Visiting Team Report

Judson University
Department of Architecture &
Interior Design

M.Arch.

Visit Dates: April 6-8, 2022

NAAB

National
Architectural
Accrediting
Board, Inc.

Visiting Team Report (VTR)

2020 Conditions for Accreditation
2020 Procedures for Accreditation

To be completed by NAAB Staff:

Institution	**Judson University**
Name of Academic Unit	School of Architecture & Interior Design

Degree(s) *(check all that apply)*
 	
Track(s) *(Please include all tracks offered by the program under the respective degree, including total number of credits. Examples:*
 	
150 semester undergraduate credit hours
 	
Undergraduate degree with architecture major + 60 graduate semester credit hours
 	
Undergraduate degree with non-architecture major + 90 graduate semester credit hours)
	☐ Bachelor of Architecture
	
	   Track:
	
	☒ Master of Architecture
	
	   Bachelor of Arts degree with architecture major + 42 graduate credits
	
	☐ Doctor of Architecture
	
	   Track:
	
	   Track:

Application for Accreditation	**Continuing Accreditation**
Year of Previous Visit	2013
Current Term of Accreditation *(refer to most recent decision letter)*	Continuing Accreditation (Eight-Year Term)
Program Administrator	Professor Christopher Lauriat, AIA, Assistant Department Chair
Chief Administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located *(e.g., dean or department chair)*	Dr. Edgardo Perez-Maldonado, Assoc. AIA
Chief Academic Officer of the Institution	Dr. Gillian Stewart-Wells, Provost & VP of Academic Affairs
President of the Institution	Dr. Gene C. Crume

I. **Summary of Visit**
  a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The NAAB visiting team would like to thank Judson University's Department of Architecture and Interior Design for its assistance and hospitality during our virtual accreditation visit. In particular, we want to recognize the efforts of department chair Dr. Edgardo Perez-Maldonado for being extremely helpful in leading the department's preparation and organization for the team visit. We would also like to recognize and thank assistant chair Christopher Lauriat, especially in the preparation of the Architecture Program Report and the creation of the virtual team room. A special note of thanks should be given to Cyndi Zariss for her continuing support to the program and in preparation for the visit. The team appreciated the thoughtful discussions we had with students, faculty, staff, administration, alumni, and professional architects throughout our visit.

Some unique characteristics of the program that stood out to the NAAB team during the visit include the small and intimate nature of the program and its community of collaboration, the commitment to a Christ-centered worldview in its approach to architectural education, and the preceptorship requirement that prepares students to enter the professional world of architecture. We add some observations on each of these items below.

In our meetings, we heard that faculty and students alike are drawn to the size of the program. There is a strong sense of community, where students feel that they really matter. In many cases the team heard that students chose Judson because they knew they would not be "just a number." The faculty, staff, and administrators are drawn to the program because of the opportunities to work closely with students and mentor them throughout their education. They are committed to the students, in both their professional and personal growth. The students commented on the open and collaborative nature of their studio spaces, which fosters cross-pollination in the program, from the first year through to the graduate program. Students seem deeply invested in each other's success. The team also found a deep respect between the faculty, staff, and administration.

The program's faith mission embraces the three legs of sustainability – social, economic, and environmental. The study tour and community-based studios encourage students to understand the role of the architect as designing for others, rather than for themselves. The program treats stewardship of the natural environment as a fundamental ethical principle and is woven throughout the curriculum. The program's home, the Harm A. Weber Academic Center, with its LEED Gold certification, serves as a model to the students, and sends a powerful message about the program's values. The facility is an incredible resource to the university, but it was noted during the visit that continued investments are required so that it can continue to perform at its best.

The team heard from many voices about the importance of the preceptorship requirement. Students commented on the requirement as a compelling reason to attend Judson. Alumni and practitioners noted how the preceptorship grounds the program in practice and prepares students to think holistically about the built environment. Practitioners who hire students in the preceptorship program find Judson students to be hard-working, professional, and eager to learn. They commented on their community spirit and resilience and emphasized the ways in which the preceptorship prepares students to enter the working world as highly confident professionals. Faculty credit the preceptorship with bringing a sense of maturity and intentionality to the graduate program. Alumni who completed the preceptorship commented on the positive impact it had on their own graduate experiences, allowing them to see the larger world of the architecture profession through the lens of their classmates' experiences.

The program is positioned to move to a new stage in its evolution. New leadership and recent faculty hires have brought a note of excitement and anticipation. In addition, there is great trust in the university administration and a sense that the institutional leadership supports and values the program. In our meetings, we saw a desire to provide stability to the program – growing the

faculty ranks, increasing financial support, and providing services to support students. In a small program, faculty departures and reductions in funding can have a significant impact. Over the last five years, faculty have taken on additional teaching and service duties, but clearly remain committed to the program and its students. There seems to be strong support for the faculty at both the departmental and institutional level.

The faculty and staff embrace the mission of the program and the university and are deeply committed to their students. With a focus on whole-person education, they serve as true mentors to the students, guiding them to become leaders in their communities. The faculty commended the university for its emphasis on diversity and inclusion, as well as its focus on affordability and expanding access to the profession.

The students feel supported by their faculty and feel a real sense of connection to the university. They value the preceptorship experience and enjoy the connections the program provides to the practicing community, from faculty who maintain their own practices to the opportunities for internships and preceptorship positions. They appreciate and value the supportive faculty, who are flexible and receptive to feedback.

Faculty, students, and staff are proud of the community they have created and take great pride in the program and its facilities. The closeness and intimacy of the program is apparent, Together, they celebrate their successes, but also deeply mourn their losses. Recent challenges, including COVID and the accidental death of two of their own students, have brought the community even closer together.

Throughout our visit, it was quite clear that the students are at the center of the program.

b.   Conditions Not Achieved (list number and title)

SC.1   Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment

SC.6   Building Integration

5.7   Financial Resources

II.   **Progress Since the Previous Site Visit**

2009 Student Performance Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2013): Ability to make technically clear drawings and prepare models illustrating components for building design is demonstrated in 452 Integrative Architecture Design Studies II and 322 Advanced Construction Tectonics and Assemblies. While the components were available to understand writing outline specifications, the team did not see ability to write and author outline specifications demonstrated.

Team Assessment: SPC A.4 Technical Documentation has been eliminated from the current 2020 Conditions, although SC.4 Technical Knowledge requires that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction. This criterion is now **Met**.

2009 Student Performance Criterion B.4 Site Design: *Ability* to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.

Previous Team Report (2013): Introduction and teaching of site design is partially evident in the ARC 451/452 Integrative Design Studios. Ability in the integration of site design and its influence on the design evolution of a project is absent in the low pass work.

Team Assessment: PC B.4 Site Design has been eliminated from the current 2020 Conditions, although elements of site design are incorporated into PC.2 Design, SC.3 Regulatory Context, and SC.5 Design Synthesis. This criterion is now **Met**.

2009 Student Performance Criterion 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.4. Technical Documentation	*B.3. Sustainability*
A.5. Investigative Skills	*B.4. Site Design*
A.8. Ordering Systems	*B.7. Environmental Systems*
A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture	*B.9.Structural Systems*
B.5. Life Safety	

Previous Team Report (2013): The team had difficulty detecting comprehensive design skills in ARC 451 where indicated by the program and instead focused our efforts in evaluating work from ARC 452 where there was more evidence. Sustainability, accessibility, and environmental systems were well integrated in the final project in ARC 452. Specifically in the low passes, the team noted weakness in integrating structural systems, historical conditions, and site design into the designs. Although the team noted strong work in the structures courses (ARC 341/441 Theories and Advanced Architectural Structures) the team found little-to-no documentation was demonstrated of horizontal or lateral structural systems within the overall building design. Additionally, the team found little to no site design information such as surrounding buildings, topography, watershed or vegetation on the site plans, perspectives, building sections, or elevations. The team noted full design integration of structures and site design in the high passes was evident.

Team Assessment: SPC B.6 Comprehensive Design has been replaced by SC.6 Building Integration in the current 2020 Conditions. This criterion remains **Not Met**.

2009 Student Performance Criterion B.7 Financial Considerations: *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting.

Previous Team Report (2013): There is no evidence of introduction or application of financial considerations at either the concept or detail level with regard to the project. In 2006 it had been incorporated into the curriculum of ARC 580 Programming and Research Methods in Architecture.

Team Assessment: SPC B.7 from the previous Conditions has been largely eliminated from the current 2020 Conditions, although SC.4 Technical Knowledge requires that the program ensure student understanding of assessing technologies against economic objectives. This criterion is now **Met**.

III.   **Program Changes**

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

Team Assessment: The program has accelerated its development of a formal assessment structure to meet the changes in the 2020 Conditions. At the time of the Virtual Site Visit, the program presented a structure that aligns NAAB criteria with the university's approach to student learning outcomes. The program will not begin reviewing the student learning outcomes until AY2022-2023. A full cycle of review is five years. One PC/SC will be reviewed in Year 1, one PC/SC in Year 2, two PC/SCs in Year 3, three PC/SCs in Year 4, and 6 PC/SC in Year 5. As a result of this calendar structure, there has not yet been a full cycle of review for any program/student criteria.

IV.   Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

[X] Described

Program Response:
The Judson University Department of Architecture and Interior Design (DAID), home to undergraduate majors in Architecture and Interior Design, as well as the graduate Master of Architecture degree program, aspires to be a global leader in design education and Christian Service. The Architecture Program provides Judson's students with a Christ-centered, comprehensive professional architecture education. The architecture program was founded in 1997, and the professional Master of Architecture degree was initially accredited in 2004 by the National Architecture Accrediting Board (NAAB). The Architecture program, both undergraduate and graduate, is now widely acknowledge for its innovative approach to architectural education, including a one-year preceptorship (internship) a program that enables our students to fully engage in professional contexts. The preceptorship program serves as a structured transition between academic studies, internship, licensure, and ongoing professional registration. Our department prepares future architects to participate in the much-needed change in our culture. The Department of Architecture and Interior Design's professional curriculum aims to develop leaders who can be responsive to the environmental and cultural changes of our greater global community.

Analysis/Review: The mission and context, as summarized above, was consistently observed during the team's virtual visit and in the evidence presented in the APR and the virtual team room.

The mission of the architecture department is closely aligned with the university mission and history and provides students with a Christ-centered comprehensive architectural education. The program focuses on demonstrating a strong faith-based worldview that explores the intersection between Christianity and the architectural profession. The program shows a deep commitment to sustainability and environmental stewardship, emphasizing the ethical position that the "care of the natural world is a Christian value." The program's home, the Harm A. Weber Academic Center (HWAC) is a LEED Gold certified building and helps to reinforce this aspect of the program's mission daily.

Additionally, the program emphasizes Christian values of collective effort, service to one's community, and empathy to design for others to emphasize how architecture can support social justice and community healing. This is evidenced through the program's community design-focused studios and the annual Didier Symposium on Christ and Architecture, as well as through outreach programs and student involvement in the university's RISE program, where they can work with young adults with intellectual disabilities.

A keystone of the program is the required preceptorship, that serves as a transition between the undergraduate and graduate programs. Here, students gain professional work experience in a structured environment that provides a foundation for their graduate education. In graduate courses, these experiences inform class discussion and content and help to contextualize their own experience in the professional world.

This condition is **Described**.

2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[X] Described

Analysis/Review: The program provided a narrative response to each of the six subsections of this condition, including specific discussion for each of the components within these. This discussion follows a brief introductory paragraph that underscore's the common values of the profession shared by Judson University's architecture and interior design programs, encompassed by a liberal arts stance undergirded by a Christian worldview.

Design: The brief response here emphasizes the "foundational" role of design education in the program from the first year through completion of the degree, indicating that Judson prepares students "to be architects who design." This is based on a curriculum that furnishes students with knowledge about "art, design, and architecture with an historical, religious, and social understanding."

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: The APR references an array of courses that appear to cover many aspects of environmental stewardship and the professional responsibility that architects hold in relation to their work and the natural world and on the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: The APR offers an extensive review of each of the three categories comprising this subsection. With respect to diversity, the program appears to focus on sustaining and increasing diversity at multiple levels, even within the constraints of a relatively small program and cohort of students and faculty. Several accomplishments are listed for the past two years.

Equity: The APR outlines its response to the challenges and opportunities of ensuring equity. This includes "reasonable accommodation" for students based on a range of individual needs, as well as active participation by architecture students in the university's "RISE program," which serves as a resource for students with intellectual disabilities.

Inclusion: This subsection builds on the text under diversity and offers specific examples of the program's efforts on this front, including programs and policies in place.

Knowledge and Innovation: The APR indicates that the program has been able to augment its efforts in this area thanks to "the strategic integration of new faculty members." Technology upgrades are also flagged as providing the program a better base from which to serve student endeavors. The lecture series provides a forum for professionals in the Chicago area to share and discuss their work. Visiting lectures and similar offerings are scheduled to resume in the fall of 2022.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: The response in the APR highlights three courses relating to community outreach and architectural practice (including law, management, leadership, and ethics).

Lifelong Learning: The APR states that "The Department of Architecture insistently bridges opportunities for students and graduates to participate in continuing education programs and cites several examples and programs involved in these efforts."

This condition is **Described**.

3—Program and Student Criteria

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

3.1 Program Criteria (PC)

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

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The materials and files in the virtual team room demonstrate evidence of student understanding at the prescribed level that is assessed via ARC 462: Preceptorship Preparation; ARC 556: Architectural Practice, Leadership and Ethics; ARC 656: Architectural Practice, Law and Management. The first course prepares students for a required work experience gained by a student under expert supervision. ARC 556 describes the path to U.S. licensure and career opportunities available, with many alumni guests speaking to the students regarding their career paths. ARC 656 is a co-requisite course with a studio where student teams work directly with real clients and local architects as experts.

Supplemental experience includes an annual career fair and the required preceptorship experience. Evidence was heard in interviews with alumni and local hiring firms confirming skills and knowledge gained by students in the program, as well as endorsements of student quality and preparedness.

The program provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this PC in 2026-27 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The team found that materials and files in the virtual team room demonstrate evidence of student understanding at the prescribed level that is assessed via ARC 452: Integrative Arch Design Studies II, ARC 651: Advanced Architecture and Urbanism Studio, and ARC 652: Advanced Architecture Studio. The materials and files in the virtual team room exhibit a suite of design courses, from ARC 251 through ARC 653, that cover the breadth of knowledge architectural students must develop prior to graduation. This includes content beginning with ordering systems and concluding with complex design assignments in ARC 651 and 652 that require students to integrate a range of knowledge into a final project.

Topics that are sometimes treated as peripheral, such as building codes and cost estimating, are woven into the curriculum. The studio work is structured so that student design efforts are required to be developed on a foundation of research and analysis of site conditions, precedents, and other important

factors. Assignments in the advanced level of the design curriculum include work in the local and regional context of Judson University. Students are introduced to the practical and the theoretical throughout this curriculum, with materials such as a "Design Process Guide: An Introduction to Design Thinking" by associate professor M. Allen Frost in ARC 652 – just one example of how the faculty contribute to what appears to be a well-rounded and comprehensive design preparation.

Assessment is evidenced via clearly defined rubrics for these courses. The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this PC in 2024-25 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The materials and files in the virtual team room demonstrate evidence of student understanding that is assessed through ARC 101: Shop Stewardship, Materials, and Processes, ARC 321: Theories of Environmental Stewardship, ARC 421: Environmental Technology I, and ARC 422: Environmental Technology II. ARC 421 and ARC 422 focus on building systems and user wellness/comfort.

The assessment plan includes methods of measuring results for three of the four courses. ARC 101 introduces students to working with physical materials and processes. ARC 321, ARC 421, and ARC 422 are assessed through projects and assignments.

The Harm A. Weber Academic Center, which houses the architecture program, achieved a LEED Gold rating. This building serves as an operating demonstration of sustainability principles.

The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this PC in 2024- 25 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The materials and files in the virtual team room demonstrate evidence of student understanding at the prescribed level that is assessed via ARC 231: History of Architecture I, ARC 232:

History of Architecture II, ARC 331: History of Architecture after Industrial Revolution, and ARC 332: Architecture of Cities. The four-semester sequence begins with a chronological study of the history of architecture (western and nonwestern) from the ancient through the twentieth century. The final class in the sequence focuses on how different cultures shape urban environments.

The assessment plan includes direct measures of the results in the four classes listed above. ARC 231 and ARC 232 measure student understanding through two examinations and a paper. ARC 331 and ARC 332 measure student understanding through two examinations and a research project.

Supplemental experience includes a required study tour that provides an immersive experience in a foreign culture (Arc 381: Architecture Study Tour). The tour typically includes travel to two or more European cities. During COVID, the study tour has focused on domestic locations, but has continued as a required component in the program. The domestic tour focused on Native American cultures to broaden student perspectives. Although cancelled for one year, the program has been re-structured to ensure that all students will participate in the study tour.

The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks"; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this PC in 2022-23 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The materials and files in the virtual team room demonstrate evidence of student understanding at the prescribed level that is assessed via ARC 332: The Architecture of Cities, ARC 421: Environmental Tech III, and ARC 652: Advanced Architecture Studio.

ARC 332 exposes students to the history and physical character of cities in different parts of the world. In ARC 421 students explore the theoretical, conceptual, and practical relationships of acoustic and lighting environments, as well as passive and active heating and cooling systems. Students test characteristics and condition in existing spaces and then manipulate it in a variety of ways to determine the impact. In ARC 652, graduate students investigate design in contemporary practice including typology, tectonics, sustainability (design, materials, and systems), and context. The revised APR notes that a heliodome is available for student investigations into environmental, sustainability, and building enclosure strategies.

The assessment plan includes direct measures of the results in the three classes listed above. ARC 332 includes mid-term essay exam, research project and presentation, reading assignment summaries, and final exam. ARC 421 includes four projects, three topic-specific tests, and a final exam. ARC 422 includes homework exercises, two tests, and one final exam. ARC 652 assesses through research and discovery and design development exercises, and a final design presentation.

The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the

program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this PC in 2024-25 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The materials and files in the virtual team room demonstrate evidence of student understanding at the prescribed level that is assessed via ARC 451: Integrative Architecture Design Studies I, ARC 580: Programming & Research Methods, and ARC 575: Community Outreach Studio. In particular, ARC 575 highlights learning and experience via leadership and collaboration; the students have real world clients and stakeholders with a real site and problem and must coordinate together in teams with other students.

The assessment plan includes direct measures of the results in the classes listed above, including activities, assignments, and assessments fully articulated and scheduled in each course's syllabus.

The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this PC in 2026-27 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The program has established student learning outcomes, assessment measures, and benchmarks for this criterion. The materials and files in the virtual team room demonstrate evidence of student understanding at the prescribed level that is assessed via ARC 381: Architecture Study Tour. Faculty accompany students on a month-long sketching trip. Cultural engagement is modeled by faculty and relationships are developed between students and faculty.

Supplemental opportunities to foster and ensure a positive and respectful environment include full-time faculty serving as academic advisors, allowing them to mentor students outside the classroom. Faculty also frequently engage students in professional work or connect them with other professional opportunities.

The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabus, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the

program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this PC in 2026-27 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The materials and files in the virtual team room demonstrate evidence of student understanding at the prescribed level that is assessed via ARC 332: The Architecture of Cities, ARC 556: Architectural Practice, Leadership, and Ethics, ARC 575: Community Outreach Studio, and ARC 652: Advanced Architecture Studio. Specifically, ARC 575 engages students directly with the community in a project addressing environmental and social justice and ARC 652 encourages collaboration and the development of empathy for historically marginalized and underserved communities.

The APR addresses this condition, noting a commitment to "seek, prepare for, and support students who typically lack access to traditional college experiences" and develop diverse faculty representation. It also describes ARC 429: Multiculturalism and Architecture, a course focused on developing awareness and appreciation for the varied perspectives from diverse cultures and how it impacts the built environment.

The assessment plan includes direct measures of the results in the three classes listed above. ARC 332 utilizes a mid-term essay exam, research project and presentation, reading assignment summaries, and final exam. ARC 556 measures student understanding through four case study and reflection assignments and three quizzes. ARC 575 and 652 are studio courses that require research and development exercises, as well as a final presentation.

Supplemental experience is also provided through ARC 381: Architecture Study Tour. This 4-week study tour is intended to explore a variety of cultural contexts in Europe and North America. It includes sketching, reflection essays, and two design exercises.

The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this PC in 2026-27 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

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

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

[X] Not Met

Team Assessment: The evidence offered by the program cited six different courses, offered during successive years. While the team found evidence related to the understanding of health and safety – two of the categories included in this condition – satisfactory evidence with respect to the third category,

human welfare, was found only in a lecture at the very beginning of the earliest course, ARC 222: Construction Tectonics. The visiting team did not find this convincingly reinforced in later courses, where doing so would allow students to relate consideration of human welfare to their studio experience. In addition, students transferring into the program may miss this critical element.

Assessment is evidenced via clearly defined rubrics for these courses. The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this SC in 2022-23 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

As summarized above, and notwithstanding this documentation and plan for assessment, the visiting team finds that this condition is **Not Met.**

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The materials and files in the virtual team room demonstrate evidence of student understanding at the prescribed level that is assessed via ARC 462: Preceptorship Preparation, ARC 556: Architectural Practice, Leadership and Ethics, and ARC 656: Architectural Practice, Law and Management. ARC 462 prepares students for internship exploring the history of practice, contemporary practice, and strategies for professional development. ARC 556 is a survey of the professional practice of architecture with discussion of ethics and professional conduct. ARC 656 extends this content into the areas of law, ethics, registration, marketing, regulation, finance, project delivery, contracts, and client relations.

The assessment plan includes direct measures of the results in the three classes listed above. ARC 556 measures student understanding through four case study and reflection assignments and three quizzes. ARC 656 measures student understanding through four written assignments and four quizzes.

Supplemental experience is also provided through a preceptorship program, which requires each student to complete a minimum of 1,600 hours of work in professional firms upon completion of the undergraduate degree to qualify for admission to the graduate program.

The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this SC in 2026-27 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

SC.3 Regulatory Context—How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the

United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The program has established student learning outcomes, assessment measures, and benchmarks for this criterion. The materials and files in the virtual team room demonstrate evidence of student understanding at the prescribed level that is assessed via ARC 656: Architectural Practice, Law and Management. In this course, faculty lectures, guest lectures, site visits, and local architecture firm visits are all designed to correlate with the required reading from the reference, *Architects Handbook of Professional Practice,* found in the syllabus. Additional evidence of analysis of the regulatory context is shown in studio work, where designs incorporate an awareness of these regulations in the final presentation drawings submitted.

The assessment plan includes direct measures of the results in the class listed above, including activities, assignments, and assessments fully articulated and scheduled in the course syllabus.

The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabus, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this SC in 2026-27 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The APR lists and describes a series of eight (8) courses that form the basis for a solid foundation in technical knowledge. These courses take the student from a very beginning introduction to the technical knowledge required for the practice of architecture. Technical topics are also integrated with background in codes and standards, specifications, area calculations, and other topics. This approach encourages students to see the array of technical issues woven together instead of treated as separate, stand-alone areas of knowledge.

As the student progresses through the technical series, courses offer more in-depth study. ARC 421: Environmental Technology II covers acoustics and lighting, while ARC 422: Environmental Technology III addresses life safety, smoke, and fire suppression. ARC 441: Advanced Architectural Systems then rounds out the scope of study of required technical architectural knowledge.

The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this SC in 2024-25 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Although student work in other studio courses was included in the folders in the virtual team room, the visiting team focused on the work in the three upper-level studios (third year and beyond) cited in the APR. These are ARC 351: Intermediate Architectural Design Studies, ARC 451: Integrative Architecture Design Studies, and ARC 452: Integrative Architecture Design Studies II. The team concluded that the student work applicable to a comprehensive evaluation of this student criterion was found in ARC 451, and that this was the only course in which an adequate (required) number of students were represented. Work in ARC 351 and ARC 452 touched on abilities demonstrated in some of the required areas, but there was not an adequate representation of students included in the work for these courses.

The work in ARC 451 is focused on the development of a design for a performing arts facility in an urban setting in Chicago. Students initially studied precedents, site context, regulatory requirements, and environmental system opportunities and analysis, and then followed diagram and design studies with a final design and presentation material. Preliminary studio work also included consideration of historical and social context. While the visiting team, in review of this work, noted a range of accomplishment within the sample of students included, all work indicated an appropriate level of ability as described for this NAAB condition.

The team concluded that the sub criterion for "consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions" was found in the link between the study and analysis in the early stage of this class and the designs, including representative system drawings (such as structural, lighting, and acoustical plans and sections) in the final presentations.

The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this SC in 2024-25 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

This condition is **Met**.

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

[X] Not Met

Team Assessment: The courses identified by the program for satisfaction of this condition overlap with those cited for SC.5 Design Synthesis. These included ARC 451: Integrative Architecture Design Studies I and ARC 452: Integrative Architecture Design Studies II. The program links and coordinates these studios with ARC 421: Environmental Technology II and ARC 422: Environmental Technology III. Arch

451 was also noted in the APR "in service of deliverables covering mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems."

As with the visiting team's review of SC.5, we found that the folders in the virtual team room for ARC 451 met the threshold for the number of students whose work could be evaluated in accordance with NAAB requirements. The team reviewed all student work provided but concluded that only the work in ARC 451 was applicable for a comprehensive evaluation. The content and assignments from this studio are described in the section above on SC.5.

The team found evidence that students had developed ability with respect to the integration of the first four sub criteria for this NAAB condition (building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, and life safety systems). However, the team did not find sufficient or consistent evidence that the final element of this condition, integration of "the measurable outcomes of building performance," had been achieved or demonstrated across the student work represented in the virtual team room.

Assessment is evidenced via clearly defined rubrics for these courses. The program has provided, in the virtual team room, the course syllabi, instruction materials, schedule, and assessment information required by the NAAB. Benchmarks were provided in the "Proposed Assessment Benchmarks" document; these will continue to see revision as the scheduled date for assessment nears. During the time of the visit, an addendum to 5.2 Planning and Assessment was provided and further clarified in discussions with program administrators.

The program has in place an assessment plan that describes a regular mechanism to collect data, analyze results, and identify actionable insights for continuous improvement. At the time of the visit, the program had not collected data for any of the assessment measures. The program is scheduled to first assess this SC in 2024- 25 and will follow the process described in Section 5.3 of the APR.

As summarized above, and notwithstanding this documentation and plan for assessment, this condition is **Not Met**.

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

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

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Judson received its required letter of accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), which is included in the APR (dated 12/15/2017). This letter shows the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) affirmed a 10-year accreditation, with interim monitoring of finances for 2018-19.

Additional documentation was provided that described the requirement for further interim monitoring regarding enrollment, finances, loans, and credit lines (letters dated 5/08/2020 and 9/03/2021).

This condition is **Met**.

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

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

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

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

document the criteria and process used to ensure that the general education requirement was covered at another institution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Judson University's professional program is a pre-professional degree plus the Master of Architecture (M.Arch.). The documentation of the criteria and curriculum meet the NAAB requirements and is provided in the revised APR. From material provided in the Judson University Catalog, the program requires 175-180 credit hours (133-138 undergraduate credits, plus 42 graduate credits hours). This exceeds the NAAB minimum requirement of 168 credit hours, as well as the minimum requirement of 30 graduate credit hours.

The program provided additional documentation clarifying the distribution of required professional courses (113 cr. hrs.), elective professional courses (12 cr. hrs.), general studies (40-42 cr. hrs.), and optional studies (10-13 cr. hrs.). The institutional accreditor requires 30 credit hours of general education coursework.

While the APR provided inconsistent information, the curricula for the pre-professional and professional programs are located on the program's website and are publicly available. The M.Arch. degree title is used appropriately.

This condition is **Met**.

4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education

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

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

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

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The program has provided a detailed and well-described description of how incoming students transferring to Judson University in the professional degree program are evaluated for satisfaction of any NAAB accreditation criteria. Program administrators, during the visit, provided an account that paralleled and reinforced the narrative in the APR. The visiting team had the opportunity to review the application files for three transfer students, each from a different preparatory background. Appropriately, a transfer student without any architectural background, is placed as a first-year student.

Incoming students are evaluated based on a transcript of previous college work as well as through an interview with the assistant chair of the Architecture Department. The assistant chair then completes an assessment worksheet to the admission representative for the program, following which additional discussion with the assistant chair may take place. The review (as indicated in the APR) considers: "(1) compatibility with course content for course substitution and (2) compatibility with the NAAB's Student Performance Criteria." A copy of the evaluation form is included in the APR.

Key courses, such as ARC 452: Integrative Architecture Design Studies II and ARC 422: Environmental Technology III, must be taken by all students, and therefore no advanced standing is granted with respect to these classes.

This condition is **Met**.

5—Resources

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

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

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

[X] Described

Team Assessment: The program provided a detailed description of the administrative structure and governance in the APR. Judson University's affiliation with the American Baptist Churches USA and its faith-based mission is noted throughout the document. The university governance structure includes three schools in two divisions – the Division of Education and the Division of Professional Studies – with the School of Art, Design and Architecture (SoADA) as a department. Key personnel at the University and department level are identified. During visit interviews, it was noted that the department is now named the Department of Architecture and Interior Design (DAID).

The APR also notes that the architecture program is an autonomous "flagship program." This was reiterated in visit interviews. The role of the faculty in the governance structures is outlined noting committees, task forces, monthly assemblies, and policy voting. The limited program staff is also described. Student participation is described, including student organizations such as AIAS and Tau Sigma Delta, monthly Major's Meetings, and a variety of fora to elicit feedback. The small size of the program enables students and faculty to mix regularly, encouraging communication and shared problem solving.

This condition is **Described**.

5.2 Planning and Assessment
The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies:

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

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

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

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

> 5.2.5 Ongoing outside input from others, including practitioners.

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

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The revised APR, as well as additional materials in the virtual team room, demonstrate the program's planning process for continuous improvement.

The Department of Architecture and Interior Design developed a Strategic Plan in for 2020-2025, which was subsequently updated in January 2021. In May 2021, the university completed a Strategic Plan for 2021-2025. Beginning in fall 2021, all programs on campus began developing Actions Items for their units in response to the University Strategic Plan. The complete list of Action Items is to be complete at the end of Spring 2022. As the document is in its development phase, the program has not begun implementation

of its Action Items. The strategic objectives are evaluated through faculty meetings, curricular reviews, and Major's Meetings.

Working with the university's office of Institutional Research and Development, the program has developed a self-assessment structure for the program. To assist in this work, the department established a Curricular Revision Committee (CRC). Curriculum and course-level assessment is based on seven university-wide Student Learning Outcomes (SLO), to which the NAAB criteria are mapped. The next curricular revision session is scheduled for May 2022.

The program presented a calendar for the frequency of assessment. In Year 1, two SLOs are reviewed (which only contain one NAAB PC). In Year 2, one SLO is reviewed (containing only one NAAB PC). In Year 3, one SLO is reviewed (containing two NAAB PCs). In Year 4, one SLO is reviewed (containing three NAAB SCs). In Year 5, two SLOs are reviewed (containing six NAAB PC/SCs). It should be noted that nearly 50% of the NAAB criteria are scheduled to be evaluated in the in the final year of a five-year cycle and may not provide adequate time to correct deficiencies in a manner that aligns with the NAAB accreditation timeline and requirements.

This condition is **Demonstrated**.

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

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

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

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: While the APR indicates that the program has "experimented with numerous forms of shared governance," the APR does describe a continuous process of curriculum development that has been managed at times by the faculty as a whole and via committee. Students have also been involved in curriculum adjustments. Curricular development has included mapping of the courses into four major focus areas. The faculty propose adjustments suggested by the NAAB accreditation process and the NAAB Conditions, including curriculum evolution parallel to the 2013 and 2020 NAAB Procedures and Conditions. The APR also indicates that a comprehensive curriculum review is planned for 2022-2023, with initial work to be done by a task force that includes faculty and the department chair. Ultimately, changes in the curriculum are approved by the respective university curriculum committees responsible for undergraduate and graduate academic policy. Final curriculum approval is sought from the Faculty Assembly of the university.

This condition is **Demonstrated**.

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

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

5.4.2   Demonstrate that it has an Architect Licensing Advisor who is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. These duties include attending the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay up-to-date on the

requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.

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

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

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: Evidence of appropriate and adequately funded human resources can be found in the APR, material provided in the virtual team room, material publicly available on the program's website, and from interviews during the team visit.

5.4.1: Faculty workloads are balanced by two tracks: "Professional" or "Tenured" for nine months with benefits, with duties varying by track. An "Overload Contract" occurs when teaching over 18 credits in a year – most often in summer. Sabbatical is offered every seven years and further time off for overloaded semesters can be requested on a case-by-case basis.

5.4.2: Professor Sean Gallagher is the program's Architect Licensing Advisor (ALA). He provides lectures on the process for licensure. Students are required to enroll in the Architect Experience Program (AXP) prior to the start of their preceptorship. NCARB leadership speaks to students on the process of licensure – accomplished jointly with the AIAS leadership.

5.4.3: The university administration has demonstrated a commitment to the program. During the visit, meeting participants indicate that this is largely through supporting faculty needs, with a focus on faculty development. During the visit, faculty noted the administration's commitment to hire new full-time faculty to support the program and a flexibility regarding scholarship/service loads for existing faculty in recognition of their increased teaching and service loads within the department.

5.4.4: Judson's small scale helps to meet the needs of student mental well-being. Students are often referred to as "being known" by faculty and staff. Examples of class syllabi and schedules describe time for reflection at the beginning of class and times of sharing with the class. Students are further supported through connecting with faculty in the common dining and required chapel. A Wellness Center supports students across the university. Students are supported in internship and job placement.

This condition is **Demonstrated**.

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
The program must demonstrate its commitment to diversity and inclusion among current and prospective faculty, staff, and students. The program must:

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

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

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

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

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

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The APR outlines the university diversity plan that focuses on recruitment, retention, and accountability. Also noted in the APR, is the university's RISE program, which seeks to provide students with disabilities a tailored education on a path to independence, as well as inclusion in the university experience.

In the additional documents provided in the visiting team room, student and faculty demographics are provided for both the university and program. There is racial and gender diversity at both levels in the student body. Similar diversity is not present among the faculty. The program developed and articulated goals based on the 2020-2025 Strategic Plan to increase and sustain diversity in their program, for both students and faculty. As part of this goal, the program has recently hired four faculty members, including the chair, who identify as Latin American/Hispanic. The gender diversity of the faculty is limited to 12% female, with only one female full-time faculty member. In interviews, it was noted that since the last accreditation visit there was a departure of several female faculty, and that gender and ethnic diversity\ have been an intentional part of the recruiting strategy since.

The APR and additional materials in the virtual team room outline strategies to "yield a higher number of students from underrepresented communities." The university is working to identify ways to better engage changing student demographics.

The APR provides a link to the university diversity and non-discrimination policies provided on the university website. It also expresses commitment to the values behind these policies, not just the rules.

It is noted that the university has made some ADA accommodations on buildings where readily achievable. New facilities are built to current accessibility code requirements. Some existing buildings have not yet been updated and therefore that have limited access. It is noted that instructors "strive to make reasonable accommodations" to student needs and course syllabi outline accommodation procedures that may be requested by the student.

This condition is **Demonstrated**.

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

5.6.1   Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.

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

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

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

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

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The physical resources are illustrated in plans and descriptions in the APR. A common first-year art and design studio is centrally located on the first floor. Architecture studio spaces are contiguous spaces for the second year, third year, fourth year, and graduate studios, which encourages interaction among classes. The building has capacity for future growth in both the

undergraduate and graduate programs. During interviews, it was clear that the university values and invested in the architecture program with the construction of the Harm A. Weber Academic Center (HAWAC) building in 2007 and its LEED Gold certification. During the Virtual Site Visit, participants commented on the need for repairs and ongoing maintenance for the building to function properly, as well as prevent acoustical distractions in the classrooms and studio spaces.

Based on the material provided in the APR and interviews during the visit, the program has demonstrated that facilities support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, faculty roles, and a variety of learning formats through multipurpose classrooms, seminar spaces, a gallery, and pin up locations. There are digital media labs and a wood shop for student and faculty use. The LEED Gold building is used as a living lesson and example of sustainable design.

In interviews, it was evident that the resources are appropriate and available for both faculty and students. Given the small size of the university campus, the architecture building also houses the library for the entire university. Students use the library for both the resources it contains, but also the physical space for working, meeting, and gathering.

This condition is **Demonstrated**.

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

[X] Not Demonstrated

Team Assessment: Information on financial resources was provided in the APR, through additional evidence in the virtual team room, and through discussions with university and program staff and faculty during the visit.

Judson University is a largely tuition-driven institution, with available revenues dependent on student enrollment. The Architecture Operating Budget (AOB), as presented in the revised APR, excludes full time faculty/staff wages and benefits (part-time faculty salaries are paid through the AOB). Other items outside the scope of the AOB are architecture library acquisitions and periodicals, facilities improvements, information systems and technology support, the wood shop, and the Visual Resources Collection (VRC).

Although the revised APR indicates that the architecture and interior design programs "remain the most substantially supported academic programs" at the university, the visiting team observed in meetings and through review of additional material, that the program is asked to operate on a very tight budget.

As indicated in the revised APR (p. 78), the operating budget since the time of the last accreditation visit (2012-13) has increased only 2.5%, after having seen more substantial increases in 2017-18 and 2018-19). These fluctuations are largely due to changes in graduate student enrollment, which is currently at eight students (compared to 18 in 2018-19). As a tuition-driven institution, maintaining consistent graduate student enrollment is important to the financial well-being of the program.

Throughout the visit, meeting participants noted reductions in the budgetary allocation provided by the university in recent years. These reductions have impacted the program's ability to expand its offerings to students.

In addition to the operating budget provided by the university, the program's funding is supplemented by an Architecture Program Fee (APF) assessed to students in the amount of $950 per semester, from the sophomore year through the remainder of the program [students in ARC 122 pay a fee of $650]. The APF is used for the purchase of materials in bulk, offset fieldtrip costs, and purchase and maintain equipment.

Through relationships with alumni, professional practices, and advisors, the program has developed a sponsorship model to complement the allocated budget. Through this model, firms provide sponsorship of the program's Community-Driven Architecture and Design Studios held in different cities each year. Additionally, sponsorships help to provide student fellowships in the required study tour to offset costs for student participation. Although firm sponsorships to the program are modest, giving in 2021-22 (as of March 31, 2022) has increased 34% over the 2019-2020 fiscal year. Total donations have also increased

significantly, from $17,375 in 2019 to $63,018 in 2021. The number of donors during this period has also increased (from 26 to 87).

Heavy reliance on student fees and external donations for regular operating expenses does not provide a stable base for the operation of the program.

This condition is **Not Demonstrated**.

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

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

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The program provided a thorough discussion of the Information Resources available at Judson. This includes the architectural collection within the Benjamin P. Browne Library, which is housed in the Harm A. Weber Academic Center, along with the architecture program. The architectural print collection appears to be extensive, and is reinforced by 42 electronic databases, including extensive access to architectural periodicals. Online access is available to students at all times. Acquisitions of architectural materials (books, publications, online resources) are developed from faculty input as well as library staff\ research, to keep collections up to date.

The library offers instruction in research and information literacy, both to classes on request and to students for specific assignments. Students and faculty spoke enthusiastically about the library and the effective support and instruction by the library staff as students enter the program.

Architectural students have access, having attended an orientation, to the Fab Lab, which includes a variety of fabrication equipment, including 3D printers. A model shop also supports classwork and "personal projects."

This condition is **Demonstrated**.

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

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The program has made the NAAB statement on accredited degree programs, as found in the NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*, available publicly on its website.

This condition is **Met**.

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

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

    a) *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*

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

    c) *Procedures for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The program has made the following documents publicly available on its website: 2020 Edition of the *Conditions for Accreditation*, the 2009 *Conditions for Accreditation*, the 2020 *Procedures for Accreditation,* and the 2012 *Procedures for Accreditation*.

This condition is **Met**.

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The APR describes student access to career development information. The Student Success Center (SSC) is available to the entire campus student body, including the architecture program, and provides assistance on professional goals through "personalized and structured resources." During interviews, it was noted that there are additional opportunities for professional networking throughout the year with guest critics and office tours, for those students with the initiative to pursue them.

The APR also outlines the preceptorship program that requires students to work for a minimum 1,600 hours in professional practice prior to entering the M.Arch program. The department also hosts an annual job fair and facilitates firm interviews upon request.

This condition is **Met**.

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

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

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

    c) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB

    d) The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit

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

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

    g) Plan to Correct (if applicable)

    h) NCARB ARE pass rates

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

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: By the time of the visit, the program made all the required documents available. Items c), d) and e) are available on the program website, and links (also available to the public) were provided for the other items.

This condition is **Met**.

6.5 Admissions and Advising

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

a) Application forms and instructions

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

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

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

e) Explanation of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Required evidence for admissions and advising for first year and transfer students is found in the APR and in various links on Judson University's website:

Application forms/Admission requirements: Forms and directions are on the university's website for both undergrad and graduate admission including links to the "Mid-Program-Review" requirements.

Process of evaluating non-accredited degrees: A process for evaluating transfer students is described. Preparatory education is evaluated by a committee of faculty and decisions are endorsed by the whole department.

Financial aid and scholarships: Information and forms for financial aid and a large variety of scholarships, grants, and awards can be found via links on the website.

Impact of student diversity goals on admission procedures: Student body diversity data can be found on the website, but no specific metrics are listed that show a direct impact on admission. One of Judson's goals is to "increase the recruitment, retention, and representation of people of color, ethnic minorities, women, people with disabilities...," and to "publish yearly the outcomes."

This condition is **Met**.

6.6 Student Financial Information

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

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

[X] Met

Team Assessment: The program website is transparent regarding the cost of attendance. Conversations with students and faculty confirmed access to information in accordance with 6.6.1. Faculty and staff serve as advisors to students in addition to providing information on scholarships and financial aid.

This condition is **Met**.

IV.   Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

PC.1   Career Paths
The required preceptorship provides all students with an immersive professional experience to augment their education. Practitioners find Judson students to have a strong work ethic, professionalism, and preparation to enter the working world.

Appendix 2. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator Representative
Michelle A. Rinehart, Ed.D.
Vice Provost for Faculty
Georgia Institute of Technology
A. French Building, Suite 112
Atlanta, GA 30332
404.894.4883
michelle.rinehart@gatech.edu

Practitioner Representative
Monica Wangler, AIA, LEED AP
Senior Associate | Senior Project Manager
NBBJ
250 S. High Street, Suite 300
Columbus, OH 43215
Direct: 614.232.3023
Mobile: 614.354.5984
MWangler@nbbj.com

Regulator Representative
Kin DuBois, FAIA
6070 Crestbrook Drive
Morrison, CO 80465
303.817.1884
kin.dubois@comcast.net

Student Representative
Cooper Moore, AIAS, NOMAS
2021-2022 AIAS Governance Committee
emoore43@kent.edu

Observer
Susan Touloukian
Project Coordinator, Touloukian Inc.
Boston, MA 02127
617.834.9653
stouloukian@gmail.com

V.   Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle A. Rinehart, Ed.D.
Team Chair

Monica Wangler, AIA
Team Member

Kin DuBois, FAIA
Team Member

Cooper Moore, AIAS, NOMAS
Team Member

Susan Touloukian
Observer