August 1, 2014

Michael A. Fitts  
President  
Office of the President  
Tulane University  
218 Gibson Hall  
6823 St. Charles Avenue  
New Orleans, LA  70118-5684

Dear President Fitts:

At the July 2014 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the directors reviewed the Visiting Team Report (VTR) for the Tulane University, School of Architecture.

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

This new, maximum term of accreditation was approved by the NAAB in March 2013 and put into effect for all decisions made after July 1, 2013.

The accreditation term is effective January 1, 2014. The program is scheduled for its next accreditation visit in 2022.

Continuing accreditation is subject to two reporting requirements.

First, all programs must submit an Annual Statistical Report (see Section 10 of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition, Amended). This report captures statistical information on the institution and the program.

Second, any program that receives an eight-year term of accreditation is required to submit an Interim Progress Report two years after a visit and again five years after the visit. This requirement is described in Section 11 of the 2012 NAAB Procedures. The next statistical report is due November 30, 2014; the first interim progress report is due November 2016.

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

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

Very truly yours,

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

cc:   Kenneth Schwartz, FAIA, Dean  
Christine Theodoropoulos, Visiting Team Chair

Enc.
Tulane University
Department of Architecture

Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture
Track I ([5-year] 138 credit hours total + 30 graduate credits)
Track II (non-preprofessional degree + 111 graduate credits)
Track III ([advanced standing] preprofessional degree + 62 graduate credits)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
28 February 2014

*The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1940, is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture. Because most state registration boards in the United States require any applicant for licensure to have graduated from a NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.*
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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The Tulane School of Architecture’s exemplary civic engagement is achieved by the school’s integration of community service into its curriculum. At Tulane, students develop a deep understanding of the role of architects within the public realm, have numerous opportunities to participate in service-based learning activities and fully integrate curriculum knowledge with hands on design projects in the community.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, the school assumed an active role in the recovery of the City of New Orleans. Through this process students and faculty have pursued meaningful engagement with communities that promotes intellectual and cultural diversity within the architecture program. Their work is strongly supported and endorsed by university and civic leadership. It has informed the development of new programs including the school’s Master of Sustainable Real Estate Development, and the university’s undergraduate minor in Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship while strengthening existing programs including the Master’s of Architecture and Master’s of Preservation Studies. It has launched community service initiatives such as the Tulane City Center and URBANbuild, programs that are notable for their contributions to the school’s leadership development mission and well positioned to help stimulate economic growth within the community, increase social awareness through design excellence and expand architectural practice to include innovations in responsible community design. By using the city as an interdisciplinary learning laboratory, both for existing programs and new programs, the school has opportunities to affect tangible change across multiple disciplines by implementing cutting edge sustainable, preservation, and urban design research strategies into its architecture curriculum.

The make-up of the school’s student body is in transition. In the Master of Architecture program, graduate enrollment is increasing and undergraduate enrollment is decreasing. Tulane’s new four-year Bachelor of Science in Architecture program (beginning Fall ‘14) will provide undergraduates with more options to study architecture within the context of a liberal arts education. It will also provide Tulane undergraduates with a 4 + 2 pathway to an accredited degree. Students in the school’s various programs take courses together in ways that promote a sense of community through interdisciplinary dialog and peer mentoring. Programs in entrepreneurship, historic preservation and real estate provide opportunities for architecture students to pursue specialized and alternative career paths within the profession.

The team extends its appreciation to the school’s administrators, faculty and students for their hospitality and responsiveness to questions and requests for information. The school was fully prepared for the NAAB visit. The team room contained a well-organized and complete record of the three tracks leading to the Master of Architecture degree.

Because of weather-related flight cancelations, two of the five voting team members departed New Orleans on Wednesday morning, earlier than originally scheduled, and were unable to attend the exit meetings. Their departures occurred after the completion of the team’s evaluation of the program and preparation of the exit report.

2. Conditions Not Met

I.2.3 Physical Resources

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria

B. 5. Life Safety
B.6. Comprehensive Design  
B.7. Financial Considerations

3. Causes of Concern

A. Program Compression  
The compression of learning experiences that meet the NAAB’s Student Performance Criteria during the first three years of the five-year program frees up the fourth and fifth year of study for students to have opportunities to participate in off-campus programs unique to Tulane’s community involvement as well as to pursue particular interests, minors or second majors. The compressed format, while meeting NAAB requirements as it is currently offered, may be limiting some aspects of program quality. Evidence supporting this concern included:

Design Achievement Plateaus in Third Year: Student work produced in fifth-year thesis studios did not show significant improvement in design ability compared to work from third-year studios.

Lack of Graduate/Undergraduate distinction: At Tulane, all students receiving an accredited degree are enrolled in a Master of Architecture program. Students without a prior undergraduate degree who begin their studies in the university’s Newcomb Tulane College are considered to be undergraduate students by the school and the university. In the School of Architecture, vertical course enrollments within the core intermingle students with different levels of experience in higher education. Sophomores are co-enrolled with graduate students. Some courses provide additional activities for graduate students, but the school has not articulated distinct learning objectives associated with the particular educational needs of each cohort. The lack of identity unique to the graduate program that includes in-depth, advanced study was identified as a concern in the 2006 VTR. The school currently provides ample opportunities for graduate students to pursue advanced study especially during the final year of their program, but identity uniqueness for graduate students within the core curriculum is still lacking.

Generic Core Experience: The core curriculum is structured to achieve NAAB professional learning outcomes early in the program but student experience in the core seems generic and may not be taking full advantage of the uniqueness of the school’s mission as experienced in the fourth and fifth years of study.

B. Internship Inconsistencies  
The accredited program includes professional internships that are not awarded credit but are required for graduation. Currently, there are inconsistent interpretations and understandings of the requirement within the school’s community.

C. Internal Communications  
While the school functions effectively using widespread input and makes sound decisions related to curriculum, finances, personnel and other program or operations needs and improvements, the sharing of some information and decision making processes could be more effective. Areas that may benefit from improved communications include: the alignment of teaching assignments with faculty research agendas, mentoring faculty as they progress toward tenure, promotion or post-tenure review, student awareness of and access to instructional support services, and streamlining student communications with various advisors at the university, school and faculty levels.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2008)

2004 Criterion 13.14, Accessibility: Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities
Previous Team Report (2008): This condition is not met. The team is concerned with the inconsistency in addressing site and building circulation and access needs. Clear and concise graphic solutions to restroom, elevator, parking and pedestrian access needs should be commonplace in studio design work.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is now met. See Section II.1.1.B.2 of this report.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

1.1.1 History and Mission:

[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2014 Team Assessment: The history and mission of the program, the school and the university is well documented. In addition, the APR describes the impact of Hurricane Katrina and how it reshaped Tulane University's relationship with the City of New Orleans.

The school's commitment to community-based applied research and education reflects the mission of the university and the school is actively engaged in productive relationships with the institution as a whole and in partnership with various units at the university. The university and the city frequently showcase the school's achievements as examples of successful partnerships. The school's involvement in Tulane's new minor in Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship is an example of a unique synergy that merges the university and school missions.

Undergraduate architecture students have access to Tulane's extensive and high quality general education offerings. Graduate students have opportunities to pursue general and discipline specific interests. Both promote the development of broadly educated architects.

1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

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

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.
The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which in each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2014 Team Assessment: Students and faculty developed the school’s Studio Culture Policy to promote a positive and respectful learning environment that prepares students for professional practice. Policy sections discuss the importance of Critical Inquiry, Collaboration, and Stewardship and Community Engagement.

Institutional policies concerning harassment, anti-discrimination, and academic integrity also support and protect individual responsibilities and rights.

The school provides a culturally rich and supportive environment for all members of the school’s community by promoting intellectual exchange and cultural respect, through its engagement with the diverse contexts of the university, the city and the profession and through its commitment to increasing the diversity of faculty and staff, as well as student diversity. The school has vigorously pursued a number of outreach efforts intended to promote student diversity and has succeeded in improving the diversity of its faculty through new hires, and the diversity of intellectual exchange through the involvement of guest critics and adjunct faculty with diverse interests and backgrounds.

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

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: Architecture students take advantage of Newcomb Tulane College’s general education program, as well as minors and double majors from across the university. The school contributes general education courses and an undergraduate minor in architecture. Symbiotic programs in preservation (at the undergraduate and graduate levels) and sustainable real estate development (at the graduate level) provide opportunities for students to pursue these areas of interest. Students also have access to a robust program of extra curricular opportunities and services offered by the university.

The school’s active involvement in projects for New Orleans communities makes significant, highly visible contributions to the university’s community service mission while providing students and faculty with opportunities to engage in the development of new knowledge.

Faculty and students from the school participate in university governance and make meaningful contributions to university wide initiatives.

---

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: By incorporating experiences that teach students how to respond to the regional needs of New Orleans, students are encouraged to acquire abilities that will prepare them to work in a global world and position them to assume leadership responsibilities within communities and the profession. The school provides study abroad opportunities and access to visiting practitioners and scholars who contribute perspectives and introduce challenges derived from their experiences in other regions of the U.S.

Students benefit from a close community that is furthered by the connectivity of the physical facilities where studios are in close proximity and are configured to promote dialog among students enrolled in different sections. The united culture of the school and its learning environment promote peer mentoring and intellectual exchange between graduate and undergraduate students, between students in different programs and between students and faculty. This promotes a high level of student awareness about options for study at Tulane, and about directions they may choose to pursue in their future careers.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: The program provides a good overview of internship and licensure both through coursework and through advising provided by the IDP coordinator, who is also the instructor of professional practice subjects. The Career Development Director provides additional information and services that help students prepare for the transition from school to practice. Students at all levels are aware of licensure requirements.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: The program offers study abroad opportunities as well as multiple opportunities to travel regionally as part of upper level design studios. Through various community outreach initiatives, students are exposed to real world scenarios that provide valuable practice lessons including collaboration opportunities and client communication skills. The year-long DESIGNbuild program is an extraordinary educational experience that integrates all aspects of professional practice as students collaborate with a community and a client to design and build a house that contributes to the vitality of a campus-adjacent neighborhood. The
program contributes to the growth and development of the profession by graduating well prepared individuals who understand the importance of environmental, cultural and socio-economic impacts of community-based design.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: The Tulane School of Architecture responds to this perspective with distinction. Both the development of civic values and the call to civic action on behalf of the public good are deeply embedded in the school’s culture. As an important participant in the post-Katrina Tulane Recovery Plan, the school has received regional and national recognition for its work related to complex social challenges through architecture and non-architecture program experiences. Community service is deeply integrated into the university’s mission. All Newcomb Tulane students are required to complete a freshman service class (TIDES) and two Service Learning requirements. Through the dedicated work of its students and faculty, the school has emerged as a leader of community engagement and service learning at the university and in the nation.

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: The school’s long-range plan supports the academic mission and values of the school and aligns with the university’s mission and vision. The school has identified many priorities (some already implemented) that comprise a coherent strategy for advancing the following well-conceived and clearly communicated concepts:

1. Educating students in the abiding cultural and social roles of architecture, preservation and real estate development by providing a well-rounded, humanities-based education with discipline-specific coursework;
2. Preparing future professionals through continually assessed and updated coursework in design, building technology and professional concerns, with an emphasis on critical thinking;
3. Instilling a sense of responsibility and ethical conduct through civic engagement.

Together with the backing of the university’s administration, and the identification of key timing issues and fundraising goals, the school’s administration, faculty and staff are well positioned to implement their long-range plan.
I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

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

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: Self-assessment activities involve administrators, staff, faculty, external advisors and students. The university has a robust structure for ongoing assessments of courses by students, administrator, faculty and staff performance through annual or periodic reviews, and campus-wide assessment that informs regional accreditation.

The provost, the school’s administrators, the school’s board of advisors, and the school’s faculty and staff provide regular input to the school’s development of, and progress toward achieving goals in support of its long-range plan.

In addition, the school’s standing committees provide a structure for ongoing assessment of various aspects of the school’s programs and activities. Special assessment efforts, such as staff retreats provide additional opportunities for reflection. The Studio Walk Through invites broad faculty participation in assessment of the design studio curriculum and student performance.

The school’s inclusive approach to assessment supports an environment where students are comfortable asking questions and voicing concerns with the school’s administration, faculty and staff. The development of programs such as the Master of Sustainability in Real Estate Development and the Minor in Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship and URBANBuild—the hallmark community design program—were developed with input from students.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

1.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: Faculty and staff resources are appropriate to support student learning and achievement. The faculty to student ratio is 12:1.

Policy statements regarding equal employment opportunity/affirmative action are available on the university website under General Policies. The university maintains guidelines for promotion and tenure policies. The school's policy includes a detailed outline of tenure and promotion procedures.

Teaching assignments generally include two courses per semester with one being a studio. Studio contact hours are typically 12 hours per week providing extensive opportunities for individualized instruction.

The school has an IDP coordinator who hosts Lunch & Learn seminars throughout the year and IDP workshops once each semester. These events are open to all students. In addition faculty who have not yet attained licensure are encouraged to do so.

When possible, the school provides full time faculty with opportunities to apply for course releases in order to pursue research. Faculty and staff can apply for funding support from Dean's Fund for Excellence for Research and Creative Work. Tenure-track faculty are eligible to apply for a fourth year research leave and tenured faculty are eligible to apply for sabbatical leaves. Staff development resources include university training as well as free tuition and release time to take courses at the university.

- Students:
  - An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This documentation may include, but is not limited to application forms and instructions, admissions

---

2 A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
requirements, admissions decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshman, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.

- An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The school and university provide information about admissions policies and application procedures for prospective students on their websites. These materials provide clear information for new and entering students at the freshmen, transfer and graduate levels.

Information about merit scholarships, need-based financial aid, Louisiana resident financial aid for undergraduate students as well as general information about financial resources for graduate students is documented on the university’s website.

The school’s commitment to student achievement is articulated in the Institutional Mission and evidenced in the school’s academic programs and extensive support of student organizations and extracurricular activities, such as Architecture Week.

1.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The school has an adequate administrative structure that is similar to structures used by other academic units within the university. The dean reports directly to the provost and oversees the Master of Architecture degree program, in addition to the school’s other academic programs. The associate dean for academics, the associate dean of students, and the associate dean for community engagement support the dean in facilitating the various aspects of the teaching, research, and outreach missions of the university. The school’s staff provides services and expertise that meet the needs of students, faculty and administrators.

All of these individuals and their relationships are clearly identified in school’s organizational chart.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: Faculty and students actively participate in governance using a structure that includes committees that span the school’s important decision making. They are comprised as follows:

Executive: five faculty members and the dean;
Curriculum: 13 faculty members and three students;
Grievance: five faculty members and the dean;
New Faculty: seven faculty members, and three students;
Promotions, Review, and Tenure: five faculty members;
Resources, Outreach, Events, Publications: 11 faculty members and four students.
Student Affairs: six faculty members and two students;
Graduate Admissions: seven faculty members and three students.

Some staff members participate on committees and all staff are invited to a staff-only retreat.

1.2.3 Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:
- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

[X] Physical Resources are inadequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The school is housed in Tulane’s Richardson Memorial Hall, an historic building prominently located in the center of campus. The building configuration offers special spatial qualities that nurture the formation of a learning community where all members are in close proximity. Many aspects of the school’s facilities, such as the library, shop areas and computing lab, as well as studio and computing workstations support the school’s needs well. However, there are a few problems that appear to be having a negative affect on teaching and learning as well as a negative effect on workplace equity and comfort.

During our meeting with students, it was very difficult for us to hear students and for the students to hear us in Thomson Hall. The acoustics of the room combined with the noises from the building service systems made it difficult to communicate in this space that is routinely used as a lecture hall. We also learned that the HVAC system does not function well throughout the building, which causes instructional and workspaces to become uncomfortable.

Because of the limited number of office spaces available, some of the school’s full-time faculty must share their offices. The quality of office spaces varies considerably which makes it difficult for the school to provide each member of the full-time faculty with equitable access to office space of similar quality and comfort.

The 2006 VTR mentions, “The visiting team understands and is concerned that there are critical capital improvements and deferred maintenance actions that have not yet been completed and should be initiated to ensure the continued educational function of the building.” Since 2006 the school has invested in a number of building improvements. A new off-campus facility for the Tulane City Center is currently under construction and a full renovation of Richardson Memorial Hall has been proposed as part of a capital campaign. However, there appears to be further need for maintenance and improvements to address important comfort and equity issues.

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.

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The school’s operating budget and extensive access to institutional services and resources indicates that there are ample financial resources to support student learning and achievement. This is evidenced by small class sizes, a well-qualified faculty with small student to faculty ratios, faculty development support, and many opportunities for elective study, field trips, speakers
programs, and other program enhancements.

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

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

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The collection in the Architecture Library in Richardson Memorial Hall includes art, architecture, and design materials with emphasis on architecture, landscape architecture, building technology and construction. The collection spans multiple formats including printed volumes, hardcopy and digital journal subscriptions, videos, digital images, construction documents, and an interlibrary loan service. Students have access to reference assistance both in the school and main libraries.
PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

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

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

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: Statistical reports reveal that student demographics for the accredited program are consistent with those of the university on a whole. The time to graduation and the enrollment demographics are also comparable to the school and to the rest of the university. The school has been identified as an example program that was used to inform the Diversity and Inclusive Excellence (D&IE) Strategic Plan for the University. The goals of the D&IE plan are consistent with those of the school.

In recent years, due to the current career profile of the faculty, there have been relatively few tenure or promotion cases within the school. More are expected in the next few years as the school’s newer faculty progress in their careers.

3 In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
I.3.2. Annual Reports: The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2009 NAAB Procedures. Beginning in 2008, these reports are submitted electronically to the NAAB. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the NAAB will provide to the visiting team all annual reports submitted since 2008. The NAAB will also provide the NAAB Responses to the annual reports.

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

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: These were provided.

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials: The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty are adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history and context of the institution.

In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit4 that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The faculty exhibit demonstrated a suitable range of knowledge and experience as well as development and achievement since the 2008 NAAB visit. Most faculty members have masters or doctoral credentials and the majority of faculty members are licensed architects. They have diverse backgrounds and have been educated at universities across the U.S. and abroad. They are involved in a wide range of practice, research, scholarship, and creative work. Each faculty member's knowledge, expertise, and experience are principal factors in determining teaching assignments to promote student achievement.

---

4 The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Two binders containing policies were available in the Team Room. They contained:

1. Tulane School of Architecture Studio Culture Policy
2. Self Assessment procedures
3. Personnel policies, including:
   1. Position descriptions
   2. Rank, Tenure, and Promotion policies
   3. EEO/AA
   4. Diversity Initiatives
   5. Faculty Development
4. Student-to-Faculty Ratios and Square Footage
5. Admissions Requirements
6. Advising Policies
7. Academic Integrity Policy
8. Career Services
9. Required Materials & Computing Resources
10. Required NAAB language
11. General Tulane School of Architecture resources & documents
II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria: The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.

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

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The final papers from AHST 3010 and AHST 6610 History/Theory of Arch & Urbanism I and thesis documents from AHST 5110 Thesis Preparation demonstrate reading and writing ability. Student speaking and listening skills were confirmed by the team through student interviews.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Design thinking skills are developed in the DSGN 2200 and DSGN 3100 Architecture Studios. The use of abstract ideas, the consideration of diverse points of view and the ability to test alternative outcomes is evident in the DSGN 2200 Architecture Studio. The use of abstract ideas, the consideration of diverse points of view and the ability to test alternative outcomes is evident in DSGN 3100 Architecture Studio.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Visual communication skills are acquired in the core Architecture Studios, DSGN 1100, DSGN 2200, and DSGN 3200 Comprehensive Studio. ATCS 6110 Site Strategies also addresses this criterion. Graphic process skills are evident in DSGN 1100 and DSGN 2200. Graphic programming skills are evident in ATCS 6110 and DSGN 3200.
A.4. Technical Documentation: Ability to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Students acquire technical documentation ability in APFC 4200 Professional Concerns I: BIM, ATCS 4020, and ATCS 6110 Integrated Building Systems.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Students acquire investigative skills in DSGN 3100 Architecture Studio, and in ATCS 4020, and ATCS 6150 Integrated Building Systems.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Fundamental design skills are developed throughout the Architecture Studio sequence and most evident in DSGN 3100 studio projects.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Students learn to use precedents in the DSGN 2100, DSGN 2200 Architecture Studios, and DSGN 3200 Comprehensive Studio. Urban precedents are emphasized in DSGN 2100. Building precedent studies inform student work in DSGN 2200 and DSGN 3200.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The criterion is met through AHST 1100 Introduction to Architecture and DSGN 2200 Architecture Studio. Understanding of historical ordering systems is evident through quizzes in AHST 1100. The understanding of natural and formal ordering is clearly evident in student work for DSGN 2200.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence that this criterion is met was found in students' analysis papers and quizzes from AHST 3010 and 6610 History and Theory of Architecture and Urbanism I and AHST 3030 and 6620 History and Theory of Architecture and Urbanism II.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence that this criterion is met was found in students' analysis papers and quizzes from AHST 3010 and 6610 History and Theory of Architecture and Urbanism I and AHST 3030 and 6620 History and Theory of Architecture and Urbanism II. Student research for the 2014 version of DSGN 2200 Architecture Studio also addresses cultural diversity.


[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: This criterion is met in ATCS 3030 and 6130 History and Theory of Architecture and Urbanism III.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: Student work across the curriculum demonstrates effective critical thinking, communication and visual representation skills. Students receive a broad-based, well-rounded education that prepares them well for life long intellectual and professional development.

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

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

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

[X] Met
2014 Team Assessment: Student work from AHST 5110 Thesis Preparation meets this criterion. For graduate students who do not elect the thesis option, pre-design ability is demonstrated in work produced in DSGN 3100 Design Studio and APFC 6161 Professional Concerns.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Student work from DSGN 3100 Design Studio meets this criterion.

B. 3. Sustainability: Ability to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction and operations on future generations through means such as carbon-neutral design, bioclimatic design, and energy efficiency.

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Student work from DSGN 3200 Comprehensive Design incorporated three or more sustainable design strategies.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Exercises completed in ATCS 3010 & ATCS 6110 Site Strategies combined with design work from DSGN 3100 Design Studio meet this criterion.

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

[X] Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: DSGN 3200 Comprehensive Studio projects demonstrated attention to life safety issues and included egress diagrams that demonstrated understanding of egress principles, but some of the projects displayed in the team room included errors or failed to resolve the entire emergency egress pathway at the ability level. Documentation of studio work from the DSGN 5100 Options and DSGN 5200 Thesis Studios did not provide sufficient documentation of egress systems to demonstrate ability.
B. 6. Comprehensive Design: Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student's capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following SPC:

A.2. Design Thinking Skills    B.2. Accessibility
A.5. Investigative Skills    B.4. Site Design
    Global Culture
B.5. Life Safety

[X] Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: Student work from DSGN 3200 Comprehensive Studio demonstrated ability in 9 of the 11 listed areas. Students' ability to integrate B.5 Life Safety and B.2 Accessibility into a single comprehensive design project needs further development.

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

[X] Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: The syllabus for APFC 4100 and APFC 5161 Professional Practice & Ethics indicates that this subject area is covered but there were no assignments made in the course that could provide student work that showed evidence of understanding.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Work completed in ATCS 3030 and ATCS 6130 Building, Climate, Comfort meets this criterion.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Student work from ATCS 4010 and ATCS 6140 Structural Systems meets this criterion.
B. 10. Building Envelope Systems: Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Student work from ATCS 3020 and ATCS 6120 Materials and Methods, ATCS 4020 and ATCS 6150 Integrated Building Systems, along with work completed in the Comprehensive Studio meets this criterion.

B. 11. Building Service Systems Integration: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Student work from ATCS 4020 and ATCS 6150 Integrated Building Systems and DSGN 3200 Comprehensive Design included diagrams of vertical circulation systems. Student work from ATCS 3030 and ATCS 6130 Building, Climate, Comfort showed understanding of electrical and plumbing systems.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Student work from ATCS 3020 and ATCS 6120 Materials and Methods, ATCS 4020 and ATCS 6150 Integrated Building Systems, along with work completed in the Comprehensive Studio meets this criterion.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: Student work demonstrated basic competencies in most areas of Realm B with some variability of achievement in studio projects. Although there are many indicators that students are achieving comprehensive design skills, they are still developing the ability to manage complex circulation systems in multistory buildings that resolve life safety and accessibility issues. Recent and planned changes to the curriculum appear to be addressing these deficiencies.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: Students work in groups in the DSGN 2100 Architecture Studio to develop initial design concepts. In APFC 4200 Professional Concerns II: BIM students work together in teams to design BIM projects that take advantage of the strengths of BIM methods while at the same time showing system integration and successful design presentation techniques.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: An understanding of human scale was visible in the majority of the studio projects. Additionally, concepts of space and form over the course of human history, as well as concepts of human comfort in the built environment were found in the quizzes and final exams of ATCS 3030 and 6130 Building, Climate, Comfort and AHST 3010 and 6510 History and Theory of Architecture and Urbanism I.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The architect's responsibility to the client is addressed in the quizzes of the APFC 4100 and 6161 Professional Concerns I.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Project management understanding is shown in student response to quiz questions in APFC 4100 and 6161 Professional Concerns I.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Practice Management understanding is addressed in a project of the APFC 4100 and 6161 Professional Concerns I, where student groups simulate the formation of a firm, develop a business plan, and analyze strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: An understanding of firm and project leadership can be found in the projects of APFC 4100 and 6161 Professional Concerns I.
C. 7. Legal Responsibilities: Understanding of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Student understanding of legal responsibilities is evidenced in quizzes of APFC 4100 and 6161 Professional Concerns I.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Student understanding of ethics and professional judgment is evidenced in quizzes of APFC 4100 and 6161 Professional Concerns I.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The Tulane School of Architecture meets this student performance criterion with distinction through the program's deep commitment to community service that affects the learning experience of every student. In addition, community and social responsibility is addressed in the quizzes of APFC 4100 and APFC 6161, Professional Concerns I.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: All of the above conditions were met. Per the Student Performance Criteria matrix provided by the school, a majority of the Realm C criteria were addressed in the professional practice classes (APFC 4100 and APFC 6161), while not uncommon, there is some concern about whether a single course can fully address the wide range and depth of Realm C subjects being presented. However, student experience related to a number of these criteria extended beyond the lecture classes, and into the community outreach activities that are hallmarks of the program.
II.2.1 Regional Accreditation: The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Tulane University is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: General studies and electives are a required part of the curriculum, as shown in the APR. All undergraduate students take the Tulane Interdisciplinary Experience Seminar, first year writing, foreign language, cultural knowledge, quantitative reasoning, scientific inquiry, public service, writing intensive coursework, and a capstone experience.

The school uses the M. Arch degree title exclusively for all paths to the NAAB accredited degree.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development
The program must describe the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications (e.g., changes or additions) are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Further, the NAAB expects that programs are evaluating curricula with a view toward the advancement of the discipline and toward ensuring that students are exposed to current issues in practice. Therefore, the program must demonstrate that licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The school’s curriculum committee is tasked with the process of evaluating, updating and refining the curriculum. Faculty, student and advisory board input informs this work. The school strongly encourages the registration of all faculty members, the majority of which are registered or are in the process of completing registration requirements.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The school’s evaluation process used to place students with advanced placement into the five-year undergraduate track or three and a half year graduate track is extensive and undertaken with great care and objectivity. Examples of the school’s transfer analysis identified the gaps in each student’s record and provided a plan for how they will be addressed.

An equivalent checklist for the NAAB general education requirement does not exist, however all sample student files met the NAAB’s 45-credit general education requirement.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The statement on NAAB accredited degrees is posted on the school’s website at: http://architecture.tulane.edu/programs/naab-accreditation

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The 2009 Conditions and 2012 Procedures are on the school’s website at:


II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:
   www.ARCHCareers.org
   The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
   Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
   The Emerging Professional’s Companion
   www.NCARB.org
   www.aia.org
   www.eias.org
   www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Career development information is posted on the school’s website at: http://architecture.tulane.edu/careers/advising
II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

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

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: APRs and VTRs are on the school’s website.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The school’s website contains a link to pass rates on the NCARB website: http://architecture.tulane.edu/careers/opportunity/631
III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

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

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

Reference Tulane University, APR, pp. 1-2

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

Reference Tulane University, APR, pp. 1-2

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference Tulane University, APR, pp. 9-13

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference Tulane University, APR, pp. 13
2. Conditions Met with Distinction

Perspective: Architectural Education and the Public Good
See section 1.1.3.E of this report.

C. 9. Community and Social Responsibility
See section II.1.1.C.9 of this report.
3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
Christine Theodoropoulos, Dean
College of Architecture & Environmental Design
California State Polytechnic University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0280
(805) 756-5916
(805) 756-2765 fax
Theo@calpoly.edu

Representing the AIA
Michael J. Thompson, AIA, LEED®AP, NCARB
138 Central Avenue
Glenside, PA 19038
(215) 886-2956
architrave50@gmail.com

Representing the AIAS
Rachel Martinelli
1700½ S. La Brea Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90019
(317) 777-9592
remartinelli4@gmail.com

Representing the NCARB
Kenneth Van Tine, AIA, LEED®AP
inFORM Studio
235 E. Main Street, Suite 102B
Northville, MI 48167
(248) 449-3564
(248) 449-6984
kvantine@in-formstudio.com

Representing the ACSA
Andrew Chin, Interim Dean
Florida A&M University
School of Architecture
1938 South Martin Luther King Jr., Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32307
(850) 599-8763 office
(850) 599.3436 fax
andrew.chin@famu.edu

Non-voting member
Melissa C. Brandrup, AIA, LEED®BC+D
MCB Architecture, PLLC
PO Box 2600
Edwards, CO 81632
703-868-8103
mcbrandrup@hotmail.com
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Christine Theodoropoulos  
Team Chair  
Representing the ACSA

Michael J. Thompson, AIA, LEED®AP, NCARB  
Team member  
Representing the AIA

Rachel Martinelli  
Team member  
Representing the AIAS

Kenneth Van Tine, AIA, LEED®AP  
Team member  
Representing the NCARB

Andrew Chin  
Team member  
Representing the ACSA

Melissa C. Brandrup, AIA, LEED®BC+D  
Team member  
Non-voting Member
Program Response to the Final Draft Visiting Team Report
SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

27 May 2014

Cassandra Pair
Accreditation Director
National Architectural Accrediting Board
1101 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Cassandra,

Thank you for your letter of April 2 and the enclosed draft of the Visiting Team Report. We are grateful for the hard work of the team and their thorough report. Associate Dean for Academics Wendy Redfield and I have reviewed the draft and have several comments for the Board’s consideration.

Section I. Summary of Team Findings, Part 3. Causes of Concern
A. Program Compression (page 2)

The NAAB Board should note that the curriculum in place today is essentially the same as it was six years ago, with the exception of a reduction of 10 credit hours, and less "compression" than existed at that time. It would be relevant and accurate to report that the VTR of the previous team did not express the concern six years ago. Nevertheless, it is now a Cause for Concern for this team despite the adjustments that the faculty and I introduced immediately upon arrival as dean in the fall of 2008.

Section II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation, Part 1. Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement: Part One (1): Section 2 - Resources
1.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development (page 9)

Toward the end of page 9 with regard to the fourth year leave and the Dean’s Fund for Excellence, the team’s paragraph should more accurately read as follows:

When possible, the school provides full time faculty with opportunities to apply for course releases in order to pursue research. Faculty and staff can apply for funding support from Dean’s Fund for Excellence for research and creative work, and over $200,000 in such funding has been provided by the Dean through the School’s resources over the last five years. Tenure-track faculty members are also eligible to apply for a fourth year research leave and every tenure-track faculty member has been awarded such a leave during their probationary period. This is a new program since the last visit, fully funded and supported by the School of Architecture’s own resources. Tenured faculty are eligible to apply for sabbatical leaves. Staff development resources include university training as well as free tuition and release time to take courses at the university. This year the Dean also implemented a staff-level Dean’s Fund for Excellence program and funded all four of the proposals that came forward for staff career development and enrichment activities.
Section II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation, Part 1. Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement: Part One (1): Section 2 – Resources

1.2.3. Physical Resources (page 14)

During the exit interview on Wednesday morning, we were informed by the Team Chair that this Condition was deemed to be unmet. They came to the conclusion that “Physical Resources are inadequate for the program.” It was the first time that either Associate Dean Wendy Redfield or I had any indication that the Team was concerned about this important issue. While we know that exit interviews are not the time for dialogue, I asked the following question of the Team Chair, with Associate Dean Redfield and Graduate Program Director Doug Harmon present, and we received the answer that follows:

KS - “We have never heard about this concern before now. Your verbal report this morning makes no reference to the fact that the previous Team determined that this Condition was met. Will your report include a reference to that fact and that we have, in addition, invested over $1 million in School funds over the last five years to improve the facilities as best we can since that time?” The Team Chair’s response was, “Yes, we will include that reference.”

Obviously, I was interested in making sure that there would not be an inadvertent omission, because I felt it was important for the Board to understand how perplexing this conclusion was to me, the entire School community, and the Provost. I was pleased and relieved to have two witnesses to this exchange along with the team itself.

From a brief segment in the last report under a heading of “Challenges and Opportunities” (page 3 of the 2008 VTR):

Facilities and Equipment: while there are adequate facilities for the current program it is clear that there is an opportunity to significantly improve the space and equipment provided for the workshop, media, digital technology, and faculty offices. Given the extensive community outreach and redevelopment efforts of the school, an off campus center located within the community should be established.

This is precisely what we have done over the last five years with major investments in Richardson Memorial Hall alone. In addition we have developed a new 7,000 sf facility of our own in a disadvantaged neighborhood of New Orleans for students, faculty, and the Tulane City Center (*see attachment for a relevant section of the APR for reference at the end of this letter).

The segment under 1.2.3. Physical Resources, should have read in part as follows:

The 2008 VTR mentions, “The visiting team understands and is concerned that there are critical capital improvements and deferred maintenance actions that have not yet been completed and should be initiated to ensure the continued educational function of the building.” It also indicated that the Condition was met at that time. Under a commentary on Challenges and Opportunities, they indicated:

“While there are adequate facilities for the current program it is clear that there is an opportunity to significantly improved the space and equipment provided for the workshop, media, digital technology, and faculty offices. Given the extensive community outreach and redevelopment efforts of the school, an off campus center located within the community should be established.”

Since 2008, the school has invested around $1 million in a number of building improvements. A new off-campus facility for the Tulane City Center is currently under construction and will be ready for occupancy by July 2014 (cost of this is not included in the $1 million that has been invested in Richardson Memorial Hall). A full renovation of Richardson Memorial Hall is in Design Development with a nationally prominent team of architects, engineers and preservationists, has been designated as a university priority, and has already become a successful centerpiece of the Capital Campaign for
Tulane School of Architecture. The professional services are already fully funded and underway. Nearly $5 million has been raised even before the public launch of the Capital Campaign. However, there appears to be further need for maintenance and improvements to address important comfort and equity issues.

Section II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation, Part 1. Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement: Part I: Section 3 – Reports

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials (page 14)

We would suggest a minor, yet important clarification to the text on page 14 to accurately illustrate the issue of licensure among the faculty. While the statement "...the majority of faculty members are licensed architects" is accurate, it would be better to cite the statistics; these were provided in the APR and discussed several times with the Team. It is unclear to us why the Team downplayed this ("majority" could be 51% yet we are substantially higher than that, with a strong emphasis on this important issue). We are proud of the high percentage of full time faculty who are licensed (almost all of those who are not licensed are in fields that do not involve licensure like Preservation and Architectural History/Theory). The revised section could read as follows:

The faculty exhibit demonstrated a suitable range of knowledge and experience, as well as development and achievement since the 2008 NAAB visit. Most faculty members have masters or doctoral credentials and 17 of 24 full time faculty members are licensed architects (71%) with approximately the same percentage for adjunct faculty as well. This is roughly twice the national average among schools of architecture. It is clear that the program places a high value on licensure. The faculty have diverse backgrounds and have been educated at universities across the U.S. and abroad. They are involved in a wide range of practice, research, scholarship, and creative work. Each faculty member’s knowledge, expertise, and experience are principal factors in determining teaching assignments to promote student achievement.

Section II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation, Part 2. Educational Outcomes and Curriculum: Part II: Section 1 – Student Performance – Educational Realms & Student Performance Criteria

II.1.1.B.5 Life Safety (Page 19)

With regard to the text on page 19, reference to DSGN 5100 and 5200 is inappropriate. The Team criticizes Option Studios and Thesis for not meeting the Life Safety criterion, but our curriculum is structured in a way that does not call upon these studios to do so (these studios are not included on the matrix as a result for B.5). In other words, it is inaccurate to assess us on the issue in these two studios, where compliance with this one criterion is not expected of all students (e.g., there are a few theses and option studios that are dealing with completely different issues than normative buildings, or they are experimenting with issues that do not involve current codes at all). This criterion is covered elsewhere in our studio sequence and curriculum.

We are sorry that the Team Chair did not afford us the opportunity to address this criterion, or the two sub-criteria within Comprehensive Design for that matter. Had we been given the opportunity to pull additional student projects, we could have provided evidence from the studios that do address these criteria. These issues are indeed seriously pursued and demonstrated in examples of student outcomes beyond the limited space afforded in the Team Room. We only learned that there was any concern at 2:30 PM on Tuesday afternoon when the Team Chair called Associate Dean Redfield and the Comprehensive Design faculty up to the Team Room so she could explain why they had decided to designate these two criteria as Unmet. The Comprehensive Studio teaching team, when called to the Team Room, explained that the seemingly unenclosed second fire stairs that were pointed out as a life safety problem in some projects were designed as "shutterable" fire stairs. Evidence was provided to the Team that this topic had been discussed in detail by faculty and students, with specifications and technical drawings that were circulated to students via email and discussed in lectures, as well as on-
campus visits to actual buildings that implemented this approach to egress. This information was in the Team Room. While these unenclosed second stairs were not labeled as "shuttered" or "shutterable" on the final presentation drawings themselves, the various modes of evidence in the Team Room and back-up information provided to the Team (the work products of the students themselves) evidenced the knowledge, intent, and serious engagement of life safety issues that were addressed in the studio. These were completely code compliant means of egress, and the students understood very well how that compliance was achieved as a fundamental part of their instruction. It is also important to note that all faculty teaching in this third year studio and the associated courses are licensed architects with active practices, including one faculty member who has done this kind of fire stair on several of his projects in New Orleans.

We would have appreciated the chance to demonstrate this important aspect of the larger context of studio teaching and this criterion in particular. Standard visit protocol involves notifying the program about any concerns with respect to criteria or conditions before the end of a visit, and it is standard to ask the program director to identify additional evidence from student work to support a more thorough understanding. Frequently, criteria that seem to be missing or ones that provoke some questions can gain additional clarity with examples provided to the Team from the extensive collection that a school prepares in advance of the visit. In this instance, we were informed that we were not permitted to bring any additional evidence, and the real purpose of the meeting with the Team Chair (not even the full team) involved her desire to explain why the criteria were deemed to be unmet.

In trying to think how some language could be added to the commentary, I came up with the following suggestion for consideration:

**2014 Team Assessment:** DSGN 3200 Comprehensive Studio projects demonstrated attention to life safety issues and included egress diagrams that demonstrated understanding of egress principles, but some of the projects displayed in the team room included errors or failed to resolve the entire emergency egress pathway at the ability level. At the same time, there was evidence that these issues were addressed in terms of acceptable techniques of managing exterior stairways as acceptable means of egress (using "shutterable" systems which were studied in detail and visited on site in several New Orleans locations that have used these). These should have been labeled on the drawings in the cases where students elected to utilize this acceptable egress technique.

**Summary**

We understand that the Visiting Team, and especially the Team Chair, have the prerogative and responsibility to exercise their judgment "on the ground" during a visit. In my experience of over 20 visits, with five or six as an academic administrator or regular faculty member and the rest as a member of NAAB teams, I have appreciated the normally collegial nature of this enterprise, and I respect the process.

I appreciate the opportunity to balance the Visiting Team Report with the issues outlined in the previous four pages. I am also providing a few pages of notes taken from the Architectural Program Report that help to contextualize the Facilities issues, some of which seem to have been overlooked by the Team.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kenneth Schwartz, FAIA
Favrot Professor and Dean

cc. Associate Dean Wendy Redfield AIA
Provost Michael Bernstein
*For reference, I am providing a section of the APR on these topics

Description of selected improvements to Richardson Memorial Hall since 2008:
- Major improvements to Lecture Room 204 (new digital systems, white board, lighting, HVAC)
- Major improvements to Classroom 305 (same as above)
- Transformation of Room 206 into a new classroom and conference room for student use
- Improvements to most faculty offices
- Extensive resources added to the Digital Output Lab (see under digital technologies)
- Continued attention to tools, safety and other resources supporting the Woodshop
- Implementing a studio desk replacement plan (starting on fifth floor)
- New carpet throughout public areas and many classrooms
- Replaced carpet with tile for all offices on the ground floor
- New furnishings in Lobby and elsewhere to promote informal student interaction and use
- Added an in-town office and workspace for the Tulane City Center on OC Haley Boulevard
- Implemented a new CNC operation (see digital technologies)
- Added Kitchen / Faculty Operations Center
- ADA ramp upgrade at first floor side entry
- Security card swiping installed at all points of entry
- New ventilation engineered and installed at the Digital Output Lab
- Model photography niche installed
- Exhibit space on stair mezzanine created; lighting installed
- Installation of new white boards building wide
- Pin-up space expanded

Expanded role of the wood / metal shop since 2008
- All graduate and undergraduate students are given a shop tutorial on technique and safety
- All entering graduate and undergraduate students take an intensive workworking
- This seminar includes model-making given by a professional architectural model fabricator
- Expanded shop hours with additional staff workers employed
- Summer access increased to complement summer studio pedagogy
- More shop and fabrication-focused electives offered

Improvements to the wood / metal shop since 2008
- 20’ shipping container purchased to accommodate additional outdoor tool and material storage for URBANbuild and Tulane City Center construction sites around the city of New Orleans
- A “Tool Pool” fund established to purchase tooling that is shared between the shop, TCC, URBANbuild, and the CNC shop
- CNC machine purchased and satellite facility created
- Dust collection system installed
- Additional stationary 12”disc/6” belt sander purchased
- 12” combination brake/roller/shear purchased
- Existing equipment annually replaced, upgraded and collection broadened
- “Safety Shop Manual” written. Hard copies printed and posted online on TSA and OEHS sites
- Eyewash station plumbed; PPD cabinet installed per OEHS
- First aid kits mounted in all studios and routinely restocked

Description of the computer resources available institution-wide to students and faculty

- In the last four years Tulane School of Architecture has dramatically increased its digital footprint and its information technology offerings to the community. Throughout the school we have multimedia Digital Classrooms that enhance the learning experience for our students. We have installed large format TV monitors in most areas that are used for Reviews, allowing the students to produce more interactive presentations of their work.

September 2013
Computer Access
• Public access to computers has increased from 26 stations to 46, and now each studio is equipped with 4 high-end workstations and a printer. Software packages installed in public computers have the latest versions of Adobe and Autodesk suites, as well as latest version of Rhino, MS office to mention a few.
• Lab computers are new for 2013 and host 32GB of RAM and i7 Processor, while the studio computers have 16GB of Ram and i7 Processors.

Networking
• ATSA is equipped with the latest Wireless N technology to improve both throughput and range.
• Students have fast wireless access from their studio desks to connect to shared resources such as the file server. Speed of the wireless system was upgraded by more than 8 times in the past several years.

Digital Output
• Output capacity has increased in the computer lab with a high-end multifunction scanner and printer that can now handle 46 Pages per minute (opposed to 32 PPM previously). We have increased the number of plotters to 3, tripled the laser cutting capacity, and added a wide format scanner able to handle large plans, a handheld 3D scanner, and a 3D printer available for faculty and students.
• Improvements have been made in the managing of the digital output service including better communication with faculty about deadline times and also software queues that allow students to submit work and track their position in the queue.

File Storage
• TSA has doubled the File Server storage available for faculty and students to 2 Terabytes. This File server is available to faculty and students both on and off campus.

Identification of any significant problems that impact the operation or services:
• During the past few years we have been challenged by increasing demand for more public computers and for more digital output. We have increased capacity to satisfy both of these demands.