Visiting Team Report

University of Florida
School of Architecture

M.Arch.

Visit Dates: Jan. 31- Feb. 2, 2022

OF EDIT

NAAB

National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

Visiting Team Report (VTR)

2020 Conditions for Accreditation
2020 Procedures for Accreditation

To be completed by NAAB Staff:

Institution	**University of Florida**
Name of Academic Unit	School 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 Track: ☒ Master of Architecture Track I: Undergraduate pre-professional degree with architecture major + 52 graduate semester credit hours Track II: Undergraduate professional degree + 30 graduate semester credit hours Track III: Undergraduate degree with non-architecture major + 48 preparatory semester credits + 52 graduate semester 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	David Rifkind, Ph.D. Director and Professor School of Architecture
Chief Administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located *(e.g., dean or department chair)*	Chimay J. Anumba, FREng, Ph.D., D.Sc., Dr.h.c., P.E. Dean and Professor College of Design, Construction, and Planning
Chief Academic Officer of the Institution	Joseph Glover, Ph.D. Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs University of Florida
President of the Institution	W. Kent Fuchs, Ph.D. President University of Florida

COFEDT

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

Preparation for an accreditation visit is a formidable task that demands acute attention to detail and a spirit of collaboration among the many faculty, administrators, students, and staff charged with its organization. The team is grateful to the entire University of Florida School of Architecture community for the curation of the digital team room, preparation of the APR and supporting written and digital materials, as well as a willingness to engage in probing inquiry with a balance of enthusiasm and candor.

Special thanks are due to Provost Joseph Glover, Ph.D., Dean Chimay J. Anumba, Associate Directors of Undergraduate Studies, Mark McGlothlin, Associate Director for CityLab, Stephen Bender, and Associate Director for Graduate Studies, Bradley Walters. Special thanks to Program Director David Rifkind, whose leadership provided a touchstone for all efforts made during the course of the visit.

The team found much to admire in the program including:

1. The dedication and support of the program from the faculty, students and staff including an intellectual and practical involvement in the learning environment.
    - This is evident with the recent establishment of the Equity Committee.
    - The Coalition for Design that reflects current professional and national initiatives and an interest in continual desire for further inclusion both in the people and coursework materials in the program.
    - The interest in the program governance and communication of the school, including the new Student Council that was established via interest from both faculty and students and offers a nice structure for participation.
2. The program has a strong research component and the ability for students and faculty to explore personal interests in their architectural projects and research via the PILOT program. In addition, the allied certificate options add to the identity of the program, aligning learning objectives with the sense of place and critical issues in Florida. This includes Historic Preservation, Sustainable Design, and Themed Environment Integration, among others.
3. There are exciting future opportunities for the program through further involvement and collaboration with the University's AI initiative and certificate program, a new academic building addition, as well as with the growth of the CityLab model with an additional location, Jacksonville.

There is also potential for growth and improvement in the program to align with the most recent Procedures for Accreditation. These place a new emphasis on benchmarking and the continual assessment and adjustment process. And while the planning and assessment process is described and evident in many cases, a majority of the benchmarks provided are generic and there were not specific established benchmarks for each specific criteria or course(s) to know when adjustments may be necessary. As these are newer NAAB criteria, we feel the program will adapt accordingly.

b. Conditions Not Achieved

PC.6 Leadership & Collaboration
PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion
SC.5 Design Synthesis
SC.6 Building Integration
5.2 Planning and Assessment

COPYEDIT

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2009 Condition 1.2.4 Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.*

Previous Team Report (2013): In 2010 the University of Florida instituted the Responsibility Center Management (RCM) budget model. In this model, the colleges should get all of the funds they generate directly and then pay back a service fee of about 12%. Financial resources appropriated to the SoA by the State of Florida have been reduced 20% since 2007, and this reduction has been challenging for the school. The SoA initiated the Citylab–Orlando to supplement revenue. The SoA benefits from established endowments in support of student scholarships and faculty salaries. The budget summary provided to the team indicates a significant deficit in the current operating budget, without a current means to address the situation.

Team Assessment: The APR (pp. 7–8) asserts that the School of Architecture "has maintained a stable operational budget" since the previous visit, due to increases in state appropriations for salaries and discretionary funds together with increases in endowment funds. At the same time, experience with and adjustment to the RCM budget management system at university has produced guiding principles and an inclusive structure for review and planning distribution of income, indirect costs, and overhead to the benefit of the academic units.

The School of Architecture budget has grown an average of 2.6% annually across the past four years, the CityLab programs are self-funded with potential to provide discretionary funds for the school, and the Vicenza Institute of Architecture (study abroad program) is financially independent, operating at a surplus.

Additional evidence provided in section 5.7 Financial Resources of the APR (pp. 139-140), including budgets for the main campus and the CityLab programs show positive year-end balances and positive carry-forward allocations since fiscal year 2018-19. This documentation substantiates that the program has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

Meetings with the program director and dean of the College of Design, Construction and Planning verified the improvement in and stabilization of fiscal resources, noting the role of external support from an on-going capital campaign together with endowment growth for student scholarships.

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: The Conditions for Accreditation have changed twice since the previous visit to this program. As the APR indicates ("Introduction," pp. 11-13), the overarching changes to the program focus on shifting from the idea of a "comprehensive" studio to an integrated model, as well as, most currently, an emphasis on continuous assessment by the program with adjustments implemented regularly to address items from their assessments. To respond, the program has addressed this by:

1. Introducing curricular changes in design studio sequence and integrating technical and theoretical subject matter that parallel the studios. This process appears to have begun in 2017 and will be fully in place by fall of 2024.

COPYRIGHT

2. Developing the Program's already established Curricular Assessment process to address the recent introduction of a Continuous Improvement Plan and Assessment Report. While the planning and assessment process is described and evident in most cases, more evolution of specific benchmarks will be necessary.
3. Renewing focus on Social Equity, Diversity and Inclusion with the formation of the Equity Committee in 2020 by the School of Architecture, as well as an organically formed Coalition on Design that is an evolving mechanism for change.
4. Introducing an Integrated Path to Architectural Licensure (IPAL) program starting at their CityLab Orlando program and carrying over that opportunity to students at the Gainesville (main campus) location.

COF EDIT

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 Florida School of Architecture prepares students for professional practice as architects. The school has developed a rigorous design study curriculum with comprehensive technical, historical, theoretical, and professional coursework that produces exceptional graduates. Students learn to engage their communities as agents of social change and see architecture as an ethical practice oriented toward building a more equitable and sustainable world.

The school is committed to educating excellent practitioners while serving as a laboratory for exploring the changing nature of architecture as a discipline, a profession, and an academic field of inquiry. The school's close ties to the architectural profession enable students to meet industry leaders, gain professional experience, engage clients and stakeholders, and study firsthand the shifting roles of designers, builders, and communities in shaping the built environment. The changing nature of architectural practice, real estate development, and the construction industry means that students will practice architecture in contexts we cannot anticipate, and thus the school helps students develop critical thinking skills and adopt resilient attitudes to adapt to changing economic, political, environmental, and technological factors.

With campuses in Gainesville, Orlando, Jacksonville, and Vicenza, the school helps students understand the complexities of urban and rural contexts, particularly in relation to the varied ecosystems of Florida. Students study sustainability and resilience in the face of violent changes to our climate, social equity and spatial justice in the context of systemic inequality, and emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence and automated construction, in respect to rapid technological change.

Analysis/Review:

Part One: Based in Gainesville, Florida, the University has grown to an enrollment of 57,841 (Fall 2021). Its mission as a public Land Grant Institution provides a conceptual framework for the University's programs and pedagogies, and, currently, offers meaningful rationales for confronting critical issues. Florida is the nation's third most populous state and the University's mission is "three interlocking elements" of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. Discussions with Provost Glover made clear how evolving emphasis in contemporary information technologies, with emphasis on Artificial Intelligence, an emerging area of excellence across the campus, can be harnessed to address

COPY

environmental challenges faced by Florida, that engage together the College of DCP with Agriculture, Engineering and Business to the greater benefit of stakeholders across the state.

Part Two: The University has 16 colleges, one of which is the College of Design, Construction and Planning (DCP). The DCP, an academic umbrella for the varied disciples that design and construct the made environment, includes three schools: School of Architecture (SofA), M.E. Rinker S. School of Construction Management, and School of Landscape Architecture and Planning. The majority of its courses are offered in-person on one of their campuses (Gainesville, Orlando, Vicenza with an additional facility in Jacksonville in planning) and, with the exception of necessary responses to COVID-19 disruptions, only a few classes are delivered online.

Founded in 1925, the School of Architecture has the largest enrollment within the College and plays a central role in its cross-disciplinary and collaborative work. The school encourages faculty participation at all levels of shared governance; notably, two School of Architecture faculty sit on the University of Florida's Department of Planning, Design and Construction's Architectural Review Council, which reviews design proposals for new university buildings.

The program focuses on research-based design that explores critical issues of changing culture - reflecting the changes in the region and at the University which include: social inequity, climate, energy, infrastructure, transportation and population growth. Facile integration of advanced technologies, particularly a significant investment in Artificial Intelligence (AI), dedicated to fostering positive response to Florida's particular challenges of rapid growth and fragile natural ecologies, the school promotes integration and collaborative design strategies, supported by collaboration with campus experts in "engineering, ecology, energy, medicine and construction." Equally important, allied programs in the College of Design, Construction and Planning afford cross disciplinary and collaborative opportunities with Interior Design, Building Construction, Landscape Architecture, historic preservation, the Powell Center for Construction and Environment, and the Center for Affordable Housing. The certificate in themed environments, available at the Orlando CityLab and a campus-wide certificate in AI offer opportunities for SofA students to develop unique, highly specialized and sought-after expertise.

Part Three: Seeing value in learning inside and outside the classroom, the program notes (see APR, p. 17) that it provides students with platforms for external engagement with community stakeholders, professional offices, and international exchange through study abroad, particularly its long-established program in Vicenza. For both students and faculty, participation in disciplinary and sub-disciplinary professional and scholarly organizations is encouraged and a broad range of student organizations are supported (see PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration, Non-Curricular Activities for organizations, publications, lectures and outreach; see also faculty resumes, APR Addendum).

COPYRIGHT

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 program's studios are described and demonstrated as iterative and research-based across multiple years and assignments. Studio projects range from group to independent and culminate with a project in lieu of thesis (PILOT) program in which a student-led project is selected on a topic of their choosing. The program presents architectural education as intricate problem-solving using design tools, leadership skills and confidence to inquiry.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility (Described): An overall academic commitment to acquire a better understanding of the immediate environment, and how best to incorporate sustainability issues into design was described in the APR, as well as evidenced in student course syllabi, coursework and extracurricular activities. The program's location in Florida is uniquely situated to provide students exposure to a variety of ecosystems and natural spaces close to campus and in project work. In addition, students utilize environmental software to review data and incorporate their findings into their design work. An elective student trip to Puerto Rico to better understand environmental issues post Hurricane Maria is also of note. The professional practice course, including guest lecturers, as well as studio juries addresses professional responsibility as well as opportunities to contribute beyond traditional architectural role post graduation.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (Described): It is evident that in recent years the program has made great strides toward increasing the diversity of its student and faculty populations through review of metrics, high school outreach, as well as through establishment of the CityLab Orlando program (to reach

DRAFT

non-traditional students with opportunity to work while in the program), as well as through their partnerships with five other state colleges in the area. The program has outlined a DEI Plan and new and effective lines of dialogue between students, faculty, staff, and outside consultants has been created with the Equity Committee and the Coalition in Design. While encouraging research and discussions are underway to affect similar change in the program's curriculum, changes have not yet been made and are acknowledged by faculty as an effort that will take at least another year. As it stands, the program's curriculum does not consistently communicate or prompt students to explore diverse cultural and social contexts in design work.

Knowledge and Innovation (Described): In a teaching and learning climate that fosters discovery through both scholarly research and creative practices, students are exposed to and offered opportunities to engage in the creation of knowledge and innovation that is essential to the advancement of the discipline made evident in the design studios, a rich selection of elective courses including many that support certificates in sub-disciplinary specializations, and the pursuit of independent research, notably in the PILOT program. Ample evidence of this commitment appears in peer-reviewed publications, conference participation, and creative practice by faculty and advanced graduate students. Of especial note, a campus wide initiative in AI is expanding opportunities for SofA students to engage cutting edge technologies in addressing critique challenges of climate change, environment, and regional ecologies.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement (Described): Leadership and Collaboration are described via the team projects within the Studio courses. Student leadership is especially visible through the recent Coalition in Design student-led initiative, as well as with the integration of a newly established student council within the SofA. The multi-tiered goals are described as to provide better communication between faculty and students, better feedback from students into the curriculum review and development and to provide opportunities for students to gain additional leadership skills. Additionally, the participation in several opportunities led to community outreach (Whitter Competition, FIBER and CHU efforts) and the program is planning a future Community Design and Public Interest certificate program that will continue to enhance external opportunities.

Lifelong Learning (Described): The program works to instill a desire for lifelong learning through independent thinking most clearly visible via the focus on research. This high level of inquiry and research is described and evident in the meetings with students and faculty, course work and more pointedly visible in the Research Methods course leading up to a PILOT project.

COPY EDIT

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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The program's primary method of defining both traditional and non-traditional career paths is found in ARC 6281 Professional Practice. Traditional career opportunities are covered extensively in course materials, and evidence of exposure to non-traditional career paths is evident via guest lectures and critiques by numerous professionals and alumni.

In addition, the Integrated Path to Licensure (IPAL) program is available to all students and was confirmed in discussions with student leaders that all students are notified of the program and opportunities, although the engagement across the program has been different based on location. In Gainesville the program was recently introduced, is not popular and has little to no engagement yet, while at the CityLab Orlando location a majority of the students partake in the experience. University of Florida at CityLab Orlando was one of the first programs nationally to have graduates of the IPAL program.

The criteria are assessed via global bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, IPAL participation and pass rates. Although no established benchmarks are provided, generally curriculum is modified based on feedback prior to the start of each semester and minor adjustments made following monthly curriculum committee meeting discussions.

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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The design process and methods for integrating multiple factors in different settings and scales was evident in found materials related to the ARC 6355 Advanced Graduate Design Studio 2 course, within course materials, syllabi, and examples of student work provided for SC.6 Building Integration. In addition, the evidence presented included a wide range of location and urban scale across the sequence of the required design studios.

The criteria are assessed via global bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, IPAL participation and pass rates. Although no established benchmarks are provided, generally curriculum is modified based on feedback prior to the start of each semester and minor adjustments made following monthly curriculum committee meeting discussions.

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.

COPYRIGHT

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARC 3610 Environmental Technology I and ARC 6621 Environmental Technology I.

The criteria are assessed via global bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, IPAL participation and pass rates. Although no established benchmarks are provided, generally curriculum is modified based on feedback prior to the start of each semester and minor adjustments made following monthly curriculum committee meeting discussions.

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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence was found on Syllabi and Class Presentation modules for both ARC 1701 / ARC 6705 (Architectural History I). M. Arch students are required to take a history elective in addition to the required courses and the variety of courses offered is diverse and encompassing.

The criteria are assessed via global bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, IPAL participation and pass rates. Although no established benchmarks are provided, generally curriculum is modified based on feedback prior to the start of each semester and minor adjustments made following monthly curriculum committee meeting discussions.

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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence of the program's preparation for engaging and participating in architectural research was found in the sequence of required courses: ARC 6242 Research and Methods, ARC 6913 Architectural Research 3 and ARC 6971/6979 Independent Thesis/PILOT. Syllabi, reading assignments, student case studies, and reading analyses evidence exposure to theoretical foundations necessary for inquiry, innovation and application of new knowledge in the field as does the noteworthy "Writing Fragment" assignment of ARC 6242.

Collaboration in faculty research, the availability of knowledge-based certificate options, and campus-wide investment in AI augment curricular evidence. The efficacy of research and innovation in required M.Arch. courses are underscored by the UF graduates who continue in the SofA to pursue the M.S. in Pedagogy and the Ph.D. program.

The criteria are assessed via global bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, IPAL participation and pass rates. Although no established benchmarks are provided, other than passing the course, generally curriculum is modified based on feedback prior to the start of each semester and minor adjustments made following monthly curriculum committee meeting discussions.

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.

[X] Not Met

COPY EDIT

Team Assessment: There is evidence in many group assignments particularly within the ARC 6355 Advanced Graduate Design Studio 2 that demonstrated studio teamwork, collaboration and diverse constituents in many social contexts, although there is lacking evidence of consistent or formal training, or assignments identified that demonstrate or explain leadership and collaboration skill approaches, and how to apply these skills to resolve complex problems.

The criteria are assessed via global bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, IPAL participation and pass rates. Although no established benchmarks are provided, generally curriculum is modified based on feedback prior to the start of each semester and minor adjustments made following monthly curriculum committee meeting discussions.

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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The APR (pp. 44–47) documents a structure for shared learning experiences and review processes; opportunities for student evaluation of instruction; student and faculty engagement in governance; and access to additional non-curricular activities that provide a framework for a mutually supporting learning and teaching culture among students and faculty.

Documents including ARCH 6241 syllabus provides Course Policies (syllabus p. 4) that make clear department expectations for attaining a positive and respectful teaching and learning environment, and other syllabi include “Classroom Etiquette” guidelines that parallel these policies. With such a clear culture established, a consistent and universal policy is a logical next step in order to ensure the resiliency of the school’s positive culture.

Student, faculty and staff meetings provided evidence of the school’s dedication to continual cultural improvement through the formation of new Student Council; inclusion of students in faculty committees; dialogue around needed improvements; multigenerational teaching model including Teaching Assistants and Graduate Teaching Assistants; and the wider relationships between faculty, staff and students.

The criteria are assessed via global bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, IPAL participation and pass rates. Although no established benchmarks are provided, generally curriculum is modified based on feedback prior to the start of each semester and minor adjustments made following monthly curriculum committee meeting discussions.

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.

[X] Not Met

Team Assessment: Although dedicated efforts (including administrative initiatives and non-curricular activities) are being made to infuse social equity and inclusion throughout the program, little evidence is presented that the program is regularly and consistently exposing students to architecture of diverse cultural and social contexts and to the direct application of such awareness in project development. Examination of syllabi for ARC 6356, cited by the program as primary evidence shows “social, racial, and economic equity” as a learning objective in two studio sections (Clark, Carney). Tacit approaches to equity and inclusion are understood in urban analysis and intervention (Bosworth) and exploration of cultural artifacts (Belton), but an overarching objective of engaging issues of equity and inclusion in student design work is absent. Similarly, student and faculty meetings referenced curricular revision to

COPEDIT

infuse social and racial equity together with the work and writings of under-represented populations in the history and theory courses, but these promising efforts still are evolving. There is a need for formal and consistent learning objectives and applications in a required course.

Current assessment process demands further articulation as curricular initiatives attain greater definition in specific coursework, projects and research. Some history courses were described as recently revised due to the engagement of the Coalition in Design assessment in the Fall of 2021 in addition to a student design survey in the 2020-2021 school year, as well as through the program's bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester. The program has identified that it is in the process of creating program modifications based on the recent feedback as well as establishing a more continuous survey for regular assessment. No benchmarks were identified in the process.

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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence was found in student requirements and work in ARC 6355 Advanced Architectural Design Studio 2.

The criteria are assessed via global bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, and faculty and guest critic responses. Although no established benchmarks are provided, generally curriculum is modified based on feedback prior to the start of each semester and minor adjustments made following monthly curriculum committee meeting discussions.

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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARC 6281 Professional Practice, including syllabus, videos of lectures and guest lectures, the assigned reading material, and exam questions.

The program identifies the method for assessment for this criterion to be based on evaluation of student work and participation within the ARC 6281 course, including a review of each student's professional portfolio assignment. While no specific benchmarks are provided, nor does the program articulate how the feedback is provided, there is evidence that modifications to the course have occurred adjusting for more inclusionary representation in the materials and expansion to new means of delivery methods (CMAR).

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.

[X] Met

COPEDT

Team Assessment: Evidence to substantiate the regulatory context was found in ARC 3463 Material and Methods of Construction 2 (Workshop 03, March 2021) and ARC 6355 Advanced Graduate Design Studio 2 both requirements, assignments and student work.

The criteria are assessed via global bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, and faculty and guest critic responses. Although no established benchmarks are provided, generally curriculum is modified based on feedback prior to the start of each semester and minor adjustments made following monthly curriculum committee meeting discussions. Modifications to the design studio with integration of technical worksheets have been noted as implemented by the program based on the curricular reviews.

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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the ARC 6355 Advanced Graduate Design Studio 2 Course materials. In addition, the program has recently restructured their building technology courses and created an integrated delivery method with course sequencing such that the Building Technology courses run parallel with the studio courses. This change has started and will be fully in place by fall of 2024.

The criteria are assessed via global bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, and faculty and guest critic responses. The program modification to more integrated delivery began in 2017 based on feedback. Although no established benchmarks are provided, generally curriculum is modified based on feedback prior to the start of each semester and minor adjustments made following monthly curriculum committee meeting discussions.

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.

[X] Not Met

Team Assessment: Evidence of ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts is clearly evident in the ARC 6241 Advanced Graduate Design Studio 1 student work. However, during the visit, the team found no evidence in primary, secondary and other available sources of accessible design ability within the student work.

Although no established benchmarks are provided, the program has described some of their implemented changes (shift in project size and complexity, integration of additional software based environmental assessments) that have derived from their global assessment process. This includes the bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, and faculty and guest critic responses.

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.

[X] Not Met

DRAFT

Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement of the ability to integrate building envelope systems, structural systems and environmental control systems was found in student work in ARC 6241 (Advanced Graduate Architectural Design 1) and ARC 6355 Advanced Graduate Design 1.

Evidence of the ability to integrate measurable outcomes of building performance into design decisions was found in ARC 2491C Integrated Building Tech course (formerly Environmental 1).

There was no evidence that the ability to include life safety systems is developed consistently for all students in any of the student coursework. This portion of the criterion is missing.

Although no established benchmarks are provided, the program has described some intended implemented changes (reduced program, additional software based environmental performance evaluation and adjustments to timeframe for delivery of technical coursework) that have derived from their global assessment process. This includes the bi-annual curriculum meetings with the Director, School and Alumni at the end of each semester, as well as through student performance, course assessments, and faculty and guest critic responses.

COF EDIT

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: The APR references and documents the University of Florida's accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges. The University was granted a ten-year period of accreditation in a letter from Dr. Belle S. Wheelan, President SACSCOC, to Dr. James Ernard Machen, President, University of Florida, dated January 13, 2015. (See http://sacs.aa.ufl.edu/media/sacsaaufledu/files/SACSCOC-Reaffirmation-Letter-2014.pdf.)

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.

ACCREDIT

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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence of the B. Arch meeting the required Curricular Framework was found in the APR (pp. 63-78), through diagrams, matrices, course lists, and curricular paths, that document fully the three tracks to the Master of Architecture degree offered, together with the total credits of each based upon students' undergraduate training.

The M.Arch. Track I, or "advanced" track for students with pre-professional training equivalent to the University of Florida's Bachelor of Design in Architecture is offered at the flagship campus in Gainesville and at the CityLab campus in Orlando, and requires 52 semester credit hours beyond the baccalaureate, a total of 172 semester credit hours. The M.Arch. Track III or "core program, offered at the Gainesville campus for students with no prior training in architecture, requires 48 semester credit hours of foundational "core" programming plus 52 graduate semester hours beyond the baccalaureate totaling 220 semester credit hours. The M.Arch. Track II program, a beyond professional degree requiring 30 semester credit hours beyond the Bachelor of Architecture rarely is elected.

All program tracks exceed the minimum 168 total credit hours and minimum 30 credit hours of graduate courses.

At the CityLab, the professional degree is offered with the option to pursue NCARB's IPAL program. To facilitate the accelerated path to licensure, CityLab has available summer sessions, evening course and hybrid courses to balance internship obligations and serve the needs of non-traditional students. CityLab also offers a 2 + 2+ 2-degree structure in which students can present the equivalent of the Bachelor of Design in Architecture through associate degree course work. Students earn an associate degree in architecture at Valencia College, a Bachelor of Design in architecture at the University of Central Florida

COPY EDIT

and the Advanced Master of Architecture degree (Track 1) at University of Florida's CityLab Orlando. (See APR pp. 12, 14, 21, and 25 for CityLab).

The parallel options for the M.Arch. Track I share the same curriculum and admission requirements. Dedicated efforts are made to integrate the cohorts of the discrete locations through scholarly, research, and extracurricular activities.

See also: for general program information, https://dcp.ufl.edu/programs/#graduate; for programs on the main campus in Gainesville, https://dcp.ufl.edu/architecture/graduate-school/; and for CityLab, Orlando https://dcp.ufl.edu/architecture/graduate-school/master-of-architecture/citylab-orlando/.

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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment:

4.3.1 - The APR (pp. 79-82) documents the process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB criteria required for admission to the M.Arch. Track I and Track II. To this end, admission materials include official transcripts, a resume/curriculum vitae, and a digital portfolio. Most applicants to this program are students who completed the Bachelor of Design in Architecture (B.Des) program at UF. When applicants with undergraduate degrees from other institutions apply to this program, the Admissions Officer and Associate Director of Graduate Programs review each applicant to verify eligibility. Side-by-side curricular comparisons are conducted, using the University of Florida's pre-professional degree program as a basis for evaluation. See also pertinent links to the Graduate Catalog: https://admissions.ufl.edu/apply/graduate/; and (https://dcp.ufl.edu/architecture/graduate-school/admissions/how-to-apply/).

4.3.2 - Two of the three curricular tracks offered (M.Arch. Track I and M.Arch. Track II) require certain accreditation criteria to be met in the preparatory education experience, as detailed in the APR (p. 82-83). For students who have not fulfilled the criteria at the University of Florida, review of syllabi and related course materials is required. If there is not enough evidence that applicants have met particular criteria through their preparatory education experiences, applicants will be requested to provide additional materials. If documentation is not available, applicants will be required to complete additional coursework as a part of their degree program, to ensure that all accreditation criteria are met. During the application process, transcripts for applicants to Track II are reviewed to verify that prior degree work was completed at NAAB-accredited programs.

COPY EDIT

4.3.3 - Evidence provided in the APR (p. 83-84) and University of Florida Graduate Admissions (see https://admissions.ufl.edu/apply/graduate) verifies that all applications for all graduate professional degree programs are reviewed by the Graduate School to evaluate the accreditation status of undergraduate institutions where applicants received degrees with additional criteria established for “foreign” institutions. Examples of letters of offer of admission provided in the APR articulate transparently program completion requirements and tuition costs.

COF EDIT

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.

[X] Described

Team Assessment: An overarching guide of administrative governance and administrative structure is provided in the UF Model of Shared Governance, illustrated in the APR (p. 90).

The APR clearly documents the administrative structure of the university (pp. 86 - 86); faculty roles in governance at the university level (pp. 88, with further verification from university data, see http://senate.ufl.edu/committees--councils/committees/ 29 http://senate.ufl.edu/committees--councils/committees/faculty-senate-committees/ 30 http://senate.ufl.edu/committees--councils/councils/); and opportunities for service to the university through its committee structure (pp. 88 - 89 and https://fora.aa.ufl.edu/University/PresidentialCommittees).

Organizational structure and governance at the School and College level is documented in the APR, which addresses faculty governance (pp.90 - 91 supported by the College Constitution, see https://my.dcp.ufl.edu/dcp-content/uploads/2016/09/DCPConstitution-ratifiedFeb2016.pdf and Bylaws of the School of Architecture https://dcp.ufl.edu/architecture/resources-2/by-laws/.); staff governance (p. 93 and the employee handbook https://hr.ufl.edu/working-at-uf/employee-handbook/); and student governance, including Student Council By-laws, student engagement in School Committees, and practices regarding the employ of graduate students (pp. 93-96 and https://sg.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Constitution-as-of-2016.pdf, https://www.ufgau.org/,

During both the faculty and student meetings, the team confirmed that a new SofA student council has been created for students to have a more direct involvement within the program governance. The council includes an elected member from each studio cohort, both in Gainesville and Orlando, as well as a representative from each student organization. Both the faculty and students are excited for this new development and the development of additional layers of inclusion and communication within the program. As a recent development the implication and clarity of scope and opportunity for inclusion is unknown.

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.

COPYRIGHT

[X] Not Demonstrated

Team Assessment:

5.2.1 (Not Demonstrated). The APR provides evidence of a comprehensive strategic planning assessment the Program created in conjunction with a third party (Pirie Associates) in 2018/2019. The draft strategic plan outlines 6 major objectives of the program and implementation of the plan is described as impacted by the pandemic with no targeted dates for implementation. While some of the goals of the draft plan have been integrated through organic efforts (specifically DEI through Coalition of Design and Equity Committee) there is description that the committee structure is the only method for reviewing issues and assessments and no evidence of a planning process is established for how the strategic plan will be used, adjusted or implemented going forward (no goals, benchmarks, etc.).

5.2.2 – (Not Demonstrated). KPI are established and documented for the University as a whole (APR pg.106-107), and for the College for the SACSCOC Assessment related to enrollment, demographic breakdown and matriculation. The team found no evidence of specific and formalized key performance indicators or benchmarking indicated by the program unit itself.

5.2.3. – (Demonstrated). The APR (pg. 112-115) does document an assessment for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) from 2014 that occurs every 10 years and is reported on annually related to the following objectives. For the student learning there is a rubric of how this criterion is evaluated.

- Enrollment status (Jan 2021: 154 students, typically 120-189 students)
- Minority student enrollment (Jan 2021: some successes in Hispanic and Asian student enrollment, challenges in black and female enrollment)
- Matriculation (Jan 2021: 100%-degree completion within 5 years > goal of 90%)
- Student credit hours (Jan 2021: 97.6% completed their degree with no more than minimum number of credits > goal of 90%).
- Student Learning; Knowledge (93.28% met > 75% threshold)
- Student Learning; Skills (94.57% met > 90% threshold)
- Student Learning; Professional Behavior (95.74% met > 90% threshold)

5.2.4 – (Not Demonstrated). The program created a draft strategic plan with Pirie Associates in 2018/2019 and included a SWOT Analysis as part of that effort. (APR pg. 116). Several opportunities and weaknesses were identified, and the program described that they have used this assessment to form the focus of “discussions” and began addressing a number of the concerns, but there is no indication of planning process for continuous assessment or improvement in this area (timeframe for next assessment, goals for improvement, etc.).

5.2.5 – (Demonstrated). As documented by the APR (pg. 118), the school receives ongoing input from others on a consistent basis including the following; Alumni input via the SoA Architectural Advisory Council (meets each semester), External reviewers (including practitioners and faculty from other universities) participate on final studio reviews each semester, recently from students and alumni through the Coalition in Design providing input on DEI, and in August 2021 through a Qualtrics Survey to professionals, students and recent alumni.

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:

COPY

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.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The program describes clear processes for assessing its curriculum and responding to finds through adjustment and evolution of the curriculum (see APR, pp. 124-126).

The APR, supported by discussion in meetings with the faculty, documents faculty-centered review of student work and learning objectives through end-of-semester curriculum review and a robust hierarchy of curriculum-focused committees. In addition to referencing the most recent NAAB VTR and performance criteria as benchmarks, metrics for assessment come from ARE pass rates together with feedback from alumni and firms that employ University of Florida graduates.

School of Architecture by-laws vest the faculty with curriculum management and development, primarily through the SofA Curriculum Committee (see APR, p. 125) supported by a studio coordinators committee and sub-disciplinary committees (i.e., History and Theory; Building Technology). Meeting with the faculty verifies the efficacy of curriculum management and review. The recent creation of the Student Council promises to add student voices to curricular discussions.

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.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment:

5.4.1. - Tenured, tenure-track and full-time non-tenure track instructional appointments (75% teaching/25% service) together with select adjunct faculty at the CityLab comprise the teaching faculty. The typical semester teaching load is two courses, although deviations from that standard (see APR p. 126) occur in support of student research and independent study and in service of curriculum, notably the transition to the new integrated technology courses (as noted in faculty meeting). All full-time faculty benefit from clearly articulated paths for advancement. The availability of sabbaticals, professional development leave, course releases, and release time and start-up funding for newly hired tenured and tenure track faculty promote a culture of research and creative practices as demonstrated in faculty resumes. Students and faculty both benefit from faculty ability to participate in the Vicenza Institute, the

COE EDIT

CityLab, the delivery of elective courses and certificates in areas of specialization. Service obligations are distributed equitably across the faculty.

5.4.2 - Associate Professor Bradley Waters is the Architect Licensing Advisor (has been in this role since 2008). His recent training was the NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit in 2021.

5.4.3. As noted in 5.4.1, faculty have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement through sabbaticals, course releases, and professional development leave. The APR documents parallel opportunities for professional development for staff. Travel support for academic conferences is provided with faculty, with priority given to tenure-track faculty; graduate students also have access to conference funding. The APR indicates that staff have earned college and university awards for excellence and faculty resumes demonstrate productivity and peer recognition. (See APR 127-228 and Faculty Resume Addendum.)

5.4.4. - Undergraduate advising is handled by two College Advisors located in the Dean's Office. Graduate advising is handled by the SoA Graduate Advisor and Admissions Officer. The University takes mental health seriously and offers multiple services to all students, with contact information on each syllabus and via the University website. Career/Internship and Job Placement opportunities include a College career fair the College job website. The NCARB and APX understanding is introduced in the Professional Practice courses.

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.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment:

5.5.1 – The APR includes description of discussions on diversity and equity within the school. Human resources have been allocated to the Equity Committee and other DEI-focused groups to create a DEI Plan. Financial resources have been allocated to the LAC Scholarship and Coalition in Design. Based on discussion with staff, physical resources have been modified to accommodate students with disabilities.

5.5.2 - Through searches for new faculty and stabilization of the professor/lecturer structure, the School is making efforts to diversify faculty. The School acknowledges a need for increased diversity and measurements for success in this area in its DEI Plan.

COPEDT

5.5.3 – The School's population reflects higher levels of diversity than the University as a whole. While the School/department plays no part in admissions, outreach is done to high schools and state colleges in the region to recruit a diverse population and establish accessible paths to entry (ex.: 2+2+2 Plan with Valencia College and UCF).

5.5.4 - University of Florida Regulation 1.0061 regarding these programs is provided. The College's Diversity Officer, Nawari Nawari, also plays a role in hiring and retention.

5.5.5 – The school is able to adapt to support diverse sets of abilities through university systems and proactive accommodations on a case-by-case basis, based on conversation and examples given in the staff meeting. University-based mental health services are available and supported by School faculty and staff.

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.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The physical resources are described from multiple resources as noted below.

5.6.1 - The program has 30,000 SF of designated space for studio instruction on the Gainesville (main) campus and an additional 7,400 SF of space for graduate studio instruction at the CityLab-Orlando location which appear to be adequate for their instructional models. The Gainesville campus has assigned (cold) desks for each student, while the Orlando space uses activity-based zones in the studio with the ability for students to schedule a workspace via an app. The program provided a virtual tour and further floor plans as evidence of the studio spaces.

5.6.2 - The program has described spaces that are available to the students on the Gainesville campus including lecture halls, classroom space, woodshop, and FabLab. The Orlando campus includes a large classroom and two seminar classrooms, all with hyflex technology and flexible furniture. There are also 3D printers, a laser cutter, and small tools available in the studio.

5.6.3. - The school has dedicated space for all administrative functions on both campuses. The faculty have designated office space per a UF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

5.6.4 – The program reinforces studio-based teaching and learning, and many studios are equipped with mobile video-conferencing technology for any hybrid teaching models following COVID restrictions. The college has initiated a new academic building that will start construction in 2023 and currently includes studio space, research space for acoustics, large scale fabrication, collaboration space, and designated space for public review and exhibit.

COI EDIT

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.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The APR, pp. 138-140, documents institutional support for the School of Architecture including evidence of budgets for the Main Campus programs (FY 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21) and, to the degree know at the time of publication of the APR, 2021-22, together with budgets for the CityLab Programs. Context for the funding of the School of Architecture, provided from the College of Design, Construction and Planning, is shown in the UF Budget Model; (see https://cfo.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/University-Budget-Model-Manual.pdf, linked to the APR on p. 138) that includes protocols for allocations of tuition revenue and obligations for operating expenses.

The APR (pp.138-39) documents additional and discretionary funding provided by the self-funded CityLab programs, which will, beginning in 2022, direct 40% reserves in excess of $250,000 to the school. Significantly the School's endowment funds, described in the APR and detailed in meetings with the Program Director and Dean of the College of DCP (APR, p. 139), provide support for student scholarships and teaching assistantships. A successful, on-going capital campaign, in which the College of Design, Construction and Planning (DCP) is exceeding their fund-raising goals, and robust support from alumni were described by the Dean.

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.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: Demonstrated per APR response section 5.8: description provided of informational resources, including architectural literature.

Demonstrated per the University of Florida Student Leadership meeting during the visit:

1. All faculty and students have access to this information.
2. CityLab students have access to all the same resources.
3. Resources were available including during the start of the pandemic and temporary virtual classes, including access to digital software.

C-I-E-D-T

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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees was found to be available online at https://dcp.ufl.edu/architecture/accreditation/.

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)

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The documents are found to be available online at https://dcp.ufl.edu/architecture/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.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Access to the University Career Connections Center was found to be available online at https://career.ufl.edu.

Additional resources specific to Architecture were found to be available online at https://dcp.ufl.edu/architecture/accreditation/.

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

COPEDIT

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Access to accreditation-related reports and related documents were found to be available online at: https://dcp.ufl.edu/architecture/accreditation/.

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Information and application instructions, as well as information about application for financial aid and scholarships, was found to be online at: https://dcp.ufl.edu/architecture/graduate-school/admissions/how-to-apply/.

Specific to Diversity Goals (Item 6.5E) the program provided the following statement: "*We are not allowed by state law to use race or gender as a consideration in our admissions process. As a result, our admissions decisions are based primarily on academic merit as submitted for review, including the portfolio, letters of reference, academic transcripts, test scores, etc. Once admissions decisions are determined, the Admissions Committee allocates financial support based on both academic merit and the lived experiences of applicants as articulated in their letters of intent. While race and gender cannot be used in making admissions decisions, we do consider student diversity goals in the financial aid awards allocated to accepted students.*"

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.

SOFEDIT

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Information and access for financial planning support was found to be available online at: https://www.sfa.ufl.edu/.

The initial estimate for program tuition expenses was found to be available online at: https://www.fa.ufl.edu/directives/2021-22-academic-year-tuition-and-fees/.

Estimates for additional cost for books and supplies was found to be available online at: https://www.sfa.ufl.edu/cost/graduate-costs/.

COF EDIT

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

PC. 5 - Research and Innovation

Evidence of the program's preparation for engaging and participating in architectural research is found in the sequence of required courses: ARC 6242 Research and Methods, ARC 6913 Architectural Research 3 and ARC 6971/6979 Independent Thesis/PILOT. Syllabi, reading assignments, student case studies, and reading analyses provide evidence of exposure to theoretical foundations necessary for inquiry, innovation and application of new knowledge in the field, as does the noteworthy "Writing Fragment" assignment of ARC 6242. The ability for students to shape the direction of their research, and ultimately their PILOT project, to match their personal interests leads to opportunities for the students for publication and community collaboration. Collaboration in faculty research, the availability of knowledge-based certificate options, and the recent campus-wide investment in AI augment curricular evidence. The team found this criterion to be met with distinction.

PC.7 - Learning and Teaching Culture

The program documents in the APR a framework for a mutually supporting learning and teaching culture among students and faculty. And formal evidence of syllabi contains expectations for attaining a positive and respectful teaching and learning environment. The respectful, open and collaborative culture that has been established is evidenced to exceed requirements.

The student, faculty and staff meetings during the visit provided evidence of the School's dedication to continual cultural improvement through the formation of new Student Council; inclusion of students in faculty committees; dialogue around needed improvements in communication and curriculum diversity; and more importantly the multigenerational teaching model that organically has occurred with Teaching Assistants (Undergrad), Graduate Teaching Assistants (Graduate), and faculty create a wider and multi-layered net of relationships and support system between faculty, staff and students as each cohort moves through the program.

Further, the Master of Architecture students continuing their education in the School of Architecture MSAS in Pedagogy, as well as the PhD program underscore the impact of the robust cycle of learning and teaching within the program. The team found this criterion to be met with distinction.

COPYRIGHT

Appendix 2. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Practitioner Representative
Kate Cofer, AIA, IIDA, PMP
Principal, Business Engagement Lead
KKT Architects
Tulsa, OK 74114
918.744.4270
Cell: 917.450.7311
Kate.Cofer@KKTarchitects.com

Educator Representative
Ethel Goodstein-Murphree, Ph.D., Assoc. AIA, Affiliate ASLA
Associate Dean and Professor of Architecture
Fay Jones School of Architecture + Design
University of Arkansas
129 Vol Walker Hall, Fayetteville, AR
479-575-3805, office phone
479-575-2702, phone, assistant to the deans
egoodste@uark.edu

Regulator Representative
Juan Riestra, AIA, NCARB
Orlando, FL
jj@riestra.info

Student Representative
Scott Cornelius, AIAS, Assoc. AIA
AIAS National President
Washington, DC
scottecornelius@gmail.com

COF EDIT

V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Kate Cofer, AIA
Team Chair

Ethel Goodstein-Murphree, Ph.D., Assoc. AIA
Team Member

Juan Riestra, AIA
Team Member

Scott Cornelius, AIAS, Assoc. AIA
Team Member