2023 Visiting Team Report

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
School of Architecture and Planning
Department of Architecture

M.Arch. (Undergraduate degree + 306 units*)

*MIT uses a credit unit system that documents the total hours of engagement rather than hours of instruction. The equivalent number of traditional semester credit hours would roughly amount to 114 credits, using an approximate conversion factor recommended by MIT staff.

Continuing Accreditation Visit
April 12-14, 2023

NAAB

National
Architectural
Accrediting
Board, Inc.

Contents

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The team would like to thank School of Architecture and Planning (SA+P) Dean Hashim Sarkis and the Department of Architecture for their gracious hospitality in hosting the team and preparing for the visit, and in particular Department Head Nicholas de Monchaux, M.Arch. Program Director Liam O'Brien, and Director of Undergraduate/Alumni Outreach & Career Development Paul Pettigrew for their collective effort to prepare an extensively detailed APR and digital team room. The attention and responsiveness of faculty, staff and students throughout the entire virtual visit process not only facilitated the team's work before and during the visit, but also allowed the team and program to proactively and efficiently address questions related to the Conditions for a full and constructive assessment.

In both review of the APR and discussions with stakeholders during the visit, the team observed several noteworthy aspects of the program:

- The team recognizes that the M.Arch. program and the larger School of Architecture and Planning benefit from and contribute to MIT's impact both nationally and internationally in terms of the breadth of research and knowledge generation.

- The M.Arch. program comprises roughly half of a relatively small department for a program of its caliber and is specifically studio-centric, embedded within a broader group of largely academic or research-based related disciplines. As such, it functions in many ways as the "central space" where the other components of the department communicate together. At the same time, MIT Architecture seeks to be a model for other programs — within and beyond the institute — whose students act as "bridge-builders" between design and technology, facilitated by faculty merging research with design.

- The department has made strides to establish a cooperative and shared culture among faculty, students, and staff, demonstrating a character willing to both evolve and adapt. As noted by one staff member in regard to the student body — though equally applicable to all — "they have the ability to make it their own, and they do."

- In terms of faculty development, the school places emphasis on professional mentoring and substantive support — notably eliminating 1-year contracts in favor of more secure teaching positions and the integration of research into the studio. Notably, studio professors are also given budgets that assist in both subsidizing student out-of-pocket travel expenses as well as covering specialized material costs related to course requirements.

- The school places a high priority on across-the-board student support; on average 75% of student tuition is covered, with a goal of increasing that to 80% support next year. Students in the program emphasized the importance of MIT's well-earned reputation in this regard, not only in reducing the financial burden that higher education places on emerging professionals, but also as a contributing factor to increasing student diversity.

- In addition to individual student support, the department allocates a significant budget toward student activities, including $20,000 in funding for the MIT chapter of NOMAS, used to fund both student travel to the annual NOMAS Conference as well as biweekly studio culture activities, such as lecture series and stress relief activities. The NOMAS chapter, dating back to 2015, also enjoys a direct relationship with the administration, meeting weekly with the department head to address studio issues.

- The M.Arch. curriculum provides a commendably rigorous intellectual context for today's pressing discussions of ecological responsibility and social justice. The coursework offers deep treatment of the historical, conceptual, and technical dimensions of these issues.

- The pending move of the department to new facilities in the Metropolitan Warehouse promises a considerable increase in space relative to a stable student population, while incorporating expanded maker-space and other studio space utilized by the greater institute community, including the cross-disciplinary Morningside Academy of Design — a noteworthy example of continual improvement benefiting both the program and the institute at large.

b. Conditions with a Team Recommendation to the Board as Not Achieved

Following review of the department's Architecture Program Report, an assessment of evidence in the virtual team room, and discussions with stakeholders during the virtual team visit, the team found that the program has achieved all Conditions for Continuing Accreditation.

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

<u>**2009 Conditions Not Met**</u>

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 (2015): The team found adequate evidence of students' ability to respond to urban site challenges and vegetation (Project Lechmere T stop); however, evidence was not found to support a student's ability to respond to soil, topography, and related watershed (drainage) issues.

2023 Team Analysis: The most recent IPR and NAAB response (2020) do not address SPC B.4. The 2020 Conditions do not directly map the requirements of the 2009 Condition SPC B.4 Site Design onto a comparable SC. While SC.5 Design Synthesis requirements include the ability to synthesize site conditions into design decisions, it does not require the mastery of individual site design concepts as SPC B.4 previously did. As such, this concern from the 2015 VTR is effectively moot as it is no longer explicitly required in the 2020 Conditions.

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.5. Life Safety**
	B.9.Structural Systems

Previous Team Report (2015): The team did not find evidence to support a student's ability to produce a comprehensive design that demonstrated a student's capacity to make decisions across scales addressing the following SPC:

> B.2 Accessibility
> B.4 Site Design
> B.5 Life Safety
> B.8 Environmental Systems

The team recognizes the value of the BT 1 Architectural Building Systems and BT 4 Energy courses in Building Design and Core III projects; however, it is concerned that issues remain regarding delivery sequence and evidence that clearly satisfies this criterion in a single, comprehensive project.

2020 Board IPR Review: After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent visiting team report. Specifically, the program did not provide evidence of sustainability, accessibility, and life safety at the Ability level for SPC B.6 Comprehensive Design, which was Not Met for two consecutive visits.

2023 Team Analysis: The 2020 Conditions most closely map these elements of the 2009 Condition SPC B.6 Comprehensive Design onto SC.5 Design Synthesis and SC.6 Building Integration. The team found these SC met — please see the team analysis for SC.5 and SC.6 below.

III.   Program Changes

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

2023 Team Analysis:
In addition to the general transition to the precepts of the new 2020 Conditions across the board, the department in particular looked to this transition as an opportunity to better address key aspects of building technology, sustainability, accessibility, and integrated design across the curriculum. As identified in the 2015 NAAB VTR and NAAB's response to the program's 2020 IPR, these areas became the focus of multiple "core summits" of the core studio faculty over the last two years, in addition to consideration of other program changes by the M.Arch. Curriculum Committee in response to the 2020 Conditions. This process has resulted in changes to the core studio curriculum and syllabi across multiple semesters in key courses, such as 4.153 Architecture Design Core Studio III and 4.463 Building Technology Systems: Structures and Envelopes. As noted in the APR (p. 10), the ultimate intent of this effort is to create *"a more robust curriculum, better student outcomes, and better legibility of key accreditation criteria."*

IV.   Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

1—Context and Mission (*Guidelines*, p. 5)
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).

☒ **Described**

Program Response:
Our department was founded in 1865 as part of a new institute for technical education, supporting the Industrial Revolution. As the role of technology has transformed globally so has the position of MIT, which is now preeminent in its stated mission of scientific and technological research: "to advance knowledge and educate students in science, technology, and other areas of scholarship that will best serve the nation and the world in the 21st century."

The influence of architectural education at MIT is subtle, but immense, and is reflected in MIT's larger focus on shared teaching environments, hands-on-learning, and creative problem solving in the service of cities and society. Our small and focused professional program, embedded within one of the most innovative environments on the planet, offers significant support to students from remarkably diverse

backgrounds. This allows us to provide a sensitive and rigorous professional education, but also brings with it a responsibility of using our unique position to research and expand the possibilities for our profession's future. Today, this means attention to the climate crisis, to diversity and inclusion, and the shifting role of technology in the built environment. At MIT, it also means sharing our profession's expertise and its social consequences to the frontiers that shape our surroundings—from nanomaterials to machine learning to the frontiers of biotechnology. Through these related conversations, we seek a central role for architects in shaping a just, sustainable, and accessible built environment for another 150 years - and beyond.

2023 Team Analysis:
The origins of the MIT Department of Architecture date back to one of the four original divisions of the institute, and design education has evolved over the ensuing 150+ years alongside that of the institute to stand as one of the nation's foremost centers of research and innovation. Faculty in the department bring together expertise in five interconnected discipline groups (Architecture + Urbanism; Building Technology; Computation; History, Theory, and Criticism; and the Aga Khan Program for Islamic Architecture) *"to model architecture's unique integration of diverse modes of thinking and making."* (APR, p. 12) As one department within the larger School of Architecture and Planning (SA+P), MIT Architecture leverages synergies with the Department of Urban Studies and Planning; the Media Lab and its Program in Media Arts and Sciences; the Program in Art, Culture, and Technology; the Center for Real Estate; and the Norman B. Leventhal Center for Advanced Urbanism. While focused around the classroom, workshop and studio, the larger orbit of the SA+P and the institute allow significant opportunities for students to *"collaborate across the institute's various schools, departments, and labs, and engage in cutting-edge research that both expands and transforms the discipline of architecture and its social and environmental responsibilities."* (APR, p, 14)

Both faculty and students in the department also leverage these resources in leadership within the SA+P and larger institute community. Recent endeavors such as the Morningside Academy of Design and the 2021 Venice Architecture Biennale showcase this leadership, along with such student-led initiatives — particularly during the pandemic — as WAWD? Radio, *outofframe.mit.edu*, and the publications *Imprint* and *Thresholds*. As stated in the APR (p. 15), *"[a]s a leader in combining architectural design and education with research and innovation, the Department of Architecture offers unique opportunities for its students and faculty to participate in pertinent conversations about the role of architecture and design, both within and outside the Department."*

2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession (*Guidelines*, p. 6)
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. (p.7)

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. (p.7)

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. (p.7)

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. (p.8)

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. (p.8)

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. (p.8)

☒ **Described**

2023 Team Analysis:
Although the APR describes in great detail various ways in which the program addresses specific items identified in the Shared Values, that narrative, reinforced by discussions during the VSV, makes a more convincing argument that these values are necessarily interrelated elements present in most of the department's work. As such, it is less productive to assess the department's activities and philosophies in a siloed manner in regard to the Shared Values, as opposed to noting various significant elements that highlight the integrated nature of MIT's approach.

The APR identifies architectural design as foundational to shaping our physical environment in its capacity *"to integrate multiple viewpoints … with important ethical responsibilities to people and ecologies."* (APR, p. 17) As such, the program uses design as an overarching strategy to encompass a number of other components identified in the Shared Values. Innovative thinking between the architecture and engineering departments has recently expanded on this concept, with the result being new opportunities for design education via the Morningside Academy for Design, engaging design as a tool to promote equity, resilience and life-long learning across and beyond the institute.

Other examples of the collaborative nature of the department's design, research, and outreach activities abound. As highlighted in the APR and discussions with the team, these include a three-year collaboration with the Department of Urban Studies & Planning (DUSP) and MITdesignX exploring opportunities for meaningful impact on sustainable construction, green job creation and community development. Other SA+P labs, such as the Urban Risk Lab and the Future Heritage Lab, are examining issues ranging from strategies to increase community ability to adapt to climate shock, to the translation of cultural practices via new technologies to impact threatened communities.

These opportunities highlight the intersection at MIT of the classroom, lab, and studio, creating an environment where the extensive research activities of the faculty support and engage learning by students. This takes place via student research assistantships, academic coursework, and collaborative work during the summer and January terms, including the research-based Summer Work and Pedagogy program initiated in response to COVID limitations on outreach and travel opportunities. The APR specifically calls out the collaborative participation of students in these efforts as central both to their success as well as in building the capacity for ongoing knowledge creation in MIT graduates.

This convergence of workshop, lab, and classroom also manifests itself in many of the program's core and option studios, where students collaborate directly within design teams and often with real-world partners via community engagement. As outlined in the APR, this includes opportunities of working with DUSP colleagues and community organizations in East Boston, with Roxbury's Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, or with more far-flung local stakeholders via the "Collectives" seminar. Beyond the scale of the building or the city, students have stretched the concept of practice engagement to student-focused entrepreneurship within the unique MITdesignX start-up incubator. Within the life of the institute, architecture students also express this engagement through established department activities such as exhibitions and town-hall meetings, as well as recent COVID-influenced outlets such as WAWD? Radio and the student journal *Imprint*.

The nurturing of a dynamic community through these activities has highlighted the need for a welcoming and equitable environment, particularly within a highly diverse institution located in a large urban context. Notably, the inaugural issue of the journal *Imprint* defines it as a vehicle for *"breadth and inclusion … that makes space for every student who chooses to participate."* As outlined in the APR and stakeholder discussions, SA+P and the department have stepped up their focus on DEI issues in the design and education environment *"to not only support the student body's understanding of diverse cultural and social contexts but to bring those lived experiences into the classroom as well."* (APR, p. 21) These efforts have included curricular responses; human resources, including an Assoc. Department Head for Strategy and Equity, a departmental Diversity, Equity and Belonging Officer, and the SA+P Asst. Dean for Diversity, Equity, Belonging and Student Support; and a dedicated departmental Strategy and Equity team with student and staff participation. The APR notes the intention to continue review and revision of the curriculum and teaching environment to further reflect values of belonging and inclusion.

By building on the broad foundation of integrated, collaborative design thinking that directly engages cutting-edge research across a spectrum of issues of pressing consequence to a modern and evolving society, the professional program strives to not only train skilled practitioners, *"but also serves as a laboratory for all the innovation and scholarship within the Department, challenging, expanding, and redefining the role, responsibilities, and capacities of the architect in the 21st century."* (APR, p. 17)

3—Program and Student Criteria (*Guidelines*, p. 9)

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) (*Guidelines*, p. 9)

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. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found that the program meets this criterion primarily through four key courses that convey information on career opportunities in architecture and on licensure. Evidence included a complete APR narrative, course syllabi and assignments, and grading and assessment methodology.

This begins in the first semester with 4.210 Positions: Cultivating Critical Practice, and extends through 4.THG in the student's final semester. 4.210 explores the potentiality of the profession and careers in architecture in the context of recent history and current events. 4.222 Professional Practice is a more detailed and interactive review of the profession *"…focusing on the financial, regulatory, historic, temporal, and managerial features and contexts of real works of architecture…"* (APR p. 29) The 4.222 syllabus lists an Outcome Objective as learning *"…that architecture practice is not monolithic, and that there is a broad range of ways by which architecture can be defined and practiced."* The course explores the regulatory environment, including information on professional organizations and associations such as the AIA, NOMA, NCARB, NAAB, ACSA, and the role of individual state licensing boards. *"The AXP program is given particular attention and students are encouraged to start their NCARB file if they haven't already."* (APR p. 58) In 4.189 Thesis Prep and 4.THG Thesis, students outline next steps in developing their individual approach to and understanding of a future architectural career.

As described in the APR narrative, the program assesses student learning outcomes and undertakes continual improvement per the process laid out in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below, further confirmed via additional materials and discussions during the visit.

In additional to curricular work, a variety of events/guest lecturers, internship offerings, job placement, and a business incubator "think tank" (MITdesignX) are available to students to mold and enlighten their personal path to career life. *"Thesis Prep is not really about the ending of a student's M.Arch. program, but rather about the beginning of a five or ten-year practice."* (APR p. 30) In visiting team meetings, MIT's AXP Coordinator, Paul Pettigrew, describes a database which tracks career paths of M.Arch. graduates. This database provides valuable feedback on M.Arch. alumni and strengthens the network available to both current students and program graduates.

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. (p.9)

⊠ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found evidence of student achievement for this criterion primarily in materials for the core and option studios, supported by additional non-studio coursework throughout the curriculum. Evidence included a complete APR narrative, course syllabi and assignments, and grading and assessment methodology.

The program offerings respond in multiple and reasonably coordinated ways to the requirements of this criterion. Perspectives on the effect of multiple factors such as settings, complexity, and scales of development build up in the program's design studio course sequence, and interestingly, in a few related courses. 4.151 Architecture Design Core Studio I introduces design at the scale of a public space, and expanded upon by 4.152 Architecture Design Core Studio II, which introduces design at the scale of systems and cities. 4.123 Architectural Assemblies, 4.105 Geometric Disciplines and Architecture Skills, 4.210 Positions: Cultivating Critical Practice supplement the core studios, thus adding to the understanding of the considerations in the multi-faceted design process.

Integration in design shows clearly in 4.153 Architecture Design Core Studio III, which is co-taught with 4.463 Building Technology, enabling students to examine integrative design considerations, including that of climate change. The holistic understanding of design factors and integration takes a boost from the insights students gather from the four design modules making up 4.154 Architecture Design Option/Research Studios related to constructive systems; massing, movement, and space; building envelope and public image; and design synthesis. The student's cognition of the role of design in reconciling the multiple factors accrues from the experiences in the 4.154 Architecture Design Option/Research Studios. These series of studios engage design topics at diverse scales in architecture and urbanism and offer cross-studio exercises entertaining interdisciplinary topics.

The program leverages design opportunities through a series of lecture and workshop courses. As the course matrix shows, for Spring 2022, these opportunities encompass structural design, digital fabrication, visual computing, BIM, and Islamic Architecture. Further the unique organization of MIT's Discipline Groups provides a context conducive to research in support of the design quest.

Student evaluation and learning outcome assessment transpire through the requirements of each course and further, more recently, across the curriculum. This is clear, for example, from the Core I and Core II Studio syllabi where a number of multi-faceted evaluation criteria are discussed, ranging from the articulation of theses to representational discretion to peer review and self-criticism. The program requires students to submit the semester's design work for the digital archives to inform publications and assessment of outcome. Further, the "evaluation meeting" at the end of each semester and the "core summits" involving design faculty of the first three core studios, are occasions for reflections and adjustment of strategies and content.

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. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found that the program meets this criterion through a strong presence of ecological knowledge across the curriculum. Evidence included a complete APR narrative and full course syllabi outlining assignments and grading methodologies.

The program addresses this topic from the first term with 4.464 Environmental Technologies in Buildings, which introduces fundamentals of thermal and lighting performance. Concepts and techniques are developed and tested through quantitative environmental modeling of a medium-sized net-zero building. 4.463 Building Technology Systems: Structures and Envelopes then presents more advanced concepts, coordinated with the third term architecture studio. These paired courses cover a range of important concepts including embodied carbon impacts, passive and active conditioning systems, energy load reduction strategies, building site orientation, and thermal mass and stack effects. Additional perspectives on ecological knowledge and responsibility, including the cultural and economic aspects of the topic, appear in 4.222 Professional Practice (required) and a range of elective courses.

As described in the APR narrative and discussions during the visit, the program assesses student learning outcomes and undertakes continual improvement per the process laid out in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below and by reviews of studio work. Assessment currently focuses on the paired 4.151/4.463 classes for this criterion, but the program plans to expand the integration of building performance to other design courses in the future.

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. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found evidence of student achievement for this criterion primarily through two required courses (4.210 Positions: Cultivating Critical Practice and 4.645 Architecture from 1750-Present) and a limited elective requirement in which students take two additional courses in history and theory. Evidence included a complete APR narrative and full course syllabi outlining assignments and grading methodologies. The required courses are taught by outstanding scholars and do an excellent job of framing architecture and urbanism within a global range of social, cultural, economic, and political contexts.

As described in the APR narrative, the program assesses student learning outcomes and undertakes continual improvement per the process laid out in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below, further confirmed via additional materials and discussions during the visit. As described, annual assessment and revision is undertaken both by the History, Theory and Criticism of Architecture and Art (HTC) group and by the M.Arch. Curriculum Committee. As an area, history and theory is represented in the M.Arch. Curriculum Committee by the HTC Director, or another HTC faculty serves as a committee member.

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. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found evidence of student achievement for this criterion primarily in a) coursework (Option Studios, 4.189 Preparation for M.Arch. Thesis, and 4.THG Graduate Thesis), and b) supplemental experiences (research participation opportunities, MITdesignX, and lectures/panels/symposia). Evidence included a complete APR narrative, applicable course syllabi, and assessment methodology.

Framing research activities within the overarching context of MIT's renowned research and innovation production, the department furthers the practice and dissemination of architecturally related research with

implications to both critical areas of societal impact as well as direct and indirect student learning, highlighting the confluence of research and design that builds the capacity for ongoing knowledge creation in MIT graduates.

Assessment specific to evaluating the success of the coursework in attaining learning outcomes for continued improvement occurs per sections 5.2 and 5.3 below. However, as discussed in both the APR and visit meetings, the program pronouncedly asserts the value and practice of continued assessment of research performance by referring to the institute-wide culture and expectations for research, highlighting two main mechanisms. The first is the structure set for tenure and promotion; the second is via the unique biannual evaluations (and resulting adjustments) of each department by a Visiting Committee (VC), consisting of alumni, field experts, and representatives of MIT's Corporation (board of trustees). Further, the $4.7M funding in FY 2022 for faculty research with student involvement is an important indication of research success with implications to student learning. The department's innovations, such as Christoph Reinhart's Daylight Autonomy developed through studio experiments as just one example cited, are another benchmark for research performance.

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. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found evidence of student achievement for this criterion primarily in materials for the Core II and Core III Studios, 4.152 and 4.153. Evidence included a complete APR narrative, course syllabi and assignments, and grading and assessment methodology.

The team found that collaboration is a key value embedded in coursework. Though design projects are often completed alone, concurrent, corequisite coursework tends to integrate design and theory. The faculty for the Core I Studio work in tandem with faculty in other required sectors of architecture to provide students with an interdisciplinary education, focusing on history, theory, design development, daylighting, time-based media, and orthographics. The Core II Studio integrates community involvement and outreach in a semester-long design research project centered in Boston. It is evident from provided syllabi and faculty profiles that students are involved in stakeholder engagement and community outreach to work with city institutions that support children, youth, individuals, and families. The Core III Studio implements a team design project and integrates a building technology course into design projects. The Master's Thesis semester places heavy emphasis on the importance of integrating many voices into one project – whether or not they are academic or other stakeholder voices. Evidence provided indicates that students work with many groups to develop a final thesis project.

Both the APR and discussions during the visit provided additional evidence of leadership and collaboration achievement in various non-curricular activities as well, including such areas as the entrepreneurial incubator MITdesignX, student organizations (ASC and NOMAS), student publications, and providing the impetus for the department's Strategy and Equity team, on which students continue to participate.

As described in the APR narrative, the program assesses student learning outcomes and undertakes continual improvement per the process laid out in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below, further confirmed via additional materials and discussions during the visit.

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. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:

The team found evidence of achievement for this criterion in a number of integrated ways. Most unique is the Review Value Statement — shared with students, faculty, and guest critics — that grounds the articulation and communication on studio culture. As stated in its Review Value Statement, the program values the context and feedback from those not intimately familiar with the work and the opportunity to encompass "*a range of perspectives to aid the student in contextualizing their work within broader creative and research landscapes.*" The Statement demarcates the role and expectations of the review parties — convenors, reviewers, and students.

In support of innovation, the program cites significant statistics on funding for students, where 73.76% of graduate students most recently received teaching or research positions. The department elaborates on "*how the community is involved in creating and maintaining a positive learning environment; and policies and practices related to social equity and diversity within the [d]epartment.*" (APR, p. 50) The studio culture at MIT "*fosters an environment that is open to innovation and encourages students to pursue individual and collective initiatives. As the [d]epartment is horizontally distributed in its organization, students feel empowered to engage faculty and resources across disciplines.*" (APR, p. 52) The activities of the Architecture Student Council (ASC) and other student organizations (NOMAS, student publications) contribute to the inclusiveness and creativity of the student body.

Learning and Teaching culture is regularly assessed through two important mechanisms: a) the department conducts regular quality-of-life surveys distributed by students to students, which serve as an essential mechanism to understand and improve learning, teaching, and community-building in the department; and b) the department's Strategy and Equity team has an explicit mandate to improve the quality of the intellectual and creative community and is responsible for a range of initiatives to constantly craft a supportive and inclusive learning environment.

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. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:

The team found evidence of achievement of this criterion in both curricular (primarily Core II and Core III studios) and non-curricular activities. Evidence included a complete APR narrative, applicable course syllabi, and assessment methodology.

The team found that diversity, social equity, and inclusion are key values that guide not only program admissions decisions but also curricular decisions and coursework content. The core studios promote designing with social equity in mind. Core I Studio focuses on the public realm, Core II on civic institutions, and Core III on community outreach. Students also have a vast array of courses focused on social equity and inclusion (both design and theory) outside of the core studios, primarily via the option studios and supporting coursework provided as electives. Past course offerings indicate extensive community outreach to communities in and around the Boston area, and faculty profiles show experience in designing for the public realm.

As described in the APR narrative, the program assesses student learning outcomes and undertakes continual improvement per the process laid out in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below, further confirmed via additional materials and discussions during the visit.

Non-curricular areas further reinforce achievement of this criterion. The team found the student body to be diverse, both in statistics provided by the program and observations of student involvement during the visit. The department has made large strides forward in recent years through the appointment of a Diversity, Equity and Belonging Officer, exclusively for the architecture department. Diversity, Equity and Belonging Officer Lauren Schuller cited that her role involves liaising with students, staff, and faculty to promote a culture that is respectful and proud of the diversity present in the program.

3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes (*Guidelines*, p. 10)
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. (p.10)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found evidence of student achievement for this criterion primarily in materials for the Core II and Core III studios, as well as 4.464 Environmental Technologies in Buildings. Evidence included a complete APR narrative, course syllabi and assignments, and grading and assessment methodology.

The team found that the MIT M.Arch. program instructs students on present and emerging built environment life safety issues. Broader aspects of HSW in the built environment at the city scale such as land use regulations are first introduced in 4.464 Environmental Technologies in Buildings. 4.464 also introduces principles of responsible design for energy savings/embodied energy, carbon sequestration and other climate related issues. The Core II project syllabus includes learning objectives covering HSW at an urban site level, offering students a choice of several topics to analyze and present. These topics include circulation, structure, access, lighting, and acoustics, providing students exposure to life safety and welfare issues.

As described in the APR narrative, the program assesses student learning outcomes and undertakes continual improvement per the process laid out in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below, further confirmed via additional materials and discussions during the visit. The faculty assesses and gives feedback on Core II Studio work for life safety issues by redlining submitted drawings. Accompanying notes provided by the faculty further detail HSW corrections needed on student work. Core III modules include both a basic condensed building code/life safety reference handbook and, in design program requirements (Design Problem 1.3, Program), a summary of expectations for the student concerning application of HSW requirements to their design product. Learning objectives are clear. The redline drawing review describes how the student's abilities in applying health, safety and welfare principals is evaluated and assessed.

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. (p.10)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found evidence of student achievement for this criterion primarily in materials provided for 4.222 Professional Practice. Evidence included a complete APR narrative, full course syllabi and assignments, and grading methodology. Course lecture topics include the context of practice settings, regulatory organizations, AXP and paths to licensure, and professional ethics. The discussion on ethics includes case studies as well as current issues relevant to the context of professional practice, such as diversity, equity, housing, and sustainability. In addition to 4.222, the required Core III Studio includes first-hand exposure to issues of stakeholder relationships, while the IAP terms provide opportunities for further experience via short-term professional internships.

Going forward, the program will regularly assess student outcomes and undertake continual improvement in 4.222 Professional Practice according to the process and frequency described in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below. Additional provided materials and discussions with the program during the VSV documented recent adjustments made to the coursework as a result of this assessment regimen.

13

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. (p.10)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found evidence of student achievement for this criterion primarily in materials for 4.153 Core Studio III, supported by 4.222 Professional Practice. Evidence included a complete APR narrative, course syllabi and assignments, and grading and assessment methodology.

The team found that the program conveys critical principles of the regulatory environment. Core II and Core III studios apply fundamental HSW content to the studio design program. Lectures by faculty and guests in Arch 4.153 and 4.463, combined with Core Studio architectural program content, illustrate the evaluative process architects use to comply with land use laws and regulations as part of a project. Core III modules include both a basic condensed building code/life safety reference handbook and, in design program requirements (Design Problem 1.3, Program), a summary of expectations for the student concerning application of life safety requirements to their design product.

4.153 Core III Studio includes lectures from allied professionals covering site design topics – such as grading and drainage, topography, vegetation – essential both to design of the project and to assembly of materials for government agency review processes. 4.222 Professional Practice syllabus describes lecture content including discussion of planning and building entitlement review processes. 4.464 Environmental Technology in Buildings focuses on climatic performance of buildings and compliance with ASHRAE and daylighting performance standards using both conventional instructive content and simulative modeling. The objective of teaching regulatory context is stated in the APR. This is also explained in the redline drawing process as provided by faculty as additional evidence.

As described in the APR narrative, the program assesses student learning outcomes and undertakes continual improvement per the process laid out in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below, further confirmed via additional materials and discussions during the visit.

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. (p.10)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found evidence of student achievement for this criterion primarily in materials for 4.463 Building Technology Systems, 4.464 Environmental Technologies in Buildings, and 4.153 Core III Studio. Evidence included a complete APR narrative, course syllabi and assignments, and assessment methodology.

The SA+P provides a robust and well supported array of educational tools and opportunities related to this criterion for M.Arch. students. These resources are integrated in an appropriate sequence across technical and design coursework. In 4.123 Architectural Assemblies, students review and then create case studies examining architectural assemblies and systems including building envelope, structure & constructability, and the context in which design decisions were made. This overview prepares students for more in-depth study of architectural technology integrated with Core II and Core III lectures and assignments. In 4.401/4.464 Environmental Technologies in Buildings, a first semester class, students are instructed on HVAC/occupant comfort, climate and carbon emissions management, passive energy design, energy load reduction, daylighting/artificial lighting concepts & methodologies, and building acoustics. The course *"has a strong environmental modeling component."* (APR p. 37) MIT's Sustainable Design Lab site shows further coursework and examples of student work toward net zero energy design and similar goals.

4.463 Building Technology Systems is delivered in parallel with the Core III design studio and integrated with Core III studio work. 4.463 explores the exterior building envelope, emphasizing performance aspects/climate criteria and overall integration into building design. Examples of Core III student work include climate data and energy modeling and also Karamba parametric analysis, which tests performance and construction methods for structural assemblies and technologies. 4.154 Architecture Design Option Research Studios, MIT's Sustainable Design Lab, MITdesignX, and MISTI all provide progressively expansive opportunities for students to reach their potential in understanding and contributing to a full range of architectural technologies and development of emerging technologies.

Student work examples show synthesis of these lessons and principals in an integrative fashion. Though exhibits of student work demonstrate an experimental attitude and desire to stretch beyond the commonplace or commercially viable, the APR and syllabus show that guest lectures in 4.222 Professional Practice and other pedagogy express to students the constraints on practice for design and economic criteria.

As described in the APR narrative, the program assesses student learning outcomes and undertakes continual improvement per the process laid out in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below, further confirmed via additional materials and discussions during the visit.

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. (p. 12)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found evidence of student achievement for this criterion primarily in materials for the Core II and Core III Studios (4.152 and 4.153), 4.464 Environmental Technologies in Buildings, and 4.463 Building Technology Systems: Structures and Envelopes. Evidence included a complete APR narrative, course syllabi and assignments, student work, and assessment methodology.

The curriculum introduces regulatory design requirements at a variety of scales and levels of detail in a sequence appropriate to the increasing complexity of studio work. First semester class 4.464 Environmental Technologies delves into code requirements for HVAC, lighting, acoustics, and energy efficiency. The regulatory context is expanded in Core II Studio course content. Student work evidence from Core II Studios demonstrated application of regulatory requirements to studio work and subsequent assessment by faculty via examples of redline review and accompanying notes. At the beginning of Core III semester, faculty provide a "Code Handbook" for student use, which is a compilation of basic building code requirements applicable to Core III Studio projects. In response to deficiencies noted in the 2015 NAAB VTR and subsequent IPRs, the program has added visiting critics and lectures to the Core III curriculum delving deeply into areas of energy load reduction and human comfort, along with passive and sustainable environmental building systems and design techniques.

The synthesis of user requirements is most readily apparent in the syllabi and student work for 4.153 Core III Studio, which dovetails with in-depth emphasis on user-specific site conditions for the studio projects. Student work clearly displayed how understanding of both user context and stakeholder input directly influenced project design development. There is good evidence that the consideration of site conditions is required throughout the program and that students are developing the ability to think about site conditions in a meaningful way when designing. The three semester core studio sequence is designed to expose students to a range of site conditions — first a public park, then a dense urban neighborhood, and finally a complex coastal condition. Evidence of site concerns is apparent in all of these courses, but particularly in the Core III Studio, where student work shows a clear integration of site conditions — as well as related historical, social, and functional considerations — as important drivers of design decisions, with specifics of coastal conditions covered by a supplemental "Code Primer" document. 4.464 Environmental Technologies in Buildings also specifically addresses site conditions at the beginning of the M.Arch. program.

The APR indicates added enhancement to the accessibility criterion by requiring the use of the Massachusetts State Building Code (MSBC) 9th Edition, and integration of accessibility principles into students' design work, including *"ADA code mission, principles of accessible routes in buildings and in graded landscape paths, code-compliant stairs, ramps and elevators, and layouts for accessible bathrooms."* (APR, p. 5) Student project examples indicate the consideration of accessible features for both the building interiors and outdoor parking.

As described in the APR narrative, the program assesses student learning outcomes and undertakes continual improvement per the process laid out in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below, further confirmed via additional materials and discussions during the visit. In the Core III studios, this includes student self-assessment identifying key areas of continued exploration stemming from their studio work. In addition, the APR outlined a process undertaken by the program following the most recent NAAB IPR review to improve delivery and demonstration of SC.5 components, particularly universal design and site considerations.

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. (p. 12)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team found evidence of student achievement for this criterion primarily in materials for the Core II and Core III Studios (4.152 and 4.153), 4.464 Environmental Technologies in Buildings, and 4.463 Building Technology Systems: Structures and Envelopes. Evidence included a complete APR narrative, course syllabi and assignments, student work, and assessment methodology.

The pairing of the Core Studio sequence with the Building Technology course sequence in the first year generally reflects the program's intent for integrated design decisions: 4.151 Core Studio I with 4.464 Environmental Technologies in Buildings, and 4.152 Core Studio II with 4.462 Introduction to Structural Design. However, the ultimate integration transpires in the second year pairing of 4.153 Core Studio III with 4.463 Building Technology Systems: Structures and Envelopes, where the pairing *"gives students the chance to explore and test the development of an architectural design proposal with an integrated understanding of a building's technical performance and how a design proposal responds to climate change in the Anthropocene."* (APR, p. 63) Among other topics, the latter course describes the key considerations of steel, reinforced concrete, and timber as structural systems; examines structural systems in terms of force flow, hierarchy, and efficiency; considers integration of structural systems with design intent; and utilizes analytic and digital tools for assessment. These themes are congruently re-examined in the context of the Core III design studio, which requires the detailed examination of structural and building envelope systems and details. The semester is structured as a single studio project organized around four Design Modules including a) Constructive Systems: Convention & Transformation; b) Massing, Movement & Space; c) Unpacking the Wall; and d) Synthesis. Student assessment is through studio reviews and a coordinated series of homework assignments in 4.463.

Core II and Core III studios also integrate fundamental HSW and building performance content provided in first semester course 4.464 Environmental Technologies in Buildings into the studio design program. 4.464 focuses on climatic performance of buildings and compliance with ASHRAE and daylighting performance standards via classroom content and simulative modeling. Taught in parallel with Core III studio, 4.463 Building Technology Systems Structures and Envelopes introduces broader life safety and welfare issues in a thorough and ambitious list of topics on structures, building comfort and an array of building technologies. Student work evidence shows both thermal and daylighting modeling studies indicating integration of these concepts into building design. Lectures by faculty and guests in 4.153 and 4.463 support a more exhaustive integration of life safety systems into the students' studio design process. At the beginning of Core III semester, faculty provide to students a "Code Handbook," which is a compilation of basic building code requirements for use in their design work. Additionally, faculty use a

redline drawing review process to provide iterative feedback to students on their success in integration of life safety and building systems concepts in the Core II Studio.

As described in the APR narrative, the program assesses student learning outcomes and undertakes continual improvement per the process laid out in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below, further confirmed via additional materials and discussions during the visit. In the Core III studios, this includes student self-assessment identifying key areas of continued exploration stemming from their studio work. In addition, the APR outlined a process undertaken by the program following the most recent NAAB IPR review to improve delivery and demonstration of SC.6 components, particularly in terms of life safety and environmental systems.

4—Curricular Framework (*Guidelines*, p. 13)

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 (*Guidelines*, p. 13)
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)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The APR includes a link to MIT's most recent accreditation letter from the New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE), dated 30 June 2020, scheduling the next comprehensive review for 2029: *https://accreditation.mit.edu/sites/default/files/images/2020%20MIT%20Reaccreditation.pdf*. The APR also provides a link to additional details of NECHE's accreditation and MIT's various evaluation and accreditation reports at *https://accreditation.mit.edu/archives*.

4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum (*Guidelines*, p. 13)
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.

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. (p.13)

    4.2.1   **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. (p.14)

    4.2.2   **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. (p.14)

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.

    4.2.3   **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.

    4.2.4   **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.

    4.2.5   **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.

        ☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The APR documents the requirements and curriculum for the M.Arch. degree, consisting of 282 units and a 24-unit thesis, all of which are at the graduate level. Note that MIT uses a different credit unit system that documents the total hours of engagement rather than hours of instruction. The equivalent number of traditional semester credit hours would roughly amount to 114 credits, using an approximate conversion factor recommended by MIT staff.

The APR lists the number of required & elective Professional Studies (237 units) and Optional Studies (69 units). Admitted students in the M.Arch. program must document completion of required General Studies via an acceptable baccalaureate degree or other preparatory coursework evaluated by the department prior to commencing graduate studies (see section 4.3 below).

The M.Arch. program does not accept transfer students. While all enrolled students must complete a full 306 unit course of studies, some required courses may be waived per department evaluation of preparatory work (see section 4.3 below), allowing students to take additional Optional Studies coursework in their place.

The APR also lists all other non-NAAB-accredited degrees offered by the department, including Master of Science programs in several of the department's sub-discipline groups, an undergraduate Bachelor of Science in Architecture, and various PhD programs.

4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education (*Guidelines*, p. 16)

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.

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The program sufficiently explains in the APR (pp. 125-134) and on the department website (*https://architecture.mit.edu/graduate-admissions*) the academic preparation requirements for admission to the M.Arch., as well as for the waiver of required coursework.

Required academic preparation includes a bachelor's degree; one semester of college-level coursework in each of mathematics and natural sciences; and two semesters of college-level coursework in the humanities and/or social sciences. Students may be admitted with limited deficiencies, but deficiencies must be resolved prior to entry into the first year of graduate study. Transfer students are not allowed to enter the program; there is no option to shorten the 3.5-year M.Arch. program. Applicants who have begun another program may qualify to waive required courses they have already taken and instead take free electives.

A setup for receiving and evaluating degree transcripts or other experiences such as certificates, study abroad, and community college is in place. The department academic administrator reviews enrolling students' final transcripts and may waive the requirement for completed courses but not waive the credits, with the option for taking electives instead. Additionally, students may qualify to TA for classes they have taken previously.

The program does not rely on preparatory education experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain accreditation criteria. Admitted M.Arch. students who have completed the equivalent of a required course in the curriculum via prior experience may petition the program's academic administrator to waive the requirement. Petitions must include as much relevant material as possible (transcripts, syllabi, assignments, portfolio, etc.), which is then evaluated by the M.Arch. Program Committee, consisting of one faculty member from each of the department's discipline groups.

5—Resources

5.1 Structure and Governance (*Guidelines*, p. 18)
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.

☒ **Described**

2023 Team Analysis:
At MIT the M.Arch. program is administered by the Department of Architecture, which is led by a Department Head and two Associate Heads. Administratively the department comprises one of six divisions within the School of Architecture and Planning, which is one of the six primary academic units that make up the Institute. Importantly the budget of the department flows directly from the upper administration of the institute, meaning that the M.Arch. program has fairly direct access to the administrator controlling its budget.

All stakeholders described the M.Arch. as the site of connection for the entire department, as it is the largest degree program and involves all of the department's sub-disciplines. The team found good evidence that the department administration is strongly committed to the M.Arch. program and is accessible to all constituencies, including students. Structured participation in program and departmental governance occurs through a wide array (14) of committees that include faculty, students, and staff. The M.Arch. program is also well-represented in committees at the school and institute levels.

The team's assessment is based on the APR, supporting documents, the website, and discussions with stakeholders during the visit.

5.2 Planning and Assessment (*Guidelines*, p. 18)
The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies:

    5.2.1 The program's multi-year 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.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
The APR and discussions during the VSV demonstrate the strategic planning process for both the department and institution, primarily in how that ties directly into the institute's primary assessment and planning mechanism, i.e., the Visiting Committees. The Visiting Committees, composed of corporation, institute and alumni appointees that include outside educators and practitioners, evaluate and advise on the goals and outcomes of the strategic plan on a two-year cycle. Within the department, the annual strategic planning process emanates from five distinct groups: the department Cabinet/Committee on Graduate Studies; committees for each academic program; the Strategy & Equity team; the student cabinet; and ad-hoc committees as needed. These groups recommend changes on a semesterly basis. In

addition to assessment of these outcomes bi-annually via the Visiting Committees, the department also seeks comparative input from sister institutions, particularly in the areas of admissions, core requirements, faculty evaluations, facilities and resources, intellectual directions, and tenure processes.

The program provided greater detail on the key performance indicators for the primary areas of current strategic planning focus, including addressing climate change; diversity, equity and belonging; and design & design pedagogy. In addition to describing specific metrics in these focus areas, the APR describes the metrics and assessment mechanism for academic instruction and individual student performance outcomes. For academic programs and instruction, these include incorporation of NAAB PC/SC criteria into the discussions of the M.Arch. Curriculum Committee as well as student evaluations coordinated by the registrar's office Curriculum and Faculty Support, conducted during several evaluation periods each term. The primary assessment mechanism for student and course outcomes occurs in the end-of-semester Evaluation Meeting, *"in which faculty across our MArch meet to assess ... outcomes across our 3.5-year curriculum. This assessment is done in collaboration with key staff in Student Services, who help track follow-ups with individual students, as well as instructors and the program director, who takes responsibility for shifting and adjusting individual course outcomes."* (APR, p. 89)

Both the APR and discussions with administrators during the VSV highlighted current challenges that the department and school have identified as part of the planning and assessment process, as well as the strategies with which they are addressing them.

5.3 Curricular Development (*Guidelines*, p. 19)
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.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
The program operates a large network of committees and councils that directly or indirectly influence curricular development at the level of the course, sequence, and program. Internally, and partly prompted by the shift in the 2020 NAAB framework, the program is crystallizing three existing forums for curriculum development and evaluation — the M.Arch. Curriculum Committee Meeting, the Evaluation Meeting, and the Core Summit Meeting. Each forum is operating at a relevant scale with the provision to evaluate the achievement of and adjust as appropriate the Program and Student Criteria. Backed with 14 committees, cabinets, and or councils across the Department of Architecture, these forums meet at a frequency of one or two times per semester.

The APR, additional materials, and visit discussions explained how architectural curricular development and department faculty/staff interact with and impact a diversity of forums across the institute. The internal and external relationship structures appear to coalesce to cause certain modes of activity to benefit aspects of the architectural program curriculum. Program directors, including the M.Arch. director, work with faculty on best practices for conducting student learning assessments and monitoring assessment success. As a benchmarking practice, at the conclusion of each semester, faculty and students present the work of their studios to the department head, associate deans, program/department directors, and fellow M.Arch. faculty for review. The team verified the work of these regular assessment meetings in terms of promoting continuous improvement via review of meeting minutes and evaluation reports.

Although the APR sufficiently lists overall roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including a chart or another summarizing device to further clarify how the various bodies interact in the curricular assessment process would be useful.

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development (*Guidelines*, p. 19)

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.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
The faculty in the Department of Architecture enjoy ample opportunities for professional development, supported by the department and the institute at large, that have an impact on their research and teaching. The APR (pp. 98-100) notes these in detail, supported by discussions with faculty and administration during the visit. A sampling of these opportunities include: a) supporting and facilitating an unprecedented representation of faculty and students at the 2021 Venice Biennale; b) a pre-tenure research leave program that provides tenure-track faculty with the opportunity to take a one-semester leave with pay to conduct concentrated research; c) the institute's parental leave policy, providing leave for faculty members, regardless of gender, who wish to spend the majority of their academic time on the care of and responsibility for a newborn child; d) tenure clock extension for pregnant women faculty; e) the development of new skills such as the institute-wide MIT quick-start and longer-term classes; f) supporting participation in conference/professional meetings; and g) generous start-up funds to attract women and underrepresented minorities to the faculty. Other opportunities include Humanities Arts and Social Sciences (HASS) grants, career development chairs, nominations for named professorships, and institute awards.

Department staff also enjoy development opportunities, confirmed in visit meetings, including training offered by the Human Resources Department, the possibility of enrolling as Special Students at the institute, nomination for school and institute awards, and tuition assistance.

The students in the M.Arch. program enjoy extensive and diverse support services facilitated by the administration and faculty, including academic and personal advising as well as career advice, placement assistance, and regular evaluation of student progress. This support crystalizes early with an intense support orientation when students enter the program: a) the degree administrators and student services team manage the first and most substantial advising of incoming professional M.Arch. students; b) the team prepares a comprehensive guide of institute and department information and schedules a week of orientation activities; c) the MIT Libraries and STOA (MIT Architecture IT Office) offer their own orientations; d) subsequently, students are assigned to faculty registration officers, who approve students' subject enrollments each semester and monitor progress in meeting curriculum requirements; and finally, e) studio instructors have an important place in advising their students for any given term and often develop continuing mentoring relations.

In support of a vocal and engaged student body, the department boosts the Architecture Student Council (ASC), co-lead by two students voted by the students each year and is composed of 15 cabinet members. The ASC maintains continuous communication both with the department's administration and with the institute-wide Graduate Student Council (GSC). In addition to the ASC and GSC, the department also provides significant funding for the MIT chapter of NOMAS, which, with ASC, essentially fills the role

of an AIAS chapter, as per discussion with students during the site visit. The departmental support has facilitated a gamut of student self-driven initiatives and activities. These include a film series titled 'Cinema and Architectural Imagination;' an online radio station; *outofframe.mit.edu*: an online space for the amplification of student voices and research; *Imprint*: a collective student-led publication that offers a diverse and inclusive platform for the department's students to share their work; and the continuing publication of *Thresholds*, a peer-reviewed journal of architectural history and theory, which the department's students edit. Of particular note, students were a driving force in the establishment of the department-wide Strategy and Equity team, on which both students and staff retain representation.

The program has a qualified Architect Licensing Advisor, Paul Pettigrew, with a well-defined role and active agenda, including attendance at the NCARB Licensing Advisor's meeting in summer 2021.

The APR discusses at length the criteria and procedures for recruiting competent and diverse faculty, citing initiatives, policies, and practices. Not to infer incongruency in faculty workloads, the APR is silent on the faculty loads themselves, let alone the effect of such workloads on promoting students and faculty achievement. However, the faculty expressed no concern about workload balance during visit meetings, and the large number of faculty compared to the relatively small number of architecture students in the M.Arch. program has a positive implication for sustainable faculty workloads.

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (*Guidelines*, p. 20)
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.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
As noted under PC.8, the team found that diversity, social equity, and inclusion/belonging (DEI) are key values that permeate the department's strategic goals, manifested in a significant portion of department resources. The establishment of an associate department head with a specific DEI portfolio in 2020 is emblematic of that effort.

Regarding faculty, the department has extended resources and utilized data-driven approaches to further increase a diverse group of faculty. The APR (p. 103) comments that the school has *"continued to improve the diversity of its faculty and staff. Of our 42 full-time faculty and lecturers as of Fall 2020 (17 Female, 23 Male, and 2 non-binary) 18% identify as URM. Of seven full-time faculty hired to the tenure-track or long-term contracts the last two years, (5 female, 1 male, 1 non-binary), three identify as URM (two black, one Latinx)."* Staff in the program cited that the greatest stride forward in promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion has been the appointment of a Diversity, Equity and Belonging Officer, Lauren Schuller. In Schuller's year in the school, she has expanded funding opportunities for the DEI sector, collaborated with other Diversity, Equity and Belonging Officers in other disciplines within the institute, and hired student staff. The creation of this new role in the department is laudable.

As mentioned in PC.8, the program's admissions are centered around diversity and inclusion. As noted in the APR (p. 104): *"In academic year 2020, admissions were 468 applications (244 female, 224 male, and 54% international applicants), 21 were targeted, 45 admitted (62% W, 24% URM, 40% Intl), and 25 enrolled. In 2021, admissions were highly competitive with a record number of applications (825). Twenty-one were targeted, 30 admitted, and 22 enrolled (45% W, 32% URM, 32% Intl). In our view, this class of students are the most accomplished and the most diverse the program has welcomed to date."* Quite notably, MIT focuses on reducing the financial burden higher education places on students through scholarships for students in the M.Arch. program. As stated earlier, the department administration has noted their desired intent to increase per-student scholarship totals to 80% and eventually 100%, which in itself will greatly facilitate increased diversity from under-represented student populations.

In addition to standard EEO/AA and disability accommodation policies and procedures provided to the team, the department maintains a large array of other DEI resources and initiatives. The team noted through interactions during the VSV that the department has an active NOMAS chapter that meets regularly (biweekly) with department administration, with the intent of bridging the gap between students and the administration and promoting social equity in the program. Mentorship is a large focus of the department's internal approach to ensuring lower staff turnover as well as student success. It was noted in discussions during the VSV that a mentorship program pairing the school's 6,000+ alumni with current students was underway, as well as a mentorship effort for faculty to ease into new roles. The department administration is intent on using MIT's resources as leverage to better the program; multiple members of the administration mentioned that MIT has a responsibility to provide students and faculty with mentorship support. Students also receive consistent one-on-one mentorship from faculty advisors, which includes but is not limited to academic advising, professional development, networking, and career advising. Students noted that career support, while available, is certainly a place for growth in the program.

Perhaps the most visible manifestation of the department's commitment to proactively address DEI issues is in the standing Strategy and Equity team, the impetus for which originated in the student body. With the direct support of both the associate department head and new Diversity, Equity and Belonging officer, the team includes representation from faculty, students, and staff, spearheading DEI efforts in areas such as graduate student admissions, faculty support, and curriculum assessment and improvement.

5.6 Physical Resources *(Guidelines, p. 21)*
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.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
The program provided color-coded plan drawings of the architecture department spaces and their relative positions on campus as well as a video tour that included the opportunity to see spaces in use. Total current department floor area is roughly 39,000 SF. The program is maximizing the available facility in support of program goals. The program assigns students studio workstations as part of a cohort. As seen in the video, student studio desks in the Main Group are steps away from supporting lecture, review, and shop spaces. Gallery space is plentiful and well situated. The Long Lounge – the primary lecture space – is a flexible space for seating up to 100 occupants and is well situated. An additional larger venue is

24

available in nearby Huntington Hall. In VSV meetings, faculty discussed potential options that would benefit students, including changing faculty assigned to student cohorts, and strategies to enrich and encourage more extensive and communal student use of the existing studio space, perhaps by modeling behavior, reconfiguring studio spaces, or both.

Studio, classroom spaces, common study rooms, labs, offices, and maker spaces/provided equipment are well situated, spacious enough for program needs, appropriately equipped, and well-staffed. The department categorizes shop areas by the level of complexity and hazard of the equipment housed within. MIT students' access to higher hazard shops is dependent on their meeting safety training requirements. Faculty discussion noted weighing the potential benefits of changing student design studio desktop workstation software to a uniform platform that would better facilitate student communication and camaraderie.

Faculty offices are well situated and adequate for program needs. Offices on Level 4M, Building 10 are, however, somewhat remote from studios on lower levels.

The APR explains the program's evolving pedagogy in response to the stresses of the pandemic and its adaptation to remote learning as an institution long rooted in studio culture. The APR describes the SA+P leaning on MIT's IT resources and identifying unanticipated challenges that led to going beyond simple transferal of the physical studio to an online environment. The APR describes unanticipated re-visioning and a spirit of renewal to the benefit of the program as the SA+P emerges from remote and hybrid learning. The minutes of a MIT Core Summit noted this anxiousness for the future, though faculty comments displayed an engaging optimism, energy, and positivity.

Planned facility improvements give cause for further optimism. Remodeling of MIT's MET Warehouse will provide 217,000 GSF of facility floor area for all of SA+P. Slated for completion in 2025, the MET Warehouse will be the new expanded and consolidated home of the department and M.Arch. program, as well as including studios and research units for the urban planning and real estate programs, and the Morningside Academy of Design.

5.7 Financial Resources *(Guidelines, p. 21)*
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.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
Funding of the M.Arch. degree program is part of overall funding for the Department of Architecture, administered by the department head. Funding for the department comes from four sources. The General Institute Budget (GIB) is the primary source, combined with three other funding sources: earnings from endowments, recurring financial contributions from other MIT offices or departments, and faculty-controlled research grants. Note that in MIT's budget structure, all departments receive GIB funding directly, rather than going through the institute's constituent schools. Under the overall budget, the department operates five of its six groups (Architecture and Urbanism, Building Technology, Computation, History and Theory, and Art, Culture and Technology) and their respective degree programs. A separate dedicated endowment funds the Aga Khan Center for Islamic Architecture.

The pandemic brought financial stresses and budget shortfalls for the institute, including a 3% cut in the Department of Architecture's GIB allocation. In the department's response strategy, it did not consider cuts in payroll expenses and student support funding, in keeping with its enrollment practice and philosophy, which accounts for roughly 90% of the GIB allocation. Student tuition funding is at a current baseline of approximately 75% of a student's tuition costs with a future goal of 100% tuition funding. It is also the department's policy to not charge shop fees and to financially support student's costs for unusual or large models/projects. Beneficiaries of endowments as well as the balance of financial contributions that comprise the budget are immune to cuts. The 3% cuts accordingly had to be taken from the relatively small remaining operating budget (approximately $1M in 2020-2021). The department covered this

shortfall in the first post-pandemic year by small budget cuts across programs and $166,000 in support from the provost.

As explained in detail to the team during the site visit, the department has enacted a five-year plan to make up the budget shortfall. This has involved $96,000 in second year post-pandemic support from the provost followed by a successful fundraising effort that secured $1M in donations to be disbursed over a five year span. During those intervening five years or sooner, the department plans to secure an additional professorial endowment, righting the budget imbalance initiated by the pandemic.

5.8 Information Resources (*Guidelines*, p. 22)
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.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
The program clearly demonstrated that all groups have excellent access to a very strong collection of architectural literature, visual, and digital resources, as well as to a substantial group of discipline-specific librarians and professionals. In addition to the significant resources of the entire MIT library system, the program primarily draws on the resources of the Rotch Library, which is dedicated to serving the MIT School of Architecture and Planning. The Rotch collection includes more than 100,000 physical volumes, 150,000 slides and plates, and full digital resources. The library has a staff of 12, including a dedicated Architecture and Design Librarian, and is conveniently located for both the current and future physical configuration of the school. The team verified these conditions via the APR, the facilities video, the library's website, and discussion with the architecture librarian during the VSV.

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 (*Guidelines*, p. 23)
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.

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The Statement on NAAB Accredited Degrees appears on the Student Resources page of the department website*: https://architecture.mit.edu/student-resources#naab-accreditation.*

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures (*Guidelines*, p. 23)
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)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Links to the 2014 & 2020 NAAB Conditions and the 2012 & 2020 NAAB Procedures appear on the Student Resources page of the department website: *https://architecture.mit.edu/student-resources#naab-accreditation.*

6.3 Access to Career Development Information (*Guidelines*, p. 23)
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.

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The program provides information and links to full career development resources on the department website: *https://architecture.mit.edu/student-resources#career-development*. The Career Advising and Professional Development (CAPD) center features resources specifically related to architecture and planning careers, postings on MIT Handshake, and extensive resume & portfolio assistance resources. The MIT Alumni Advisor Hub also provides one-on-one advising and connections to opportunities in alumni firms.

As noted in the APR (p. 124), the program also includes two required courses in the curriculum dealing with career development, 4.210 Cultivating Critical Practice and 4.222 Professional Practice.

6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents (*Guidelines*, p. 23)
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

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Links to all required reports and NCARB ARE pass rates appear on the on the Student Resources page of the department website*: https://architecture.mit.edu/student-resources#naab-accreditation.*

The department shares the Review Value Statement with students, faculty and guest critics, serving as the central articulation of studio learning culture. The program introduces this in "The Review at MIT Architecture: Values and Goals" section of the department website: *https://architecture.mit.edu/about*. A

link to the AIAS framework for studio culture also appears on the department website: https://architecture.mit.edu/student-resources#naab-accreditation.

A summary and link to the Strategy and Equity Report appears on the department website: https://architecture.mit.edu/news/strategy-equity-year-review.

6.5 Admissions and Advising (*Guidelines*, p. 24)

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

⊠ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Full information and links to application forms and instructions, admissions requirements and procedures, the process for evaluation of prior education, financial aid and scholarships, and application of diversity goals appear on the department website: *https://architecture.mit.edu/graduate-admissions.*

6.6 Student Financial Information (*Guidelines*, p. 24)

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.

⊠ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The program provides access to resources and advice for making financial aid decisions on the *Student Financial Services* page of the MIT website: *http://sfs.mit.edu/.* Resources include calculators and tools for initial cost estimates, budgeting, financial aid, graduate stipends, and health plan costs.

V.   Appendices

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

PC.5 Research and Innovation

Framing research activities within the overarching context of MIT's renowned research and innovation production, the department furthers the practice and dissemination of architecturally related research with implications to both critical areas of societal impact as well as direct and indirect student learning, highlighting the confluence of research and design that builds the capacity for ongoing knowledge creation in MIT graduates.

PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture

The program is leading a distinctive culture of academic innovation and attention to not only students' needs, but in palpable ways to faculty and staff as well. Noticeably unique is the Review Value Statement shared with students, faculty, and guest critics that grounds the articulation and communication on studio culture. The level of support to graduate students (73.76%) in teaching or research positions, the plan to progressively subsidize most student tuition, and the empowering of students to engage with faculty and resources across the organization of the department, all are bright spots distinguishing the M.Arch. program.

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development

The department accommodates an unusually broad array of development and support opportunities serving faculty, students, and staff, emblematic of its ethos of shared culture. While faculty enjoy wide support for research, teaching, and professional development, staff benefit from significant development opportunities and a culture of inclusion. Students similarly enjoy diverse support opportunities and resources ranging from direct financial aid to research participation to a gamut of self-driven initiatives and activities, notably including a foundational and ongoing role in the department's Strategy and Equity team.

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Diversity, social equity, and inclusion/belonging (DEI) are key values that permeate the department's strategic goals, manifested in a significant portion of department resources in a wide range of initiatives. The department strives to reduce the financial burden of higher education on students, with generous (base 75%) scholarships offered to students, and annually increased during a student's time at MIT as the department secures additional funding. This in turn helps create a diverse student body. Extensive mentorship is provided to ensure a diverse faculty/staff as well; mentorship is clearly a large focus of the department's internal approach to ensuring lower staff turnover. Students are afforded mentorship through one-on-one advising with faculty, as well as a larger alumni mentorship program set to launch in the near future. The appointment of an associate department head with an explicit DEI portfolio as well as a Diversity, Equity, and Belonging Officer further confirms the department's commitment to addressing social equity concerns. In addition to personnel and student initiatives, the curriculum also highlights DEI issues, with consistent community involvement among under-represented communities in both core and option studios.

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

Program Criteria, and Student Criteria Matrix

Key: ■ Primary Evidence (dark red) ■ Secondary Evidence (olive)

Subject #	Subject Title	Term	Instructor(s)	PC.1 Career Paths	PC.2 Design	PC.3 Ecological Know. & Respon.	PC.4 History & Theory	PC.5 Research & Innovation	PC.6 Leadership & Collaboration	PC.7 Learning & Teaching Culture	PC.8 Social Equity & Inclusion	SC.1 HSW in the Built Environ.	SC.2 Professional Practice	SC.3 Regulatory Context	SC.4 Technical Knowledge	SC.5 Design Synthesis	SC.6 Building Integration
	Fall 2021 Semester	**FA 2021**															
4.105	Geometric Disciplines + Architecture Skills	FA 2021	Jih, J.		S												
4.151	Architecture Design Core Studio I	FA 2021	Clifford, Brandon		P				S		S						
4.151	Architecture Design Core Studio I	FA 2021	Landman, Jeffrey		P				S		S						
4.151	Architecture Design Core Studio I	FA 2021	Garcia, Deborah		P				S		S						
4.151	Architecture Design Core Studio I	FA 2021	Nahleh, Mohamad		P				S		S						
4.153	Architecture Design Core Studio III	FA 2021	Kennedy, Sheila		P			S	P		P		P	S	P	P	P
4.153	Architecture Design Core Studio III	FA 2021	el Samahy, Rami		P			S	P		P		P	S	P	P	P
4.153	Architecture Design Core Studio III	FA 2021	Jih, J.		P			S	P		P		P	S	P	P	P
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	FA 2021	Garcia-Abril, Anton		P												
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	FA 2021	Daniels, Yolande		P												
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	FA 2021	Pinochet, Diego		P												
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	FA 2021	Tessmer, Lavender		P												
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	FA 2021	Tibbits, Skylar		S				S						S		
4.210	Positions: Cultivating Critical Practice	FA 2021	Miljacki, Ana	P			S							S			
4.222	Professional Practice	FA 2021	Berry, Rebecca & Mohr, Robert			S							P	P			
4.463	Building Technology Systems: Structures and Envelopes	FA 2021	Mueller, Caitlin			P									P		P
4.464	Environmental Technologies in Buildings	FA 2021	Reinhart, Christoph			P							P		S		P
4.607	Thinking About Architecture: In History and at Present	FA 2021	Jarzombak, Mark				S										
4.621	Orientalism, Colonialism, and Representation	FA 2021	Rabbat, Nasser														
4.THG	Graduate Thesis	FA 2021	Garcia, Deborah	S				S									
	Spring 2022 Semester	**SP 2022**															
4.117	Creative Computation	SP 2022	Killian, Axel														
4.123	Architecural Assemblies	SP 2022	Simmons, Marc		S										P		
4.152	Architecture Design Core Studio II	SP 2022	Parreno Alonso, Cristina		P				P	P		P			P	S	
4.152	Architecture Design Core Studio II	SP 2022	French, Anda		P				P	P		P			P	S	
4.152	Architecture Design Core Studio II	SP 2022	Illia-Sheldahl, Silvia		P				P	P		P			P	S	
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	SP 2022	Bucci, Angelo		P			S									
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	SP 2022	Garcia, Deborah		P			S									
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	SP 2022	Goulthorpe, Mark		P			S									
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	SP 2022	Miljacki, Ana		P			S									
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	SP 2022	O'Brien, William		P			S									
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	SP 2022	Simmons, Marc		P			S									
4.154	Architecture Design Option Studio	SP 2022	Stanescu, Oana		P			S									
4.189	Preparation for MArch Thesis	SP 2022	Moe, Kiel, Nahleh, Mohamad	S				P									
4.241	The Making of Cities	SP 2022	Barrio, Roi Salgueiro				S										
4.462	Introduction to Structural Design	SP 2022	Ochsendorf, John			P											
4.511	Advanced Projects in Digital Fabrication	SP 2022	Sass, Lawrence			P											
4.521	Visual Computing	SP 2022	Knight, Terry			P											
4.567	Introduction to Building Information Modeling in Architecture	SP 2022	Nagakura, Takehiko			P											
4.612	Islamic Architecture and the Environment	SP 2022	Gupta, Huma				S										
4.645	Selected Topics in Architecture: 1750 to the Present	SP 2022	Dutta, Arindam				P										
	Non-Curricular																
	MITdesignX				S				P		S				S		
	M.Arch Alumni Contacts												S				
	AXP Faculty Advisor			P													
	NOMAS / ASC				S				S	S							
	Research Participation							P						S			
	Lectures, Panel, Symposia				S	S		P		S			S				
	Strategy & Equity								S	P							
	Review Value Statement								P								
	IAP				S			P							S		
Subject #	Subject Title	Term	Instructor(s)	PC.1	PC.2	PC.3	PC.4	PC.5	PC.6	PC.7	PC.8	SC.1	SC.2	SC.3	SC.4	SC.5	SC.6

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Practitioner Perspective
John Edwards, Assoc. AIA, LEED AP-BD+C
Bonstra | Haresign Architects
Washington, DC
202.250.9290
jedwards@bonstra.com

Educator Perspective
Salim Elwazani, PhD, AIA
Department of Architecture & Environmental Design
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403
selwaza@bgsu.edu

Regulator Perspective
Roch Manley, AIA
Manley Architects
Vancouver, WA
rmanley@manleyarchitects.com

Student Perspective
Ritika Iyer
BS Architecture, 2024
Northeastern University
Boston, MA
iyer.ri@northeastern.edu

Observer
Sean Keller, PhD
College of Architecture
Illinois Institute of Technology
3360 South State Street
Chicago, IL
skeller1@iit.edu

VI.   Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

John Edwards, Assoc. AIA, LEED AP-BD+C
Team Chair

Salim Elwazani, PhD, AIA
Team Member

Roch Manley, AIA
Team Member

Ritika Iyer, AIAS
Team Member

Sean Keller, PhD
Non-Voting Team Member