

2023 Visiting Team Report

Indiana University
Eskenazi School of Art,
Architecture + Design

M.Arch.

Initial Accreditation
October 16-18, 2023

NAAB

National
Architectural
Accrediting
Board, Inc.

Contents

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|--------------------|
| I. Summary of Visit | 3 |
| II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit | 4 |
| III. Program Changes | 4 |
| IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation | 5 |
| 1. Context and Mission | |
| 2. Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession | |
| 3. Program and Student Criteria | |
| 4. Curricular Framework | |
| 5. Resources | |
| 6. Public Information | |
| V. Appendices | 30 |
| 1. Conditions Met with Distinction | |
| 2. Team SPC Matrix | |
| 3. The Visiting Team | |
| VI. Report Signatures | 34 |

For Program COF

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The NAAB team enjoyed the three-day virtual site visit of the J. Irwin Miller M.Arch. program in the Indiana University Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture, + Design. The team would like to acknowledge the hard work of faculty, staff, and students in orchestrating the digital archive of documentation to support the program's NAAB review, particularly the work of Program Director T. Kelly Wilson. He generously shared his time and support to the team in the weeks and months leading up to the visit and provided additional information and assistance to the team during the visit. The team would also like to acknowledge the contributions of Provost Shrivastav and Dean Faimon, who provided valuable context for the M.Arch. program's history and present status in the university and school. The team would also like to thank the students and student leaders who gave of their time to meet with the team and share their backgrounds and perspectives illustrating what makes the IU M.Arch. invaluable to them.

During the visit, the team observed a young M.Arch. program that has attracted faculty and students from across the globe with its innovative curricular approach to pairing visual art studios with architectural design studios; by utilizing a strong connection to the community of Columbus, Indiana; and in providing travel opportunities for all students paid for by the program. The team heard from students how the parallel studio tracks first drew them to the program and continue to enrich their design thinking, design process, and design philosophy. Beyond the studios, students spoke of how the program welcomes, embraces, and honors their various global cultures, including hosting special events planned by students in one of the three primary student groups in the program: AIAS, NOMAS, and ArchGSA. Faculty, students, and staff spoke of the mutual respect and trust in the program and how their small size has cultivated a family-like atmosphere. This culture of respect extends into the greater Columbus community, where faculty and students engage community members and groups in art and design installations and projects. The program goes even further afield with its Nomadic Studio, currently planning a design-build studio in Mexico. The team observed how the program's curriculum, culture, and community engagement resonated throughout all of the stakeholder meetings.

The team also observed how the M.Arch. program has been a catalyst for the city of Columbus, attracting artists, architects, and students while leveraging the collection of modernist architecture in the area. Since the visit was virtual, the team was unable to experience the Republic Building, a 1971 modernist building that was designated a National Historic Landmark in 2012. However, it was clear to the team that this building is a source of pride and inspiration for the university and the city of Columbus. Students and faculty spoke of the "shop envy" visitors experience when seeing the woodshop and maker space, and faculty and administrators beamed with pride when discussing the building, a didactic tool for learning architectural history and theory, design, structures, building systems integration, and space planning. The openness of the spaces fosters a fluid approach to teaching and learning architecture, from art studios to architecture studios through the cyclical application of digital and traditional fabrication. Faculty and students spoke of the convenience and accessibility of resources available to them at all hours of the day.

Since the program hasn't yet gained accreditation and is part of the similarly new Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture, + Design, one challenge of the program is recruitment of students and the resulting desired growth in enrollment. The enrollment numbers have remained relatively flat since the first class began in 2018, while the existing facilities would support roughly double the student enrollment before outgrowing the space. The program anticipates this growth should their initial accreditation be granted. The prospect of enrollment growth relates to one of the few challenges identified during the visit. Columbus, like other smaller midwestern cities, has a shortage of affordable housing units. On-campus graduate student housing is not available in Columbus, and M.Arch. students would have to

travel to Bloomington to find this option. For students who have limited resources, the prospect of securing affordable housing in Columbus is daunting or nearly impossible. Faculty and administrators spoke of the possibility of new student housing coming to Columbus, which would be a welcome addition should the M.Arch. program increase its enrollment.

In summary, the team found a close-knit community of international educators and scholars, committed to the common goal of teaching and learning architecture through an innovative curriculum that places students in the community and around the globe. There are challenges, such as affordable housing and inter-campus travel and collaboration, that correspond to a stand-alone program in a small post-industrial city; however, thus far, the J. Irwin Miller M.Arch. program has met those challenges and is poised to grow and advance.

b. Conditions with a Team Recommendation to the Board as Not Achieved (*list number and title*)

None

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

Previous Team Report (2021):

2020 Conditions Not Met

None

2020 Conditions Not Yet Met or in Progress

- 2. Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession
- PC.5 Research and Innovation
- PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration
- PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture
- SC.2 Professional Practice
- SC.3 Regulatory Context
- SC.5 Design Synthesis
- SC.6 Building Integration
- 5.1 Structure and Governance
- 5.2 Planning and Assessment
- 5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development
- 5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- 5.6 Physical Resources
- 5.7 Financial Resources
- 5.8 Information Resources
- 6.3 Access to Career Development Information

2023 Team Analysis:

The program has sufficiently addressed these conditions not yet met from their previous visit.

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:

Not applicable. The program was previously visited in November 2021, under the current 2020 Conditions for Accreditation.

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 Summary Statement of 1 – Context and Mission:

“The J. Irwin Miller Architecture Program is a three-year Master of Architecture degree program housed within the Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture + Design, one of three schools and over 70 departments and programs within the College of Arts and Sciences located in Bloomington, Indiana, the flagship campus of Indiana University.

The program, located in Columbus, IN, 40 miles east of the main campus of Indiana University in Bloomington, IN is a collaboration between the community of Columbus, IN and Indiana University, purposed to link the best assets within the city of Columbus with the best assets of Indiana University to build and continually develop an innovative architectural design education program.

The mission of the program is to prepare students for leadership roles in the profession and in architectural innovation, for community-minded service towards a built environment mindful of civic consciousness, and to become globally and culturally aware designers who are advocates for the sustainable practice of architecture and the stewardship of the environment.

Our curriculum, formed around parallel studio experiences of architectural design and studio art (visual studies) in each semester of the 3-year program, proposes that a life-long activity of cross-pollination between two closely allied disciplines is fundamental to innovation. This curricular idea is purposed to compel our students to find, for themselves, linkages between art and architecture, and to build unique identities within the art and design worlds and the practice of architecture rather than have identities thrust upon them.”

2023 Team Analysis:

The three-year J. Irwin Miller M.Arch. program resides in Columbus, Indiana, forty (40) miles from the main IU Bloomington campus, part of the public flagship university of Indiana. The M.Arch. program takes advantage of the community engagement opportunities in and funding provided by the city of Columbus. Local engagement, global studios, and a parallel art and design curriculum reflect the program’s mission grounded in design thinking and civic consciousness. The team observed that the distance between Columbus and Bloomington creates a geographic gap between the program and its home unit, the Eskenazi School. Faculty and administrators commented on the ways they bridge the gap, including the

dean's regular visits to the Columbus campus and M.Arch. faculty serving on committees that meet regularly in Bloomington. The faculty also commented on initiatives to connect M.Arch. students and MFA students through joint exhibitions alternating between the two campuses.

The Miller M.Arch. program benefits from its location in several ways. Columbus is one of the top cities in America for modern architecture promoted by the industrialist and patron, J. Irwin Miller. Students have architectural masterpieces within walking distance. Also, Columbus business leaders, civic leaders, and community leaders collaborate with the program, provide student project opportunities, and attend final public reviews of student work. Furthermore, the M.Arch. program engages the community through applied art and design scholarship initiatives, i.e. a design project with Cummins, a Columbus-based industry partner. Faculty described the rich connections made between the M.Arch. program and the city of Columbus and how the M.Arch. program has served as a magnet and catalyst for public arts initiatives and private art galleries.

During the visit, the team documented various ways the program encourages students and faculty to learn inside and outside the classroom. The Nomadic Studio, a study abroad program for which students' expenses are covered by the program, is a source of pride for the program. One of the primary means for students to learn outside the classroom, the upcoming Nomadic Studio will travel to Mexico for a design-build project. Closer to home, the Miller M.Arch. provides off-campus opportunities for students and faculty through Columbus, IN, Exhibit Columbus, and the Columbus Area Arts Council. Students are furthermore engaged in student clubs and organizations such as AIAS, NOMAS, and ArchGSA.

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:

Design:

Per the APR pp. 14-15, the program defines its three principles for a design education with the goal to prepare students with critical and technical skills allowing them "liberty and license to engage in multiple artistic design opportunities, alongside or in contrast to working in a professional architectural office." Evidence of cross-disciplinary design and expanding the definition of design occurs in the curriculum which uses a parallel series of visual and architectural studios. Critical skills for design synthesis and integrated design are evidenced in SOAD-Z 601: *Architectural Studio 3*, SOAD-Z 641: *Energy & Environmental Systems 1*, and SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2* in course overview, schedule, learning objectives and student work. Holistic review and assessment of the program including curriculum occurs annually at a faculty retreat, with the program Advisory Board, and through Alumni Survey with resultant modifications prioritized for implementation.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility:

Per the APR pp. 17-19, the program indicates their foundational ideology for preparing students to become responsible designers, to serve and protect public HSW, and to advocate for the built environment. These principles are integrated throughout the curriculum, lectures, and community outreach, but are evidenced in provided materials (course outline, schedule, learning objectives and student work) for SOAD-Z 641: *Energy & Environmental Systems 1* and SOAD-Z 642: *Energy & Environmental Systems 2*. The program utilizes a uniform strategy and process to assess student learning at the course level that is part of the holistic review and assessment of the program that occurs annually.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion:

Per the APR pp. 19-21, the program is committed to the advancement of equity, diversity and inclusion as evidenced in faculty participation in the Eskenazi School IDEA Committee and DEI Fellow credential, in maintaining a program Diversity and Inclusion Coordinator, in the creation of a program sponsored DEI Fellowship open to domestic students, and in the establishment of a nationally recognized chapter of NOMAS. Opportunities for DEI principles in engagement and design are found throughout the program curriculum and extracurricular activities as evidenced by the AIAS participation in Freedom by Design Project, the fully funded Nomadic Travel program, and in the program's unique relationship with the city of Columbus, IN. The IDEA Committee conducts an annual "climate survey" to identify opportunities and challenges. Students, faculty and staff expressed appreciation for the diverse and accommodating culture during the virtual site visit.

Knowledge and Innovation:

Per the APR pp. 21-23, the program identifies their unique curriculum using a parallel series of visual and architectural studios as a means to innovation and a "vigilant technique of iteration" as the vehicle for knowledge. SOAD-Z 701: *Architectural Studio 5* has been created to focus on research and innovation. The program has a long-term plan to utilize community partnerships to innovate design and engage with other disciplines in the IU arts and sciences to further knowledge. The program utilizes a uniform strategy and process to assess student learning at the course level that is part of the holistic review and assessment of the program that occurs annually.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement:

Per the APR pp. 23-26, the program has a strong emphasis on leadership, collaboration, and community. Utilizing its unique relationship with Columbus, IN, community engagement and opportunities for collaboration and leadership are evidenced in the program curriculum and extracurricular activities

(lectures and exhibitions), and with professional engagement opportunities. Long term plan includes the preparation of a strategic community engagement plan for mutually beneficial direct curricular and extracurricular opportunities. The program utilizes a uniform strategy and process to assess student learning at the course level that is part of the holistic review and assessment of the program that occurs annually. There are three active student organizations (ArchGSA, AIAS and NOMAS) that enable students to experience leadership roles, collaborate and engage with design and community.

Lifelong Learning:

Per the APR pp. 26-28, the program supports the belief that learning is an “acquired habit of mind and act” beginning in design education and extends into the profession. The program utilizes a Community Engagement Coordinator to connect academia with those in the profession. Hosting visiting faculty, lecturers and exhibitions, integrating professional interactions within the curriculum, and engaging alumni through surveys are active conditions in evidence. The program indicates planned improvements as a result of the latest assessment.

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 program has two courses that address this criterion: SOAD-Z 651: *Coalition and Community Building* as well as SOAD-Z 661: *Professional Practice*. The curriculum and schedule provided by the program highlights the SLOs that align with the NAAB guidelines. “The NCARB Advisor, who is also our Community Engagement Coordinator, seeks out the best opportunities for internship pathways, linking students with design professionals within the community and the state,” per APR response p. 29. Per the APR response a thorough understanding of professional practice is discussed throughout the curriculum.

The program provided data on faculty evaluation by grades, OCQ summary, postmortem evaluations, advisory board discussions, alumni review, and exit interviews to show the cycles of assessment that takes place for this curriculum. Over the course of the curriculum, the program exposes students to information about career opportunities through student and community engagement per the APR response pp. 29-30. Students are made aware of the AXP guidelines and most begin collecting their credits while enrolled in the program. Majority agreed with: “The Professional Practice course (SOAD-Z 661) gave me an understanding of the paths to becoming a licensed architect in the United States and the range of available career opportunities that utilize the discipline’s skills and knowledge”.

Per the alumni responses:

- a. Majority strongly agreed with: “I have been offered increased responsibility, seniority, and/or compensation over the course of my creative practice.”
- b. Majority somewhat agreed with: “I regularly participate in leadership program, i.e., YAF, AIA, ASLA, NOMA.”
- c. Fifteen (15) alumni are not registered as architects. Eight are members of AIA where five are not.

During the visit the staff noted that there are a lot of community events and engagements which help provide a platform for the students to show their work and abilities. The students and the student leaders confirmed that they were familiar with the ALA and the career paths per NAAB requirements.

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:

This criterion is met within the Miller M. Architecture program through the instruction of the “twin studios” relating to both architecture and visual art (such as the duality between SOAD-Z 502: *Architectural Studio 2* and SOAD-Z 512: *Visual Studies Studio 2*), described in the APR, pp. 30-37. The program uniquely structures its curriculum around the idea that architecture and art can cross-pollinate and make both practices successful in different but parallel ways. While the architectural studios exercise the technical side of the student through invention and application of ideas into context, the visual studios act as a catalyst for personal expression of the student. Both studios produce their work through the means of an iterative process, and it services the students by creating opportunities for new ideas to flourish while being informed by past works and precedent. These studios culminate with the Nomadic Studios set within a student’s final semester (SOAD-Z 702: *Architectural Studio 6* and SOAD-Z 712: *Visual Studies Studio 6*) that take the knowledge set forth by preceding studios and apply it to foreign, urban contexts.

The means of assessment within each of these studios are typical across many of the assessment points, such as an evaluation through a given grade, course questionnaires, and faculty meetings through a retreat and postmortem discussion. Other means of assessment more relative to this particular assessment point is through curriculum meetings to address context and sequencing as well as alumni interviews that have been conducted at the one-year interval and will be conducted at the three and five year intervals. Students receive an A- or higher in grades on average and feedback from questionnaires regarding the courses meeting or exceeding learning objectives was confirmed through student meetings suggesting that this aspect of the program was a primary factor that drove the students to attend the Miller M. Architecture program. Plans for improvements are rooted in rearranging each course’s individual efforts such as an alteration of weeks within the Nomadic Studios, focusing the first semester studio on iteration (SOAD-Z 501: *Architectural Studio 1* and SOAD-Z 511: *Visual Studies Studio 1*), and relocating items to different studio courses. This is evident particularly through their use of previous studio projects for other coursework (such as utilizing SOAD-Z 601: *Architectural Studio 3* for SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2*) as confirmed by the director with their strategy for the program.

The team confirmed evidence for the program’s meeting this criterion during the virtual visit meetings with students and faculty as well as a meeting with the program director in which he walked the team through the program’s approach to design synthesis and integration.

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:

Per the APR pp. 37-38, the program describes its approach to this criterion. In SOAD-Z 641: *Energy & Environmental Systems 1* and SOAD-Z 642: *Energy & Environmental Systems 2* evidence of fundamental building science exploration in design, environmental analysis with software and professional building rating systems and ecological reflection of climate change is indicated in the course overview, schedule, learning objectives and student work.

The program utilizes a uniform strategy and process to assess student learning for each Student Criteria (SC). For PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility, the team found evidence of assessment in documents provided outside of the APR to include student learning outcomes (SLO) specific to this criterion, benchmark for student success (defined as understanding and demonstration of SLO by instructor grading and software analytics), student course reflection assessment, self-assessment (course evaluations), Postmortem summary, program Advisory Board review (acknowledged), and Alumni Survey (1yr). Modifications to the curriculum resulting from assessment documented in Curriculum Committee notes were submitted outside of the APR.

The team verified evidence during meetings with the director, faculty, and students and during the virtual site visit.

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 program describes its approach to meeting this criterion in the APR (pp. 37-39). The program teaches history and theory through SOAD-Z 531, SOAD-Z 532, (theory & context I & II) SOAD-Z 781 (History & theory), SOAD-Z 807 (Special Topics) per APR response pp. 39-41. The program provided their syllabus & schedule. The syllabus outlines the SLOs for the curriculum along with an overview of how the topics are taught within the class in SOAD-Z 781: Arch design theory F22 Syllabus.pdf The objectives speak to a general overview of human and environmental conditions, while showing that “architecture, society, and culture of any given moment are always closely intertwined”. The schedule shows in detail what is taught each class.

The program provided the faculty assessment, OCQ summaries, postmortem summaries, advisory board reviews, exit interviews and alumni one-year summary. The faculty described how this cycle of assessments is ongoing and that the instructional grades, OCQs, curriculum is discussed in the year end postmortem which is then discussed with the advisory board. All this is evident in the changes that are suggested within the Changes PC4.pdf that is provided.

During the virtual site visit, the faculty member who teaches this subject spoke about how this course is taught in class with reference to NAAB’s guidelines. The subject has become woven into the visual studies and studio courses as well and is a part of understanding art and architecture holistically. The program director explained that they offer knowledge & understanding of western and non-western civilizations within SOAD-Z 807, an elective course. The courses in Rome help understand how a city evolves over time - the program has used historians to help teach this class.

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 program describes its strategic approach to preparing students to engage in research and innovation in the APR (pp. 39-41).

The program has chosen to address PC.5 in a studio, SOAD-Z 701: *Architectural Studio 5*, the “Research and Innovation” studio, taught for the first time in fall 2022. In this particular case, students explored computational modeling to develop facades for an existing structure in China. This project aligns with the program’s focus on digital tools for the evaluation of building envelopes’ performance. In addition to this

course, the program offers students the opportunity to engage in research as graduate assistants in collaboration with faculty in the program.

The program has a five-step assessment process for each of the NAAB Conditions for accreditation. The SLOs for this PC were provided to the team, along with the student evaluation surveys and results, postmortem documents, advisory board review, first-year-out surveys, and notes from the curriculum committee. The program made changes in 2022 around this PC, moving its content to Architectural Studio 5, and provided future change recommendations to decouple the digital tools development to an earlier semester.

The team confirmed this criterion being met during meetings with faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Faculty and students spoke of opportunities for research assistantships and the mutual benefits to faculty and students alike.

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:

Per the APR pp. 43-45, the program describes its approach to this criterion utilizing its unique relationship with the city of Columbus, IN to inform the curriculum. In SOAD-Z 651: *Community and Coalition Building*, evidence of collaboration, leadership and community engagement is indicated in the course overview, schedule and learning objectives. Provided documentation such as student work specifically highlights the program's collaboration with the community's CivicLab where students utilize a proven working method, the "stakeholder engagement process". In SOAD-Z 661: *Professional Practice*, physical context and work within a multidisciplinary team are indicated in the course overview, schedule, and learning objectives. Non-curricular activities noted in support of this criterion included voluntary, yet structured engagement with the community ServeDesign Center for internships and participation in projects associated with the Center for Rural Engagement.

The program utilizes a uniform strategy and process to assess student learning for each Student Criteria (SC). For PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration, the team found evidence of assessment in documents provided outside of the APR to include student learning outcomes (SLO) specific to this criterion, benchmark for student success (defined as understanding and demonstration of SLO by instructor grading), self-assessment (course evaluations-inadequate data due to low student participation, Postmortem summary, program Advisory Board review (acknowledged), Alumni Survey (1yr), and an ad hoc Columbus Community Leadership Review. Modifications to the curriculum resulting from assessment documented in Curriculum Committee notes were submitted outside of the APR.

The team verified evidence during meetings with the director, faculty, and students and during the virtual site 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 program describes how it meets this criterion in the APR (pp.44-45). A cornerstone of the program's meeting this criterion is its Learning and Teaching Culture Policy, publicly accessible through its website (<https://architecture.indiana.edu/academics/learning-teaching-culture.html> accessed Oct. 15, 2023). The policy is based around these primary traits: 1) a collaborative and team-driven mindset, 2) an aptitude for

healthy dialogue and critique 3) respect and care for the creative ideas and personal space of others, and 4) understanding and knowledge through iterative making.

The program describes how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address its learning and teaching culture in the APR, stressing the importance of the program's parallel emphases of art and architecture. Studios are structured in parallel, one emphasizing visual exploration in drawing, painting, and observational representation, and the other emphasizing architectural design problems. The program also describes its commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion, codified in the Eskenazi School's Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, + Access Plan. The clearest curricular evidence of this criterion being met is in the course SOAD-Z 651: *Community and Coalition Building*.

The program assesses its Learning and Teaching Culture Policy regularly with students at the beginning of each semester (APR p.45). The program provided documentation of its assessment of the policy, including Online Course Questionnaire data, meeting minutes from faculty-student meetings, and the first-year out survey data.

The team confirmed this evidence from meetings with faculty and with the program director. The team found the strongest evidence of this criterion being met while meeting with students and student leaders. While the specific policy was not universally understood, it was clear to the team that the program lives out and embodies an ethos grounded in mutual respect, optimism, sharing, and engagement. Students spoke passionately about how open and accessible faculty are and about how faculty go above and beyond to care about students and their welfare.

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 program describes how it meets this criterion in the APR (pp.45-49). The program grounds its response to this criterion in its DEI plan, grounded in the following principles: 1) foster an inclusive and equitable student/faculty/staff experience, 2) require equitable and inclusive recruitment of diverse faculty, staff, and students, 3) champion teaching/curriculum that cultivates inclusive and equitable excellence, 4) support research/creative activity that enriches our DEI culture, 5) communicate and promote the Eskenazi School's DEI culture, and 6) establish a DEI Committee to spark and sustain DEI culture/initiatives.

At the curricular level, the program furthers students' understanding of diverse cultural and social contexts through required courses, including SOAD-Z 807: *Special Topics in Theory/Criticism*, SOAD-Z 781: *Architectural Design Theory*, SOAD-Z 641 and SOAD-Z 642: *Environmental Systems 1 and 2*, SOAD-Z 651 *Coalition and Community Building*, SOAD-Z 661: *Professional Practice*, and SOAD-Z 702: *Nomadic Studio*. The Miller M.Arch. program also provides extracurricular experiences for students, such as a lecture series with diverse speakers, study abroad design studios located in different geographical and cultural contexts, and local connections in Columbus with the school system through a collaboration with CivicLab, a working group of the Community Education Coalition.

The program assesses student learning relative to social equity and inclusion using the same strategies of assessment as with other criteria. These assessment tools include program objectives, assessment measurements, data, and changes as a result of assessment. The data includes a DEI Committee climate survey, diversity demographics data, and the results from a first-year-out survey. The program has identified a number of strategic actions and implementation plans for DEI and has provided a list of eight changes and five future changes as a result of their assessment of PC.8.

The team confirmed evidence of the program's DEI initiatives with the director, IDEA Committee's interim chair, faculty, and students during the visit.

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 program describes its approach to meeting this criterion in the APR (pp. 49-50). Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment is addressed within the courses of SOAD-Z 661: *Professional Practice*, SOAD-Z 641: *Energy & Environmental Systems 1*, and SOAD-Z 642: *Energy & Environmental Systems 2*. While it is present within other courses such as SOAD-Z 651: *Community and Coalition Building* as well as SOAD-Z 801: *Special Topics in Theory and Criticism* (Cultural Consciousness), these three courses take on this criterion by instructing the health, safety, and welfare at different scales: SOAD-Z 641: *Energy 1* and SOAD-Z 642: *Energy 2* instruct within the scale of a building by understanding its particular elements such as air quality, acoustics, and environmental comfort, and SOAD-Z 661: *Professional Practice* instruct this within a more urban context through urban planning, zoning, and building codes. These are present within course notes and syllabi and are confirmed through faculty and student conversations and observations conducted by the visiting team.

The program provided means of assessment such as completion of assignments, questionnaires, discussions, meetings, and surveys that culminate in a majority of students receiving an A- or higher with alumni surveys strongly agreeing to the fact that the program provides a “holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments.” Improvements to these courses resulting from assessment are found through a greater coordination between SOAD-Z 601: *Architectural Studio 3* and SOAD-Z 641: *Energy + Environmental Systems 1* for better synthesis, final studio projects to include HSW issues, and SOAD-Z 661: *Professional Practice* to strengthen knowledge on building codes and amendments within the jurisdiction of Indiana. Future planning includes a focus on maintaining engagement issues relative to the local community of Columbus.

The team verified this evidence during conversations with students and faculty during the virtual site visit.

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 program describes its approach to meeting this criterion in the APR (pp. 50-52). While the program described how SC.2 is primarily addressed in the course, SOAD-Z 661: *Professional Practice*, the team found clearer evidence elsewhere, in courses SOAD-Z 641 and SOAD-Z 642: *Energy + Environmental Systems I and II*, SOAD-Z 651: *Coalition and Community Building*, and SOAD-Z 807: *Cultural Consciousness*.

The program assesses student learning for each SC using the same strategy and process. For SC.2, the program provided the Visiting Team with the SLOs particular to SC.2, a summary of the program’s self-assessment five-part strategy for assessing SC.2, a postmortem summary, advisory board commentary (no comment from board), and a 1st year out summary. The team found more thorough evidence of this criterion’s assessment in the other courses listed above.

The team confirmed this evidence during the site visit's meeting with students, faculty, and the Architect Licensing Advisor.

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:

Per the APR pp. 54-55, the program describes this criterion as being “presented and discussed as a continuum” through the identified courses. In SOAD-Z 651: *Community and Coalition Building*, evidence of regulatory context (building code and zoning code) are indicated in the course overview, schedule and learning objectives. In SOAD-Z 661: *Professional Practice*, foundational principles are indicated in course overview, schedule and learning objectives. Evidence of student understanding of zoning/land use and building code is indicated in course syllabus, assignments and selected student work for SOAD-Z 601: *Architectural Studio III*. SOAD-Z 641: *Energy & Environmental Systems 1*, the course syllabus indicates evidence of codes and regulations specific to energy. Evidence of life-safety/egress is indicated in SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2* course syllabus, lecture summaries and selected student work.

The program utilizes a uniform strategy and process to assess student learning for each Student Criteria (SC). For SC.3 Regulatory Context, the team found evidence of assessment in documents provided outside of the APR to include student learning outcomes (SLO) specific to this criterion, benchmark for student success (defined as understanding and demonstration of SLO by instructor grading), self-assessment (course evaluations-inadequate data due to low student participation, postmortem summary, and program Advisory Board review (acknowledged). Modifications to the curriculum resulting from assessment documented in Curriculum Committee notes were submitted outside of the APR.

The team verified evidence during meetings with the director and faculty during the virtual site 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 program describes its approach to this criterion in the APR (pp. 54-56). The program addresses technical knowledge not only in the courses of SOAD-Z 521: *Structures 1* and SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2* but also within the SOAD-Z 641: *Energy + Environmental Systems 2* course as well. The program utilizes the knowledge gained across all three courses to understand the what is currently established within the systems, technologies, and assemblies and apply this knowledge to work conducted as evidence through assignment sheets most prevalent for SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2* but also present within SOAD-Z 521: *Structures 1* and SOAD-Z 641: *Energy + Environmental Systems 2*. The team confirmed that this knowledge is evident through interviews with student leaders during the team's visit.

The program assesses these measures through the completion of assignments with a given grade and OCQ questionnaires while also meeting with the advisory board as well as the faculty through the Post-Mortem discussion and all-faculty meeting. Benchmarks include a majority of students receiving a grade of A- or higher in the self-assessed courses of SOAD-Z 521: *Structures 1* and SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2* courses with the OCQ questionnaires suggesting that the course is “remarkably strong” with an “instructor of exceptional value.” Results include the courses meeting an average of high grades while meeting the learning objectives; although, there are hopes for an even deeper connection between technical

knowledge and structures with all studio design projects with greater material investigation. Improvements to the courses include a reduced number of assignments within SOAD-Z 521: *Structures 1* to expand on materiality within structural systems as well as SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2* to allow for the advancement of a previous studio design project rather than designing a new building from scratch.

The team verified this evidence during meetings with the director, faculty, and students during the virtual site 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 program describes its approach to meeting this criterion in the APR (pp. 56-58). For SC.5, the program strategically assigns students a complex site with a plethora of regulatory, environmental, and accessibility challenges built in. Students are forced to address this criterion head-on as they complete assignments for SOAD-Z 601: *Architecture Design Studio 3* and SOAD-Z 641: *Energy + Environmental Systems 1*.

The program demonstrates how it meets this criterion in its curriculum, structure, and experiences through the student work examples provided to the team (described below).

- User Requirements - This sub criterion is met in the student work from assignment: "User Requirements" (program summary, equipment specs, clearances, space descriptions) The projects that are submitted show user requirements through adjacency diagrams, clearances, a description of the program along with studying workflow and placement of equipment.
- Regulatory Requirements - This sub criterion is met in the student work from assignment: "Regulatory Requirements" (easements, setbacks, flood plain, occupancy, max. height, parking rqmts., utilities) The student work submitted demonstrates an understanding of city zoning code showing setbacks, floodplains, height restrictions etc. The students have also studied occupancy requirements and parking requirements within their work. A project submitted also looks at rezoning a site.
- Site Conditions - This sub criterion is met in the student work from assignment: "Site Conditions" (site access, noise, land use, solar orientation, prevailing winds) The projects submitted take a thorough look at the site. The site studies include the weather pattern, topography, flood map, landscape, public transportation and a section through the site.
- Accessible Design - This sub criterion is met in the student work from assignment: "Accessibility Exercise-Plan" and "Accessibility Exercise-Section" (standalone assignment to explore accessibility in detail) The projects submitted show an initial understanding of accessible design. This is demonstrated through references to ADA documentation, a study of a ramp through a site as well as an outline of accessible door swings drawn within the projects themselves.
- Measurable Environmental Impacts of Design Decisions - This sub criterion is met in the student work from assignment: "Final Project" (interior solar radiation studies + global warming diagrams) The student projects submitted under "Final project" headline are a culmination of all the parts and pieces that were studied prior to the final project. The designs document these requirements and show how the design integrates and solves for these requirements. Furthermore, the student evidence shows a response through a canopy to the sun's rays, collection of rainwater as well as materials that are used. The regulatory and user requirements are noted within the project and shown clearly within the design response.

The program provided detailed student work that demonstrated the integration of student learning within the projects that were submitted. The students noted user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions and accessible design and eventually integrated all these within the final projects for SOAD-Z

601: *Architecture Design Studio 3*. The program assesses student learning for each SC using the same strategy and process. For SC.5, the program provided the Visiting Team with the SLOs particular to SC.5, a summary of the program's self-assessment five-part strategy for assessing SC.5, a postmortem summary, advisory board commentary, meeting notes from the curriculum committee addressing SC.5., and a 1st year out summary.

The team confirmed the evidence while meeting with the faculty & the students. A meeting with the program director clarified the program's approach to meeting SC.5 and SC.6 during the virtual site visit.

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 program describes its approach to meeting this criterion in the APR (pp. 58-60). The program demonstrates it's addressing this criterion through its means of integration primarily within the SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2* course, but also within the SOAD-Z 641: *Energy + Environmental Systems 1* and the SOAD-Z 642: *Energy + Environmental Systems 2* courses that are taught in either previous or within the same semester respectively. Knowing the dense and complex nature that structure and systems has within its integration of a building, the program addresses this integration by taking previous designs from SOAD-Z 601: *Architectural Studio 3* with prior knowledge gained from adjacent courses to develop a portion of their studio project in detail. Through the evidence of student work, the work conducted ultimately culminates into a drawing set created within SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2* that includes aspects such as fire safety, wall sections, details, structural sheets, mechanical sheets, energy analysis, and ultimately how the plan of the studio project was revised to accommodate these new conditions presented. The program demonstrates how it meets this criterion through the student work examples provided to the team from SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2* (described below).

- Building Envelope Systems + Assemblies - This sub criterion is met in the student work from the assignment, "Final Drawing Submission," which includes building sections and wall sections indicating envelope systems and assemblies on sheets in a DD set of drawings.
- Structural Systems - This sub criterion is met in the student work from the assignment, "Final Drawing Submission," which includes structural plans, building sections, wall sections indicating structural systems on sheets in a DD set of drawings.
- Environmental Control Systems - This sub criterion is met in the student work from the assignment, "Final Drawing Submission," which includes mechanical/HVAC sheets and energy modeling sheets in a DD set of drawings.
- Life Safety Systems - This sub criterion is met in the student work from the assignment, "Final Drawing Submission," which includes life safety plan sheets, diagrams, and calculations on sheets in a DD set of drawings.
- Measurable Outcomes of Building Performance - This sub criterion is met in the student work from the assignment, "Final Drawing Submission," which includes building performance sheets with pre and post-performance analyses in a DD set of drawings.

Assessment evidence provided to the team includes evaluations, questionnaires, and discussions alongside meetings with the curriculum committees and the J. Irwin Miller Architecture program advisory board are present with benchmarks such as a majority of students receiving a B+ or higher within the SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2* course and questionnaires suggesting that the course is "remarkably strong" with an "instructor of exceptional value." Changes for improvements were the suggestion of material investigation as evidenced within the questionnaire as well as a deeper focus of structure and envelope through a "further integration between SOAD-Z 642: *Energy + Environmental Systems 2* and SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2* to address environmental control systems."

The team confirmed the evidence while meeting with the faculty & the students. A meeting with the program director clarified the program's approach to meeting SC.5 and SC.6 during the virtual site visit.

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 team found that the program meets this criterion by virtue of the university's accreditation. The program has provided the team with a letter from the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) dated December 15, 2017. This letter affirms Indiana University Bloomington's accreditation until 2027-28.

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.

- 4.2.1 **Professional Studies.** Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program are the core of a professional degree program that leads to licensure. Knowledge from these courses is used to satisfy Condition 3—Program and Student Criteria. The degree program has the flexibility to add additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. In its documentation, the program must clearly indicate which professional courses are required for all students. *(p.13)*
- 4.2.2 **General Studies.** An important component of architecture education, general studies provide basic knowledge and methodologies of the humanities, fine arts, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences. Programs must document how students earning an accredited degree achieve a broad, interdisciplinary understanding of human knowledge. In most cases, the general studies requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution's baccalaureate degree. Graduate programs must describe and document the criteria and process used to evaluate applicants' prior academic experience relative to this requirement. Programs accepting transfers from other institutions must document the criteria and process used to ensure that the general education requirement was covered at another institution. *(p.14)*
- 4.2.3 **Optional Studies.** All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum to allow students to develop additional expertise, either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking courses offered within the department offering the accredited program but outside the required professional studies curriculum. These courses may be configured in a variety of curricular structures, including elective offerings, concentrations, certificate programs, and minors. *(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.

- 4.2.4 **Bachelor of Architecture.** The B. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 150 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in general studies, professional studies, and optional studies, all of which are delivered or accounted for (either by transfer or articulation) by the institution that will grant the degree. Programs must document the required professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.
- 4.2.5 **Master of Architecture.** The M. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate coursework and a minimum of 30 semester credits of graduate coursework. Programs must document the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for both the undergraduate and graduate degrees.
- 4.2.6 **Doctor of Architecture.** The D. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 210 credits, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate and graduate coursework. The D. Arch. requires a minimum of 90 graduate-level semester credit hours, or the graduate-level 135 quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in professional studies and optional studies. Programs must document, for both undergraduate and graduate degrees, the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.

Met

2023 Team Analysis:

These criteria are met. The program provided the team with a link to a chart illustrating the professional studies courses (4.2.1), general studies courses (4.2.2), and optional studies courses (4.2.3) for students in the M.Arch. program. The program requires admitted students to have received an undergraduate degree of 120 semester credit hours. The M.Arch. degree program requires an additional 108 semester credit hours for a total of 228 semester credit hours required to complete the M.Arch. degree program. Of these 228 credit hours, 72 are required professional studies; 27 are general studies; 9 are optional studies; and 9 are elective professional courses. As some of the elective courses vary from year to year, the program provided lists of courses offered in 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23 in its APR (pp. 61-64).

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:

4.3.1 The program provided the team with a copy of its “Course Waiver Policy” document dated April 2021. The program offers standard waivers to four courses, and the program provided blank copies of the waiver review forms for these four courses: SOAD-Z 641: *Energy + Environmental Systems 1*, SOAD-Z 642: *Energy + Environmental Systems 2*, SOAD-Z 521: *Structures 1*, and SOAD-Z 522: *Structures 2*

4.3.2 The procedures for securing exemptions from these four courses account for NAAB criteria, PC.3 and SC.4.

4.3.3 The program provided a link to its online application process.

The team verified this criterion being met during a meeting during the virtual site visit with the director, who walked the team through the evaluation process, including documentation from a student who had requested a waiver from a course.

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:

5.1.1 Per the APR p. 70 and verified during the virtual site visit, the Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture + Design, described as “an integrated unit with no department structure”, is situated within the College of Arts and Sciences at Indiana University. An aggregate of seven “academic areas” or disciplines each led by a director (assisted by the director of Undergraduate Studies and the Executive Director of Academics) form the Eskenzi School. Since the area or discipline of architecture is exclusively at the graduate level, leadership is provided singularly by the director of Graduate Studies MArch. Key personnel are identified ([22123_IU Leadership Diagrams.pdf](#)).

5.1.2 Governance for the program is directly linked to that of the Eskenazi School since both entities recently formed. Described in the APR 70-71, enumerated in the linked website <https://eskenazi.indiana.edu/faculty/faculty-governance.html> and as verified during the virtual site visit, the documents of governance to include voting rights are “in progress” and are expected to evolve with program development. Currently, the program leadership and faculty act together in committee to address issues weekly at faculty meetings and bi-weekly with the Eskenazi School’s Dean. The Eskenazi

School has two committees with elected membership: the Faculty Advisory Board (FAB) and Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T).

Participation in university governance is regulated by the established Constitution of the Faculty of Indiana University and the faculty constitutions of each campus.

The student governance document (constitution) developed by the ArchGSA (graduate student organization) in Fall 2018 was approved and adopted in Spring 2019. The "constitution" is a living document. Discussions/issues are reviewed by ArchGSA officers (elected annually) multiple times a semester with a school meeting held once a semester. Faculty has an "open-door" policy for informal discussions. Student officers participate in faculty meetings as needed.

5.2 Planning and Assessment (*Guidelines, p. 18*)

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

- 5.1.3 The program's multiyear strategic objectives, including the requirement to meet the NAAB Conditions, as part of the larger institutional strategic planning and assessment efforts.
- 5.1.4 Key performance indicators used by the unit and the institution.
- 5.1.5 How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated multiyear objectives.
- 5.1.6 Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program as it strives to continuously improve learning outcomes and opportunities.
- 5.1.7 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:

5.2.1 - The program has documented a summary of the university and school's strategic planning processes in the APR (pp. 70-71). The program has described how the Eskenazi School's strategic planning process fits within the broader university plan and how the M.Arch. program has responded with its own five-year plan. The program provided a link to the university's IU 2030: The Indiana University Strategic Plan, publicly available online.

5.2.2 The program describes its key performance indicators in the APR (pp. 71-72). These indicators include the Online Course Questionnaire to help faculty improve their courses and student learning objectives as well as the postmortem assessment procedures for each course, for which the program provided the visiting team an abundance of documentation and evidence. The institutional performance metrics are listed on their website: <https://strategicplan.iu.edu/pillars/student-success.html>.

5.2.3 The program has outlined its progress in the APR (pp. 72-73), stating its four areas of its current multi-year objectives: curricula, community, equity, and publicity. The program provided the team with links to a draft of its 5 and 10 year multi-year plans as well as a summary of its progress.

5.2.4 The program has described and linked its SWOT analysis in the APR (pp. 73-75).

5.2.5 The program has described its processes for ongoing input from alumni and outside professionals and advisors in the APR (pp. 75-77).

The team confirmed these sub conditions as being met during the team's meetings with faculty and administrators and noted the changes made to curriculum as a result of previous rounds of assessment.

5.2 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:

- 5.2.1 The relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including NAAB program and student criteria.
- 5.2.2 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:

5.3.1 The program has documented its reasoning behind its curricular assessment processes in the APR (pp. 78-81). The program describes how the course assessment relates to curricular development through a process involving presentations of student work to an internal curriculum committee, “postmortems” of each course, and regular faculty retreats. Summaries of postmortem findings were provided to the Visiting Team. The program demonstrates its alignment of PCs and SCs with the curriculum in several diagrams provided to the team. The team confirmed this sub condition’s being met during a meeting with faculty during the visit.

5.3.2 The program has documented the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in curricular development in the APR (pp. 78-81). The M.Arch. program documents the four standing committees with the membership at the time of writing the APR, and the program provided links in the APR to an org chart to illustrate how the Miller Architecture program fits within the Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture, + Design, including the curriculum committee, program director, other directors, area coordinators, and governing committees. The team confirmed this sub condition’s being met during a meeting with faculty during the visit.

5.3 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:

- 5.3.1 Demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty in a way that promotes student and faculty achievement.
- 5.3.2 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.
- 5.3.3 Demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- 5.3.4 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 program’s APR (pp. 83-85) describes the ways in which the program meets this criterion.

5.4.1 The program describes how it meets this sub condition in the APR (p; 83) and with a spreadsheet to illustrate the faculty teaching loads. Faculty workloads are prescribed by the university, with tenure-track faculty teaching twelve (12) semester credit hours per year and part-time or adjunct faculty teaching 15 semester credit hours per year, each divided into two semesters. The faculty are also responsible for

student advising and committee service. The program has identified the committees that each tenured faculty sits on within the APR page 85 & provided sample teaching loads for the Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 semesters. The faculty confirmed during the visit that their workload is balanced.

5.4.2 Christopher Reinhart, serves as the Architectural Licensing Advisor (ALA) for the Miller M.Arch Program.” APR p. 83.

5.4.3 The program describes the various opportunities for professional development for faculty and staff in the APR (p. 84). New faculty are provided with seed funding. The program budget provides travel funding for faculty to attend AIA and ACSA conferences, and the college and university also offer competitive grant programs for faculty. Staff are provided with opportunities to attend IU HR professional development training sessions plus LinkedIn Learning and virtual workshops in specific topics. The team confirmed this with faculty during the virtual site visit.

5.4.4 The program describes the support services available to students in the APR (p. 85). IU Bloomington offers career support services for career planning and placement through its IU Walter Center for Career Advancement. Architecture faculty in the program offer advising to M.Arch. students (see 5.4.1 above). The Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) center provides students with counseling and mental health services. Students also have health insurance through the university and have access to the Student Health Center.

5.4 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:

- 5.4.1 Describe how this commitment is reflected in the distribution of its human, physical, and financial resources.
- 5.4.2 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.
- 5.4.3 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.
- 5.4.4 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.
- 5.4.5 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:

5.5.1 Per the APR p. 87, the Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture + Design is committed to actively upholding inclusion, equity, and diversity as a “guiding principle in research, teaching and service”. The Eskenazi School website includes a comprehensive Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan <https://eskenazi.indiana.edu/about/idea/index.html>

5.5.2 In support, the Inclusion, Diversity, Equity + Access (IDEA) Committee, led by a full-time Diversity and Inclusion Coordinator and populated with appointed representatives (faculty, staff and students), formed to act as the central “catalyst for all DEI initiatives, discussions and activity” in the Eskenazi School. During the virtual site visit, faculty indicated the Coordinator position is interim and the program is actively recruiting a replacement.

Per the APR p. 88, stated Plan initiatives are evidenced in Curriculum (SOAD-Z651 *Coalition and Community Building*, SOAD-Z807 *Cultural Consciousness* and required travel programs), extracurricular activity (National Organization of Minority Architects Students-NOMAS), and program designated financial award (DEI Fellowship).

As indicated on the Eskenazi School website, faculty, staff and associate instructors are offered a focused professional development opportunity with the IDEA Fellow Institutes, held quarterly. Daniel Martinez, Co-Chair and Assistant Professor, Architecture is an IDEA fellow (Summer 2023).

5.5.3 The most current Diversity Report is available for public viewing on the Eskenazi School website [Diversity Report: Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Access: About: Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture + Design: Indiana University Bloomington](#). Per the APR 89-90 and as indicated in the Plan, the program participates in regular assessment (“climate surveys” conducted by the IDEA Committee as evidenced in [210825 Eskenazi DEI Climate Survey Overview.pdf](#)) to identify opportunities and challenges. Provided diversity demographics for the program since the last accreditation cycle indicates a decrease in faculty diversity, an increase in staff diversity and an increase in student diversity due to a significant increase in international student participation. Per discussions with program faculty, staff and students during the virtual site visit, the overall consensus toward DEI was positive. The director indicated additional focus on DEI for recruitment efforts.

5.5.4 Institutional policies related to Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) are available online [Non-Discrimination/Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action: Policies: University Policies: Indiana University \(iu.edu\)](#).

5.5.5 Indiana University Office of Institutional Equity provides services and accommodations based on documented self-disclosure of disability. [Accessibility: Office of Institutional Equity: Indiana University \(iu.edu\)](#) Staff has access to reasonable accommodation through University Human Resources [ADA Services | IU HR | IU](#). Faculty has access to reasonable accommodation through the University Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs [Employment Accommodation Requests: Faculty Resources: Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs: Indiana University Bloomington](#). Students’ range of services and resources are accommodated through the University Office of Disability Services for Students. Resources available to all include Assistive Technology & Accessibility Centers <https://atac.iu.edu/>

5.5 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:

- 5.5.1 Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- 5.5.2 Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including lecture halls, seminar spaces, small group study rooms, labs, shops, and equipment.
- 5.5.3 Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- 5.5.4 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 describes how it meets this criterion in the APR (pp. 90-93), in which it provides a link to a Matterport virtual walk-through of the facilities (<https://architecture.indiana.edu/learning->

[spaces/index.html](#)) that demonstrates how the program provides physical resources to support this criterion. The Miller Architecture program occupies the Republic Building, a 1971 modernist building designed by Myron Goldsmith of S.O.M. The Republic Building was designated a National Historic Landmark in 2012. The program also provided links to detailed floor plans of the building that illustrate how the building has been retrofitted to accommodate the programmatic needs of the program.

5.6.1 The program's APR (pp. 90-92) describes the 32,000 SF building's studio spaces, including an architecture studio with 48-62 desks and the Visual Studies Studio with equipment and space for drawing, painting, and printmaking. The Matterport walk-through reflects this description. The program also describes its approach to studios abroad. While studio-based learning happens on site, the evidence supported within the APR as well as interviews with students and faculty suggest that the opportunity of studio abroad is offered through "Nomadic Studios" that are divided into two phases across what seems to be 3 different cities: Rome and two other unique cities that are chosen each year.

5.6.2 The program's APR (p. 92) lists the spaces through which the program meets this sub condition, including a permanent gallery space, two classrooms, a teaching lab, a 3-D maker space, woodshop, auditorium, private study spaces, and private studio critique/ meeting rooms. The Matterport walk-through reflects this description.

5.6.3 The program describes its spaces to support and encourage the full range of faculty responsibilities in the APR (p.93). The program has twelve (12) private office spaces and one shared office space used for faculty and staff, two desks available for use by adjunct and visiting faculty, and a private meeting room. These spaces support teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising. The Matterport walk-through reflects this description.

5.6.4 The program describes how its spaces support the pedagogical approaches in its APR (p. 93). Due to COVID-19, the program invested in technology to support online and hybrid approaches to teaching and learning. The Matterport walk-through reflects this description, illustrating the technology integrated into teaching and learning spaces. Spaces to support all learning formats and pedagogies used within the program were demonstrated through the class observation sessions. This allowed the team to view instruction in a casual manner of critique for sketches as well as a more formalized lecture course that leveraged the classroom's video conferencing equipment to accommodate both the team and remote students. Other resources that support the program's learning methodologies can be found with the separation of the visual and architectural studios to account for the different coursework that these twin studios support.

5.6 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:

Per the APR pp. 95-96, Indiana University uses "Responsibility Centered Management (RCM). An allotment of money (Provost Initiative Fund) is reserved to fund "common good" and innovation expenses and/or reallocate unit funds. All remaining funds (flat amount based upon student credits taken) are distributed to each unit (Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture + Design). The Dean of the Eskenazi School has budgetary control and allocates funds for each program area based upon budget review and recommendation of the Faculty Advisory Board. Program budgets for 3-5 year projections and analytical trends are reviewed annually by the Provost.

The program receives an annual two million from the university for operating expenses in addition to the income from tuition and discretionary funds. Fellowships (DEI, travel, and merit) are funded from the operating expenses, and as this is a significant amount (up to \$815,750 annually), it is of concern. In

discussions with the provost, dean, and director, the funding strategy for fellowships is to provide an abundance of funding while the program is seeking accreditation (it was noted that nearly all students in the program are recipients of funding currently) with the overall amount allotted to be reduced to a sustainable amount once the program has received accreditation. Of note, upon becoming accredited, the Indiana Architectural Foundation Scholarship will be established.

Student enrollment projections as provided by the program indicate conservative growth in the next three years. As verified in discussions with leadership, the program anticipates a need for additional faculty and staff to accommodate the growth, but the current facility resources are adequate (projections indicate 45 students and the facility is planned to accommodate 60).

Continued support (to include financial resources) for the program was verified during discussions with the Provost and the Dean who, in turn, indicated an overwhelming appreciation and support (to include financial resources) for the program from the Columbus community.

5.7 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 has responded to the point of information resources by stating the modes available to students and faculty for investigating architectural information. The APR (pp. 95-97) states the countless resources offered by the Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture, + Design that totals “over 100,000 volumes and approximately 400 serial subscriptions.” The pieces that are included within the collection focus across many different time periods while including instructional text on mediums, techniques, and topics related to the areas of art, architecture, and design. The materials offered by informational resources are provided within many different formats both analog and digital with the students on site in particular having “full access to over 2,500 research databases/indexes, 24,800 electronic journals, 2.2 million eBooks, and abundant digital image and streaming video collections.” On site at the Miller M. Architecture program, a library is present as confirmed from the digital walkthrough provided of the facility, and this library is equipped with two computers available for student-use to access the digital materials stated previously. The library is equipped with over 1000 volumes that cover topics on architecture, art, history, and theory that reflect the unique program that IU has fostered. This collection is built in comparison to peer library collections with “a special emphasis” on global architecture sustainability.

The accessibility of materials for a remote campus distant from the primary campus in Bloomington does not seem to be a hindrance. If a text is not present within the collection of IU libraries, students are encouraged to request new materials that can be added to the collection as long as it falls within the budgetary and relevancy parameters within the fields and focuses stated prior. If an analog text needs to be transferred from any IU library to the Miller M. Architecture program, the material can be delivered primarily from Bloomington to Columbus with existing infrastructure such as the interlibrary lending and document delivery services across all university libraries. Furthermore, the program has access to an interlibrary loan system provided by the Bartholomew County Library in Columbus, Indiana. The remote nature of the program is also present within the accessibility of a librarian that specializes on the topics of art, architecture, and design. While they are present on the Bloomington Campus for Indiana University, the students, faculty, and staff have the ability to contact the librarian through the modes of phone, email, and Zoom. This resource is presented to students through the ability to request new materials alongside

self-scheduling software with real-time availability to attend to the needs of the program and the research that they might be undertaking. While distant, the librarian continues to maintain a minimum of two office hours within the semester while attending events within the program as their schedule permits during the academic school year.

Instruction for undergoing research across the material provided is available across all levels of understanding “from basic orientations to individual class instruction on specialized topics and research.” Instruction is also available for finding imagery at the course-level and individual instruction through the means of consultation and use of equipment. The librarian stated previously is also stated to be conducting classes relative to the artist’s books collection while coordinating and providing “specialized introductions to visual arts research from beginning through advanced levels.” The team confirmed the evidence for this criterion in meetings with faculty, staff, and students during the virtual site visit.

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 program describes how it meets this criterion in the APR (p. 98), by including the language on a dedicated webpage for “Accreditation” on the university website. The team confirmed that the required NAAB language is included on this webpage: (<https://architecture.indiana.edu/academics/accreditation.html> accessed on Oct. 15, 2023). The program did not share catalogs and promotional media.

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:

The program describes how it meets this criterion in the APR (p. 98), by including the language on a dedicated webpage for “Accreditation” on the university website. The team confirmed that the required NAAB links are included on this webpage: (<https://architecture.indiana.edu/academics/accreditation.html> accessed on Oct. 15, 2023).

- a) The webpage has a link (<https://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020-NAAB-Conditions-for-Accreditation.pdf> accessed on Oct. 15, 2023) to the required document.

- b) The webpage has a link (<https://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020-NAAB-Procedures-for-Accreditation.pdf> accessed on Oct. 15, 2023) to the required document.
- c) The webpage has a link (<https://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020-NAAB-Procedures-for-Accreditation.pdf> accessed on Oct. 15, 2023) to the required document.
- d) The webpage has a link (<https://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020-NAAB-Procedures-for-Accreditation.pdf> accessed on Oct. 15, 2023) to the required document.

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 describes how it meets this criterion in the APR (pp. 98-99). Students have access to the IU Walter Center for Career Achievement, which offers career development and placement opportunities to students. The Walter Center is an available resource to all students in the College of Arts & Sciences and Eskenazi School of Art, Architecture, + Design. The Associate Director of Employer Relations serves as the liaison between the Walter Center and the Eskenazi School. Within the M.Arch. program, Britt Brewer serves as the Architecture Licensing Advisor (ALA) for the M.Arch. students. During our visit, the faculty and students confirmed that they were familiar with the IU Walter center for career achievement as well as the ALA on staff that guides them through career, education & employment plans.

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:

The program has a dedicated webpage for "Accreditation" on the university website : (<https://architecture.indiana.edu/academics/accreditation.html>)

- a) Not Applicable for initial accreditation
- b) Not Applicable for initial accreditation
- c) A public link (<https://architecture.indiana.edu/academics/indianau-2020cp1.pdf> - accessed Oct. 15, 2023) provides this letter dated May 20, 2022.
- d) A public link (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-GWpWUz5sra9I3U9bpUn8PYtAEisVni0/view> accessed Oct. 15, 2023) provides the APR dated May 3, 2021.
- e) A public link (https://architecture.indiana.edu/academics/indiana-university-vtr_2021_publicfinal.pdf accessed Oct. 15, 2023) provides the VTR from Nov. 1-2, 2021.

- f) A public link (<https://architecture.indiana.edu/academics/iu-commentary-on-vtr.pdf> accessed on Oct. 15, 2023) provides the program's optional link Jan. 16, 2022
- g) Not Applicable
- h) Not Applicable
- i) A public link (<https://architecture.indiana.edu/academics/learning-teaching-culture.html> accessed on Oct. 15, 2023) provides the program's "Learning and Teaching Culture Policy."
- j) A public link (<https://eskenazi.indiana.edu/about/idea/plan.html> accessed Oct. 16, 2023) provides the "Eskenazi School Diversity Equity + Inclusion Plan."

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:

The program publicly documents these policies and procedures, as demonstrated in the APR (p. 100).

- a. The Graduate Admissions Application instructions are located on the "Admissions + Aid" page of the program's website. This same page also includes a link to the application form, which is housed on The University Graduate School's website. This application is used by all university graduate students. Students upload portfolios to Slide Room in addition to the online application through The University Graduate School. <https://architecture.indiana.edu/admissions-aid/index.html> - accessed Oct. 18, 2023)
- b. Admissions requirements, admissions-decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios, and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing can be found on the "Admissions + Aid" page of the program's website. <https://architecture.indiana.edu/admissions-aid/index.html> - accessed Oct. 18, 2023)
- c. Forms and a description of the process for evaluating the content of a non-accredited degree(s) can be found on the "Admissions + Aid" page of the program's website. https://graduate.indiana.edu/admissions/apply.shtml?_gl=1*dnigvr*_ga*MTY2OTc0ODY4MC4xNjk3MzQyNDU2*_ga_61CH0D2DQW*MTY5NzY0MDA1Ni43LjEuMTY5NzY0MDE1MC41MC4wLjA . - accessed Oct. 18, 2023)
- d. Requirements for applying for financial aid and scholarships can be found on the "Admissions + Aid" page of the program's website. This includes information for students who may also be eligible for need-based grants. Eligibility for these grants are determined by Student Central and requires completion of the FAFSA application, FAFSA. Students can expect to receive an award package from them, separate from their admission letter detailing any merit-based awards. Only domestic students are eligible for this program. <https://architecture.indiana.edu/admissions-aid/index.html> - accessed Oct. 18, 2023)
- e. The University has a wide variety of student diversity initiatives for graduate students. The Eskenazi School also has a strategic goal through its Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan to:

“Increase the diversity of graduate students.” <https://graduate.indiana.edu/doc/shared/presidents-diversity-initiatives-brochure.pdf> - accessed Oct. 18, 2023)

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:

Per the APR p. 103, the program website <https://architecture.indiana.edu/admissions-aid/index.html> identifies and directly links students to financial information and resources. Anticipated tuition and program fees are identified directly on the program website with a link to student expense estimation software and financial advice <https://moneysmarts.iu.edu/calculate-costs/index.html>.

Financial support resources to apply for need-based grants/student loans are linked to the University's Student Central website <https://studentcentral.indiana.edu/pay-for-college/index.html>.

Per APR 103 and verified with a financial statement summary provided during the virtual site visit, all incoming students are offered Fellowship awards (¼, ½, or full tuition and healthcare) which are awarded on merit and renewable for the entirety of the 3- year program. Students are also provided full funding for travel and housing costs associated with the required Travel program (Nomadic Studio Phase 1 and 2). Domestic students are eligible for a School funded DEI Fellowship (1 out-of-state recipient or 2 in-state per academic year).

Other linked funding sources include financial support available from the Office of International Services <https://ois.iu.edu/admissions/cost-financial-aid/financial-aid/index.html>, from the University Graduate School and the College of Arts and Sciences' Graduate Office <https://graduate.indiana.edu/admissions/financial-support/fellowships-awards/index.html> <https://graduate.indiana.edu/admissions/financial-support/fellowships-awards/index.html>

V. Appendices

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

PC.2 Design:

The program exhibits distinction in its approach to the design process through its paired studios in the visual arts and architectural design. This approach offers students the opportunity to operate between 2D and 3D visualization and making, going back and forth between the two modes of exploration. Through discussions with faculty and students as well as class observations, the team was struck by the innovative flow from visual art to architectural design studios, benefiting from the open plan of The Republic Building. Through this challenging curricular model, the Miller M.Arch. program provides pedagogical experiences grounded in the rich traditions of American architectural education made relevant and current through facilities and equipment from the 21st century, an expansion of the historical canon, and an emphasis on the globally inclusive designer.

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion:

The program has demonstrated excellence in attracting talent from diverse backgrounds. The students and the faculty members have shown a desire to maintain this diversity and have shaped it into the ethos of their learning material. The travel program has shifted from the traditional study of Rome to exploring ideas of doing studios within Mexico - in turn exposing their students to a diverse set of ideas. The work that has been submitted and the empowered discussions showed equity in design. The makeup of the students and faculty was a testament to the exceptionally inclusive environment Indiana University's J. Irwin Miller M.Arch. program has curated.

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

For Program COF

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator Representative

Travis Hicks, AIA
Professor
University of North Carolina-Greensboro
Greensboro, NC
tlhicks@uncg.edu

Practitioner Representative

Farheen Charanya, AIA, NCARB, LEED Assoc.
Owner | Design Director
F+E Architects
Dallas, TX
farheen@fedesignarch.com

Regulator Representative

Deborah "Suzan" Huff, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP BD&C
Master Architect/Sr. Associate
SSOE Group
Brentwood, TN
dhuff@ssoe.com

Student Representative

Michael Boongaling, AIAS
Student
University of Memphis
Memphis, TN
michael.boongie@gmail.com

For Program COF

VI. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Travis Hicks, AIA
Team Chair

Farheen Charanya, AIA, NCARB, LEED Assoc.
Team Member

Deborah "Suzan" Huff, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP BD&C
Team Member

Michael Boongaling, AIA
Team Member

For Program COF