Architecture Design Studios; ARCH 491/591: Environmental Control Systems I; and ARCH 492/592: Environmental Control Systems II. Additional evidence for the M.Arch program was found in the following courses: ARCH 607: Contemporary Issues in Architecture; ARCH 681 & ARCH 682: Introductory Graduate Design.

The program also applied a formal assessment process to measure the students' learning outcomes. In the Graduating Student Self-Assessment Survey, the average for this question was **3.33 of 4**, one of the highest averages in the survey.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Not Met

M.Arch.
[X] Not Met

Team Assessment: The evidence for both the M.Arch. and B.Arch. programs are found in the APR (pp. 74-77). Additional course observations and meetings during the visit indicated neither the M.Arch. nor the B.Arch. met the criteria at the prescribed level. The program states that the primary delivery of this content is in the course ARCH 417/517: Context of the Architectural Profession, with an optional Practicum course that is currently not being offered. The course ARCH 417/517 covers professional practice topics in lectures, panels, and reading assignments; however, this content does not equate to sufficient understanding.

Although the program has 10 out of their 21 tenure-track faculty licensed, as well as many faculty and reviewers licensed, the students do not feel fully prepared for professional practice. This sentiment also seemed to be confirmed during the visit where many students expressed either uncertainty about the licensure process/requirements and that many professional opportunities they have experienced came from personal agency.

The program assessment for SC.2 is the students' final grade for the course – with a benchmark of 75% of undergraduates receiving 70% or better and 75% of graduate students receiving 80% or better. The Visiting Team also noted that this criterion is also included in the Graduating Student Self-Assessment. The program reported the average score was 2.97 of 4, affirming that the condition is not met.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: For both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, evidence was found in the APR (pp. 77-80) and affirmed during the visit. The department successfully demonstrates that the curriculum provides the instruction for principles in life safety, land use and current laws and regulations that apply to the practice of architecture in the U.S. Technical courses include: ARCH 462/562: Structural Design (life safety), ARCH 492/592: Environmental Control Systems II (life safety), ARCH 430/530: Architectural Contexts: Place and Culture (land use regulations); Arch 470/570: Building Construction (building codes); and Arch 485/585 & 486/586: Terminal Studios that culminate these areas of study into design application.

Regulatory Context is assessed through the following courses: Life Safety in ARCH 462/562 Structural Design and ARCH 492/592 Environmental Control Systems II, Land Use and Zoning Policy in ARCH 430/530: Architectural Contexts: Place and Culture and Building Codes are addressed in ARCH 470/570: Building Construction. Student evaluation criteria is provided for each course and is done largely through projects, mid-term and final exams. In addition, students are expected to integrate knowledge and apply it in terminal studio projects.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: For both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, evidence was found in the APR (pp.80-85). Detailed descriptions of the course sequencing, overall content, and assessment process were affirmed during the visit with a review of course materials for ARCH 461/561: Structural Behavior; ARCH 462/562: Structural Design; ARCH 470/570: Building Construction; ARCH 471/571: Building Enclosure; and ARCH 491/591 & 492/592: Environmental Control Systems I and II.

The assessment plan includes direct measures of student deliverables in the sequence of technology courses, including homework assignments, participation in lab exercises, exams, and design projects. Mid-term and final exam grades are used as benchmarks (75% of undergraduate students achieving 70% or better and 75% of graduate students achieving 80% or better. The Graduating Student Self-Assessment Survey also provides valuable information, with a score of 3.27 out of 4. The program also notes that they will be assessing SC.4 comprehensively moving forward to verify that their students are achieving acceptable levels of success.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: For both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, the APR provides a detailed description of the program's approach to design synthesis (pp. 85-90), including the studios, support courses, student evaluation process, and assessment process. Student work for the Studios ARCH 384, 485/585, 486/586, 682 and 683 was provided for review by the team. The visiting team make the observation that there is inconsistency in the quality of the work among the students as well as between the different studio sections, particularly with respect to the demonstration of process in the student work. It is acknowledged that the learning environment during the pandemic has particularly impacted the demonstration/artifacts of the design and decision-making process. This aspect of the studio sequence might be given additional attention as the Department further develops the curriculum and assessment process.

Assessment of SC.5 occurs in several ways. The gate reviews, input from the Architecture Advisory Group, and Graduate Student Self-Assessment Survey appear to be valuable tools and will be important for ensuring successful outcomes and student achievement as there is longer term data available.

SC.6 Building Integration—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: The APR (pp. 90-96) provides a detailed description of the studio sequencing for both the undergraduate (B.Arch.) and graduate (M.Arch.) levels - including the vertical studios - and the connection between the technical classes and studios. Student work for the Terminal Studios ARCH 485/585 and 486/586 was provided for review by the team, which provided evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level.

The department is currently assessing building integration in the Terminal Studios, while acknowledging that over the next year they will be looking closely at how effectively students are integrating all of the technical content that they cover through their education into their final studio. Part of this assessment will be an exploration of whether the "comprehensive studio" as the capstone of the studio education is the best position in the curriculum for the culminating integrated design studio. The visiting team has observed that there is inconsistency in the quality of the work among the students as well as between the different studio sections, particularly with respect to the demonstration of process in the student work. It is acknowledged that the learning environment during the pandemic has particularly impacted the demonstration/artifacts of the design and decision-making process. This aspect of the studio sequence warrants additional attention as the Department further develops the curriculum and assessment process.

4—Curricular Framework

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

4.1 Institutional Accreditation

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

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: A copy of the most recent letter from Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) was provided in the APR. A link was also provided to the webpage for the UO Office of the Provost https://provost.uoregon.edu/current-accreditation-cycle-2018-2024 which contains additional reports and letters regarding the regional accreditation.

4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum

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

4.2.1 **Professional Studies**. Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program are the core of a professional degree program that leads to licensure. Knowledge from these courses is used to satisfy Condition 3—Program and Student Criteria. The degree program has the flexibility to add additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. In its documentation, the program must clearly indicate which professional courses are required for all students.

4.2.2 **General Studies**. An important component of architecture education, general studies provide basic knowledge and methodologies of the humanities, fine arts, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences. Programs must document how students earning an accredited degree achieve a broad, interdisciplinary understanding of human knowledge.

In most cases**,** the general studies requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution's baccalaureate degree. Graduate programs must describe and document the criteria and process used to evaluate applicants' prior academic experience relative to this requirement. Programs accepting transfers from other institutions must document the criteria and process used to ensure that the general education requirement was covered at another institution.

4.2.3 **Optional Studies.** All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum to allow students to develop additional expertise, either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking courses offered within the department offering the accredited program but outside the required professional studies curriculum. These courses may be configured in a variety of curricular structures, including elective offerings, concentrations, certificate programs, and minors.

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

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

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

4.2.5 **Master of Architecture**. The M.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate coursework and a minimum of 30 semester credits of graduate coursework. Programs must document the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for both the undergraduate and graduate degrees.

4.2.6 **Doctor of Architecture**. The D.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 210 credits, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate and graduate coursework. The D.Arch. requires a minimum of 90 graduate-level semester credit hours, or the graduate-level 135 quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in professional studies and optional studies. Programs must document, for both undergraduate and graduate degrees, the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence is found in the APR (pp. 97-106) and on the School of Architecture & Environment's website that includes degree requirements, courses, and sample curriculums for the B.Arch. and M.Arch. (Track I and II) degrees. Information on the website includes studio requirements and non-studio requirements for these degrees. The program meets all requirements.

4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education

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

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

4.3.2 In the event a program relies on the preparatory education experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain accreditation criteria, the program must demonstrate it has

established standards for ensuring these accreditation criteria are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment:

The program has demonstrated a thorough and equitable process in evaluating new students and transfer students. It documents the accreditation criteria it expects students to have met in their education experiences in non-accredited programs from other universities and community colleges. Evidence are found in APR, related to university, school of Architecture & Environment and the Department document associated with admissions of B. Arch and M.Arch. programs.

Transcript evaluation occurs in tandem with the admissions process for undergraduate transfer students applying to the B.Arch. program. At the university-level, students can review their transcript evaluation reports and degree guide shortly after submitting official transcripts during the admissions process. Both of these resources are accessible online through the DuckWeb information system. The transcript evaluation occurs as part of the admissions process to determine the applicant eligibility to either the program for non-NAAB accredited degrees or the program for NAAB accredited B.Arch. degree.

For the M.Arch. program, prospective applicants submit transcripts from previously attended UG or Grad programs for evaluation and consideration. The transcript evaluation occurs as part of the admissions process to determine the applicant eligibility to either the program for non NAAB accredited degrees or the program for NAAB accredited degrees. The applicants are notified of their admission decision and which of to the M.Arch tracks they have been accepted.

Evidence was found in the APR (pp. 107-109) and described in detail through meetings with the program's admissions and advising specialists for both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs.

5—Resources

5.1 Structure and Governance

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

5.1.1 **Administrative Structure**: Describe the administrative structure and identify key personnel in the program and school, college, and institution.

5.1.2 **Governance**: Describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures and how these structures relate to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

B.Arch.
[X] Described

M.Arch.
[X] Described

Team Assessment:

5.1.1: Evidence was found in the APR (pp.110-117), and additional materials provided to the team, including organizational charts. Since the last accreditation, the programs are now in the School of Architecture & Environment under the College of Design, created in 2017 and reorganized from the previous School of Architecture and the Allied Arts.

5.1.2: Faculty participate in the administration of the School, College, and University and both the Eugene and Oregon campuses. Students are also given an opportunity to participate in the school's governance committees. Of note is a concern that although students appear to be engaged several activities within the Department and have a voice on various issues, this student participation at the University, College and School level, as well as the committees, is not well defined in the APR or other documents.

5.2 Planning and Assessment

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

5.2.1 The program's multiyear strategic objectives, including the requirement to meet the NAAB Conditions, as part of the larger institutional strategic planning and assessment efforts.

5.2.2 Key performance indicators used by the unit and the institution.

5.2.3 How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated multiyear objectives.

5.2.4 Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program as it strives to continuously improve learning outcomes and opportunities.

5.2.5 Ongoing outside input from others, including practitioners.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: For both the B.Arch and M.Arch programs, evidence was found in the APR (pp. 117-121). The program thoroughly demonstrates established systems of strategic planning, assessment

criteria, evaluation and feedback mechanisms to ensure continuous improvement. In 2015, the department voted to approve a Strategic Plan for the Department of Architecture with input from faculty and students that considered and incorporated its process areas of opportunity identified in 2013 NAAB VTR, that is reviewed and communicated to the UO Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. This plan also serves as a mechanism to track progress towards multi-year objectives. Performance indicators are identified for the 2015 University Program Review, which was provided as documentation material in addition to the APR. The department is planning to conduct annual student self-assessments to all graduates. A new Assessment Committee was formed in 2021 to develop a comprehensive plan for continuous improvements and to evaluate benchmark goals and achievements. The Department has successfully identified strengths, challenges and opportunities, including identifying partnership opportunities with industry leaders within the state in areas of health, mass timber and building performance with Oregon Health Sciences University and Oregon State University. Loss of tenured professors has given the department an opportunity to enrich its diversity in the faculty pool, notably with the new Spatial Justice Fellow program. The Department also demonstrates established processes to gain ongoing external input such as through the Dean's Council which consists of alumni, a newly established Architecture Advisory Group of industry leaders and other professional advisory groups that work with faculty to prioritize research and associated funding.

The Strategic Plan was revisited in 2015-16 and the school has established regular forums for open discussion to evaluate and maintain its currency. In 2018-2019 the University required a new Assessment Plan and was evaluated in 2020. The faculty continues to meet regularly to develop through ad-hoc committees.

An Assessment Committee was formed in the fall of 2021 in order to incorporate regular feedback from faculty, students, advisory committee, staff and administration. They will also evaluate the relevance of criteria and benchmarks that are used for assessment.

5.3 Curricular Development

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

5.3.1 The relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including NAAB program and student criteria.

5.3.2 The roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

B.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: Evidence is found in the APR (pp. 121-123) and was affirmed during the visit. All faculty members meet with the department head annually to discuss curriculum review and development. An Assessment Committee was formed in 2021 that works with the Design Committee and Curriculum Committee. The evidence of the work of the Assessment Committee and the roles of those involved with curricular development was verified via notes from the department head. The evidence of the work of the Architecture Advisory Group (informal assessment) during AY21-22 was verified via meeting presentation slides that contained the content of these meetings. The fall 2021 faculty retreat visioning session was a positive step in addressing proposed curriculum changes and assessment measures (this was acknowledged in the faculty meeting).

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development

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

5.4.1 Demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty in a way that promotes student and faculty achievement.

5.4.2 Demonstrate that it has an Architect Licensing Advisor who is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. These duties include attending the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay up-to-date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.

5.4.3 Demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.

5.4.4 Describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, mental well-being, career guidance, internship, and job placement.

B.Arch.
[X] Not Demonstrated

M.Arch.
[X] Not Demonstrated

Team Assessment:

5.4.1: The visiting team heard concerns with respect to both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs during the meetings with faculty, students, and program administrators about inadequate numbers of tenure-track faculty members (TTF). Retired and retiring TTFs are creating voids in key curriculum areas impacting student's academic achievement. An example is the fact that all students in the Masters' program are required to select a focused track, one of which is Housing. The impending loss of faculty in this area is putting that track in jeopardy. This loss is significant given that affordable housing is central to the notion of social equity and inclusion, a commendable strength of the program. While some of these areas of focus can be met by non-tenure track faculty (NTTF), faculty expressed that the loss of faculty has resulted in a reduction in the ability for TTF to fulfill their contractual service responsibilities.

5.4.2 : The APR (p.125) provides information regarding the Licensing Advisor. It is noted that there was a recent retirement, and a new faculty member has assumed the role. In meetings with both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. students, there was little knowledge about the fact that they have a designated Architect Licensing Advisor or who it is, with the exception of one of the M.Arch students guessed a name of a NTTF. There was no evidence found of a faculty member who has been in this position to actively perform the duties defined by NCARB.

5.4.3: The Department has a Professional Development Policy. Both TTF and NTTF are eligible for professional development funds. Additional resources are available on campus.

5.4.4: Several resources for students, including counseling and wellness services, are available on campus, and students were aware of these resources.

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

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

5.5.1 Describe how this commitment is reflected in the distribution of its human, physical, and financial resources.

5.5.2 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's faculty and staff demographics with that of the program's students and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.

5.5.3 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its students since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's student demographics with that of the institution and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.

5.5.4 Document what institutional, college, or program policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other social equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

5.5.5 Describe the resources and procedures in place to provide adaptive environments and effective strategies to support faculty, staff, and students with different physical and/or mental abilities.

B.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: Evidence for both B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs was found in the APR (pp. 127-136) and affirmed during the visit. The College of Design has updated and implemented the college's Diversity Action Plan, which was completed in spring 2021. The Department has also implemented the Design for Spatial Justice Initiative (DSJI) Fellowship Program, which supports the fellows with guides and mentors. All faculty and staff are required to take Workplace Harassment and Discrimination Prevention Training, all Faculty Search Committees and all Graduate Employees are required to take Implicit Bias training.

As a means to maintain/increase diversity in the program, the Design for Spatial Justice Initiative Fellowship has supported visiting faculty whose focus is at the intersections of diverse areas. Initiatives to increase diversity among students has shown much improvement in the admissions process. The program has reduced the cost of applications and fees, integrated a more holistic admission process, and asks for more personal/social questions for a well-rounded view of the applicant. The assessment of the provided statistics showed that these implementations have had positive results in areas of retaining diversity and increasing the number of applications to the program.

The University of Oregon maintains an Affirmative Action Program and has annual updates through its Affirmative Action Plan. The program is active and maintains compliance with the Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action obligations. The University of Oregon's Campus Planning and Facilities Management ensures equitable access to all spaces and mental health support.

5.6 Physical Resources

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

5.6.1 Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.

5.6.2 Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including lecture halls, seminar spaces, small group study rooms, labs, shops, and equipment.

5.6.3 Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

5.6.4 Resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: Evidence for both B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs is found in the APR (pp. 136-140), as well as supplemental documentation provided to the team and in meetings during the visit. The program supports studio-based learning across both the Eugene and Portland campuses. As the primary location for the program, the Eugene campus does provide many more physical resources to students, both facilities support students. The studio spaces in Eugene can accommodate up to 16 students with individual desks, stools, and are provided with locked storage and pin-up space. Every tenure-track faculty member has access to a private office and pro-tempore and retired professors are accommodated in a shared office. All full-time Portland faculty have their own office spaces, and part-time faculty share a drop-in office. Every full-time staff member has a personal workstation, and part-time student staff members have workstations. The department has studio spaces, large flexible spaces, and specialized facilities such as the library, computer labs, and shops. To support remote work/learning, the campus has licenses to Zoom, MS Teams, and Miro.

While printing and output resources are provided, an area that could ease student needs are the costs of these materials. Students noted that materials and printing add a high cost to the execution of their work.

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

B.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: Evidence found in the APR (pp. 141-144) and verified through additional conversation with program administrators and faculty. Though currently adequate, the reorganization of the program into the new School of Design in 2017 seems to have additional strain on financial resources, including reduction in tenure-track faculty and some replacement with non-tenure track or visiting faculty. The same budget allocation year over year has resulted in a reduction of tenure-track faculty (TTF) to accommodate rising costs of living, benefits, and merit increases. There is currently a search for two additional tenure-track faculty to mitigate this strain, which will increase the department budget accordingly.

5.8 Information Resources

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

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

B.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.
[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: For both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, evidence was found in the APR (pp. 144-147) and verified by additional evidence provided by the program to the Team. The program thoroughly demonstrates student, faculty and staff accessibility to a robust suite of physical and digital resources for both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs. This is demonstrated in physical resources such as specialty libraries at the Eugene and Portland campuses that are further networked through cooperative agreements into regional library resources off-campus, notably as the host institution of a consortium of 39 academic libraries around the Pacific Northwest and a member of the Association of Research Libraries. These resources are further supported by a staff led by experts with appropriate backgrounds and experiences in library sciences focused on art and design and also on-line digital resources. Students are thoroughly supported with academic and industry appropriate hardware and software resources including computer labs and virtual labs that are updated with the latest industry hardware and software such as AutoCAD, Rhino and Adobe Suite. In addition, available are resources such as cloud storage, high-speed internet, output and maker labs. Students did note that it would be helpful for the resources available to be communicated more widely, especially with the virtual to on-campus transition.

6—Public Information

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

6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: The required statement is located on the architecture department website: https://archenvironment.uoregon.edu/architecture/about/accreditation, as well as the "architecture" section of the UO Catalog.

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

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

a) *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*

b) *Conditions for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2014, depending on the date of the last visit)

c) *Procedures for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*

d) *Procedures for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2012 or 2015, depending on the date of the last visit)

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: The links to all required information are provided on the department website https://archenvironment.uoregon.edu/architecture/about/accreditation

6.3 Access to Career Development Information

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment:

Career development information is available through the Department of Architecture website. Students and graduates have access to career development resources and placement services via the Academics and Student Career Services pages.

https://archenvironment.uoregon.edu/academics

https://design.uoregon.edu/student-services/career-services

6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents

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

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

b) All NAAB responses to any Plan to Correct and any NAAB responses to the Program Annual Reports since the last team visit

c) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB

d) The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit

e) The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

f) The program's optional response to the Visiting Team Report

g) Plan to Correct (if applicable)

h) NCARB ARE pass rates

i) Statements and/or policies on learning and teaching culture

j) Statements and/or policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: The links to all information are provided on the department website: https://archenvironment.uoregon.edu/architecture/about/accreditation and an additional link to NCARB: https://www.ncarb.org/pass-the-are/pass-rates.

6.5 Admissions and Advising

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

a) Application forms and instructions

b) Admissions requirements; admissions-decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (when required); and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing

c) Forms and a description of the process for evaluating the content of a non-accredited degrees

d) Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships

e) Explanation of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: Information on admissions and advising for both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs is available on the Department's website:

https://archenvironment.uoregon.edu/admissions

https://archenvironment.uoregon.edu/academics/advising

6.6 Student Financial Information

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

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

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: Financial information, including the cost of attendance and financial aid resources, is available on the Department's website at **https://financialaid.uoregon.edu/cost_of_attendance.**

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility (B.Arch. and M.Arch.)

Both programs demonstrate a strong commitment to sustainability and environmentally responsive design for the built environment. The pedagogies encompass the entire span of the programs, as well as the research centers and institutes. Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility are central to the ethos of the department, and it is clear that the Department of Architecture is a leader and critical link in the strategic initiatives of the University.

The team was also impressed by the long success of the student organized annual HOPES conference, which is a testament to the program's commitment to Holistic Options for Planet Earth Sustainability. It is also notable that students' performances on the comprehensive assessment measures have significantly exceeded the program benchmark for success.

PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion (B.Arch and M.Arch.)

Both programs demonstrate a strong commitment to social justice. The program requires three courses to be taken by B.Arch. and M.Arch. students that address equity and inclusion. The team was impressed by the “Design for Spatial Justice Initiative”, which allows visiting faculty to teach and research these critical topics that influence both students and faculty, as well as the range of studio projects that involve community engagement. Finally, it is notable that the Graduating Student Self-Assessment Survey (completed by graduates from both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs) revealed that Social Equity and Inclusion had the highest result in the survey at 3.75 of 4.

Appendix 2. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator Representative
Susan Schaefer Kliman, PhD, AIA
Chair, Department of Architecture and Landscape Architecture
North Dakota State University
650 NP Avenue
Fargo, ND 58102
520.405.3978
skliman@klimatic.com

Educator Representative
Kevin J. Singh, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, NCARB
Professor of Architecture
Director, Community Design Activism Center (CDAC)
Louisiana Tech University School of Design
308 Wisteria St. #3147, Hale Hall 317
Ruston, LA 71272
318.257.5267
ksingh@latech.edu

Practitioner Representative
Adrianne Steichen, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Principal
Pyatok Architecture + Urban Design
Oakland, CA
m: 925.918.3568
adriannesteichen@gmail.com

Regulator Representative
Tian Feng, FAIA, FCSI
President, California Architects Board
District Architect, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District
2150 Webster Street
Oakland, California 94612
Office 510 464-6549
Mobile 510 468-6297
tfeng@bart.gov

Student Representative
Carly Sacco
Carnegie Mellon University School of Architecture
Minors in Media Design & Human-Computer Interaction
CMU AIAS President // Matt's Maker Space Project Assistant
845.204.0754
csacco@andrew.cmu.edu

Observer
Annie Kwon, AIA
Director, Partnerships
SHoP Architects, New York
646.509.9411
anniekwon@gmail.com

V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Kliman, PhD, AIA
Team Chair

Kevin Singh, AIA
Team Member

Adrianne Steichen, AIA
Team Member

Tian Feng, FAIA
Team Member

Carly Sacco
Team Member

Annie Kwon, AIA
Observer