National Architectural Accrediting Board

# 2025 Visiting Team Report

## Program: Syracuse University (B.Arch., M.Arch.)

**Type of Visit**: Continuing Accreditation

**Date of Visit**: March 2-5, 2025

**Contents**

## A. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The Visiting Team sincerely thanks Kyle Miller, Associate Dean of the School of Architecture, Chair Daekwon Park, B.Arch.; Chair Julie Larsen, M.Arch.; Micheal Speaks, Dean of the School of Architecture; Interim Provost Dr. Lois Agnew. We appreciate the University's administration, faculty, staff, and students' exceptional efforts in preparing for the accreditation visit of the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs. The team appreciates the program's responsiveness and warm hospitality throughout the visit.

The program continues to enhance the B.Arch. and M.Arch. curriculums by improving resources and being at the forefront of the university's assessment processes, aiming to improve student learning and architecture programs continually. The Dean expressed intense enthusiasm for the program, emphasizing its significance globally. The Interim Provost celebrated the program's role in the University's often leading process and whose students were among the top in the University. Further, the Interim Provost stated how the School of Architecture leads the University's mission of experiential learning and professional education through a ''pinnacle'' program on campus.

Administrators, faculty, and staff confirmed the alignment of the School's strategic plan with the University's plan through the University's Shared Competencies, the School's learning Outcomes, and the NAAB Program and Student Criteria. The team notes the sense of community and family fostered by the program's perspective of architecture as global through international students, faculty, and immersive learning programs in the U.S. and abroad.

The emphasis on experiential learning in the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs is a distinct strength, creating opportunities for place-based learning and professional partnerships for internships and research in architecture. The team confirmed the enrollment trends in the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, which affect the program's resources. The team observed a robust studio culture that emphasized making large models, evidenced throughout the buildings. We commend the program's commitment to fostering diversity among its faculty and students, creating an inclusive academic environment through the work of students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

On behalf of the National Architectural Accrediting Board, the team sincerely thanks the students, staff, faculty, and university leadership for cooperating during this visit. Your dedication to the program's success was evident, and we thank you for making the team feel welcome and supported throughout the process.

b. Conditions with a Team Preliminary Finding as Not Achieved:

- B.Arch.
    - SC.6 Building Integration
- M.Arch.
    - SC.5 Design Synthesis
    - SC.6 Building Integration
- 5.4 Human Resources and Resource Development

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

**B.ARCH.**

**2016 Condition/Criterion (Not Met): II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum:** The NAAB accredits the following 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.

The B.Arch., M.Arch., and/or D.Arch. are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Any institution that uses the degree title B.Arch., M.Arch., or D.Arch. for a non-accredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*. Every accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements.

**Previous Team Report (2016):** The team found this condition to be Not Met in the B. Arch program. The NAAB requires 45 general studies credits, and this program has 42. This was confirmed in the School of Architecture handbook and in discussions with the school's administration. Note: The program stated that the university regulates the number of general studies courses, and the 162 total credit hours for the B. Arch program exceed the NAAB minimum required total credit hours.

**2025 Team Analysis:**
Although NAAB no longer required a specific number of general studies classes before the 2020 Conditions and subsequent revisions, the program did increase the number of general education courses to 45 credits. The APR states that an unanticipated outcome of the change is that more students are pursuing minors as part of the B.Arch. program.

**2016 Condition/Criterion (Not Met): B.1 Pre-Design:** *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

**Previous Team Report (2016):** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found in student work for key elements of this criterion. While certain components of pre-design (such as site analysis and code review) were found in the student work, in both the B. Arch and M. Arch coursework, the team did not find evidence of the ability to prepare a comprehensive architectural project program that included many of the requirements of this criterion.

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The 2020 Conditions no longer contain a performance criterion specifically regarding Pre-Design. Before the 2020 conditions, the program implemented a change in ARC 307 Architectural Design V, which required a program preparation workshop as part of the design studio. As a result of the changes the program made, they have found that students in ARC 409 Architectural Design VII are better prepared to incorporate the program into design

requirements. The program has linked the previous B1 Pre-Design to the current SC. 5 Design Synthesis. The team confirmed the student's ability, as demonstrated in SC. 5 Design Synthesis, to integrate user requirements, regulatory requirements, and accessible design in the design decision process. The team found evidence in the digital team room in ARC 307 Architectural Design V and ARC 322 Building Systems Design II through student work, syllabus, schedule, and instructional materials.

**2016 Condition/Criterion (Not Met): B.3 Codes and Regulations:** *Ability* to design sites, facilities, and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

**Previous Team Report (2016):** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found in student work for key elements of this criterion. While the team found evidence of the teaching of life-safety standards in coursework, it only found evidence of an understanding of accessibility standards and no evidence of the ability to apply accessibility standards consistently in integrated design studio work in both the B. Arch and M. Arch coursework.

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The program has identified that the previous requirements of B.3. Codes and Regulations now match portions of SC.3 Regulatory Context, SC. 5 Design Synthesis, and SC. 6 Building Integration. Before adopting the 2020 Conditions, the program had implemented changes to ensure that students demonstrated the ability to apply life safety and accessibility requirements. The changes result in life safety being engaged at multiple points in the curricula. The team found SC 6. Not Met. The B.Arch. program develops students' ability to integrate building systems in design but lacks measurable building performance application in projects. Evidence was not found that students are consistently able to measure the outcomes of building performance on their design projects. In ARC 409, the focus on building systems is present, but there is limited integration of lifecycle assessment and measurable performance outcomes. ARC 423 offers a thorough analysis of building performance metrics, but this knowledge is primarily applied to precedent studies, rather than directly to students' own design projects. This gap in the application of building performance measurement prevents students from fully realizing the potential impact of their design decisions on building performance.

Further complicating this, students who are away for two semesters do not take ARC 409 and ARC 423 concurrently, meaning they cannot apply the analysis from ARC 423 to their ARC 409 projects. This limitation reduces the opportunity for students to connect theoretical analysis with practical application within their design projects. There is a need for further integration of measurable building performance outcomes into student design work to ensure that students not only understand but can also apply building performance metrics to their own projects.

**2016 Condition/Criterion (Not Met): B.10 Financial Considerations:** *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

**Previous Team Report (2016):** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found in student work. Student work at the understanding level was not consistently demonstrated in the areas of building costs, scheduling, and operational/life-cycle costs. No student work, exams, or case studies were provided to indicate that the students were able to achieve an understanding of project financial considerations.

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The program has identified that the learning objectives of the previous B.10 Financial Considerations are now part of SC.2 Professional Practice in the 2020 Conditions. Before the 2020 Conditions were approved the program implemented changes to address the learning objective in ARC 585: Professional Practice. These changes are detailed in the APR and include financing, cost estimating, scheduling, and sustainability criteria. The program found that due to the changed, students have a deeper understanding of financial considerations. The team found evidence of the student's ability in ARC 585 Professional Practice through the syllabus, schedule, and instructional materials.

## M.ARCH.

**2016 Condition/Criterion (Not Met): B.1 Pre-Design:** *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

**Previous Team Report (2016):** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found in student work for key elements of this criterion. While certain components of pre-design (such as site analysis and code review) were found in the student work, in both the B. Arch and M. Arch coursework, the team did not find evidence of the ability to prepare a comprehensive architectural project program that included many of the requirements of this criterion.

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The 2020 Conditions no longer contain a performance criterion specifically regarding Pre-Design. Before the 2020 conditions, the program implemented a change in ARC 307 Architectural Design V, which required a program preparation workshop as part of the design studio. As a result of the changes the program made, they have found that students in ARC 409 Architectural Design VII are better prepared to incorporate the program into design requirements. The program has linked the previous B1 Pre-Design to the current SC. 5 Design Synthesis. The team was unable to confirm the student's ability, as demonstrated in SC. 5 Design Synthesis, to integrate user requirements, regulatory requirements, and accessible design in the design decision process. The M.Arch. program has not demonstrated that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating the synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and the measurable environmental impacts of their design choices.

While the program has demonstrated a structured approach to design synthesis, there are inconsistencies in the application of regulatory requirements. Although some macro-level analyses of zoning and code were present, there was little evidence that students consistently apply these regulations in their design work. The supporting instructional materials have not fully demonstrated how the curriculum, structure, and other experiences comprehensively address this criterion. Evidence of a consistent application of regulatory requirements was lacking. Strengthening the integration of zoning and building codes into coursework will be necessary to fully meet this learning outcome.

While these measures demonstrate a commitment to assessing student performance, additional emphasis on regulatory requirements in coursework will enhance the program's ability to address this criterion fully.

**2016 Condition/Criterion (Not Met): B.3 Codes and Regulations:** *Ability* to design sites, facilities, and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

**Previous Team Report (2016):** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found in student work for key elements of this criterion. While the team found evidence of the teaching of life-safety standards in coursework, it only found evidence of an understanding of accessibility standards and no evidence of the ability to apply accessibility standards consistently in integrated design studio work in both the B. Arch and M. Arch coursework.

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The program has identified that the previous requirements of B.3. Codes and Regulations now match portions of SC.3 Regulatory Context, SC. 5 Design Synthesis, and SC. 6 Building Integration. Before adopting the 2020 Conditions, the program had implemented changes to ensure that students demonstrated an ability to apply life safety and accessibility requirements. The changes result in life safety being engaged at multiple points in the curricula. The team did not find evidence of the student's ability of SC. 5 Design Synthesis. The M.Arch. program develops students' ability to integrate building systems in design but lacks measurable building performance application in projects. The evidence did not demonstrate that students consistently apply measurable building performance outcomes in their design work. While precedent studies within the curriculum introduce building performance metrics, this knowledge does not translate into applied analysis within student projects. The absence of measurable building performance outcomes remains a gap in student learning.

**2016 Condition/Criterion (Not Met): B.10 Financial Considerations:** *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

**Previous Team Report (2016):** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found in student work. Student work at the understanding level was not consistently demonstrated in the areas of building costs, scheduling, and operational/life-cycle costs. No student work, exams, or case studies were provided to indicate that the students were able to achieve an understanding of project financial considerations.

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The program has identified that the learning objectives of the previous B.10 Financial Considerations are now part of SC.2 Professional Practice in the 2020 Conditions. Before the 2020 Conditions were approved, the program implemented changes to address the learning objective in ARC 585: Professional Practice. These changes are detailed in the APR and include financing, cost estimating, scheduling, and sustainability criteria. The program found that due to the changes, students have a deeper understanding of financial considerations. The team found evidence of the student's ability in ARC 585 Professional Practice through the syllabus, schedule, and instructional materials.

## C. 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.

**2025 Team Analysis:**

**OVERALL**
The program has identified that the learning objectives of the previous B.10 Financial Considerations are now part of SC.2 Professional Practice in the 2020 Conditions. Before the 2020 Conditions were approved, the program implemented changes to address the learning objective in ARC 585: Professional Practice. These changes are detailed in the APR and include financing, cost estimating, scheduling, and sustainability criteria. The program found that as a result of the change students have a deeper understanding of financial considerations. The team found evidence of the student's ability in ARC 585 Professional Practice through the syllabus, schedule, and instructional materials.

**B.ARCH.**
The team confirmed that the eight learning objectives inform curriculum decisions and that implementation is verified through the assessment process. The team also found that the learning objectives are the same for the undergraduate and graduate programs.

**M.ARCH.**
The team confirmed that the eight learning objectives inform curriculum decisions and that implementation is verified through the assessment process. The team also found that the learning objectives are the same for the undergraduate and graduate programs

## D. 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 within a larger educational institution must also describe the college or university's mission and how that shapes or influences the program.

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
Syracuse University is a private, four-year institution with a midsize urban campus, a highly residential setting, and a student population of 22,948, including 15,739 undergraduates. As a research-intensive university with a strong balance between arts, sciences, and professional programs, Syracuse fosters a culture of academic rigor and innovation. The School of Architecture aligns with this mission by emphasizing a studio-based pedagogy that integrates history, theory, and technology, preparing students for professional practice in a global context. The university's commitment to experiential learning, interdisciplinary collaboration, and high faculty engagement shapes the architecture program's development, providing students with opportunities for study abroad, visiting critic studios, and engagement with leading practitioners.

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 School of Architecture fosters a dynamic and innovative design education within a larger institution, providing students with technical skills and cultural knowledge essential for professional practice in a globalized world. Its pedagogy centers on the architectural design studio, integrating history, theory, and emerging technologies, with extensive one-on-one faculty engagement in formal and informal settings. The school's commitment to experiential learning is reflected in its robust study abroad programs in London, Florence, and New York City and shorter summer programs in cities worldwide, enhancing students' global awareness. Additionally, the program enriches its academic environment through a distinguished lecture series and Visiting Critic studios, incorporating national and international perspectives to ensure students are well-equipped for contemporary architectural challenges. 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).

The School of Architecture at Syracuse University fosters a dynamic learning environment that extends beyond the classroom through diverse opportunities for students and faculty. Students engage in experiential learning via study-abroad programs in global cities such as London, Florence, Quito, and Tokyo and immersive Visiting Critic studios with travel components to locations like Sarajevo and Miami. Faculty development is strongly supported through funding for conference travel, research grants, and professional organization memberships, complemented by university-wide programs such as those offered by the Office of Faculty Affairs and the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence. Additionally, the school enriches the academic experience by hosting renowned architects and educators for lectures and studio instruction, ensuring a continuous exchange of ideas that keeps faculty and students at the forefront of architectural education and practice.

**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)

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The program demonstrates how its curriculum and structure address this criterion.

**Design:**
The APR (pg.15-16) underscores the importance of a closely coordinated foundational sequence followed by ongoing opportunities for independent development. Design Synthesis is one of the eight core Learning Outcomes developed by the program, and it emphasizes three phases in design learning: core studios, off-campus study, and directed research. With 97% of students participating in a study abroad/away experience for one semester and 67% participating for two semesters, exposure to design solutions amid different cultural contexts is a hallmark of the program. The undergraduate and graduate directors, Associate deans, deans, and studio coordinators work closely to instill design thinking across the curriculum. They underscore that it is a collective pursuit, bolstered by exchange and strongly enhanced through experiential education, such as study abroad and away opportunities.

**Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility:**
As outlined in the APR, it integrates technical systems and statutory issues into building design at both building and urban scales through BArch and MArch courses, including Architectural Design III, V, and VIII; Building Systems I, II, and Advanced; Structures I and II; and Professional Practice. Students develop skills in building energy and sustainability principles, metrics, and design approaches by applying strategies related to site, materials, infrastructure, and life safety systems.

Assessments are conducted through PC.3: Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility and various Student Criteria. The PC.3 syllabus specifies evaluation through projects and quizzes. The Self-Assessment Table provides benchmarks, results, and planned improvements aligned with long-range planning. A review of student work in Architectural Design courses and discussions with students confirm their understanding of environmental stewardship and responsibility. Their assignments reflect an awareness of environmental impacts at local, national, and global levels. The study abroad program further reinforces responsible design principles.

**Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion:**
The Syracuse University School of Architecture demonstrates a strong commitment to Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) through its structured and proactive approach led by the DEIA

Council. The Council plays a central role in fostering an inclusive academic environment by advocating for student needs, facilitating faculty development, and curating shared resources that expand the perspectives incorporated into architectural education. The establishment of a shared repository of readings and design materials, the promotion of cost-effective studio practices, and the implementation of structured student-faculty dialogues illustrate the program's dedication to equitable access to architectural education. The School's commitment to student well-being is evident in its efforts to mitigate academic pressure through strategic scheduling and to encourage cross-disciplinary engagement for a richer student experience. Furthermore, faculty-led research and recognition in areas of social justice, disability access, and community rebuilding reinforce the program's leadership in addressing EDI issues within both the curriculum and broader professional discourse.

Looking ahead, the program demonstrates a clear trajectory for expanding its EDI initiatives through long-range planning and continued engagement with faculty, students, and external experts. The transition of the DEIA Council from data collection to direct action, including forming a rapid response team, signifies an evolution toward proactive intervention and policy implementation. Faculty development workshops on accessibility and inclusive pedagogies are expected to enhance classroom experiences, while cultural events and continued faculty contributions will further cultivate an awareness of global equity issues. The alignment with broader university competencies in ethics, integrity, and diversity ensures that these values remain embedded in institutional expectations. As Syracuse Architecture continues to refine and implement these initiatives, its commitment to fostering an inclusive and supportive educational environment positions it as a leader in advancing equity within architectural education.

**Knowledge and Innovation:**
The Syracuse University School of Architecture fosters a strong culture of research and innovation, integrating advanced knowledge into its curriculum, faculty scholarship, and special topic workshops. Through studio and technology courses, students develop an iterative, exploration-based approach to innovation. ARC 650 Architectural Research emphasizes advanced methods, while ARC 498/698 Directed Research connects research directly to student inquiry.

Faculty research spans history, social sciences, generative design, tectonics, urban design, imaging, and building performance. Institutional support includes the Syracuse Center of Excellence (CoE) and the SU Infrastructure Institute, which promote interdisciplinary collaboration. Independent Research Grants and conference funding further enable faculty contributions to the field. An Associate Dean for Research previously helped the faculty secure external funding, a role the faculty found highly effective. However, this position remains unfilled for the upcoming year.

The university supports its graduate program through the Graduate School. Long-range planning prioritizes research as a central component of the B.Arch. terminal year and a core driver of the M.Arch. curriculum. As a research institution, the University embeds research in its mission. These initiatives create an intellectually rich environment where faculty research informs pedagogy and students actively contribute to advancing architectural knowledge.

**Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement:**
The program provides detailed evidence in the APR of how it supports long-range planning for leadership, collaboration, and community engagement. It identifies student leadership within organizations such as NOMAS, AIA, ASO, and GSA, which help foster community while developing leadership skills essential for professional practice and civic engagement.

Leadership opportunities are integrated into the curriculum through courses like ARC 409: Architectural Design VIII, ARC 607: Architectural Design IV, ARC 423/623: Advanced Building Systems, and ARC 498/698: Directed Research. These courses encourage students to take initiative, engage in collaborative problem-solving, and apply leadership skills in academic and professional settings.

The program assesses leadership and engagement through PC.6 and PC.8, reinforcing its commitment to developing "the next generation of leaders." By providing structured opportunities for student involvement, the program ensures that students are well-prepared for leadership roles in architecture and the broader community.

**Lifelong Learning:**

Syracuse University School of Architecture fosters a culture of lifelong learning by integrating self-exploration and iterative learning into the curriculum and the broader academic community. Students, faculty, and practitioners continuously educate through structured and informal learning opportunities.

Students develop professionally and intellectually through various initiatives. Grant awards support independent research and projects, while a Lecture Series featuring visiting professionals and scholars presents emerging topics in design, technology, and professional practice. Internships and professional practice experiences provide real-world exposure to industry standards and expectations. The university's extensive study abroad programs offer immersive global experiences, broadening students' perspectives on architecture and urbanism. Student organizations such as NOMAS, AIAS, ASO, and GSA foster leadership and networking opportunities beyond the classroom.

Faculty benefit from public events and conferences, with funding to engage in the latest research and industry advancements. Tenure-track mentoring fosters professional development and scholarly growth, while informal peer-to-peer research seminars encourage cross-disciplinary collaboration. The Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) offers structured professional development in contemporary pedagogy, with workshops on topics such as AI in education and teaching in divisive times. These initiatives ensure that students and faculty remain at the forefront of architectural education and practice.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
As described in the APR (pg.23-24), the program relies on ARC 585: Professional Practice to ensure that students understand the paths to licensure and the range of career opportunities. This course is taught in both the h and B.Arch. programs. The supporting documentation for Lectures 1A & 1B includes detailed information on the profession, education, experience requirements for licensure, and available career opportunities that utilize the discipline's skills and knowledge through the curriculum and required non-curricular activities. The program has demonstrated how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address this criterion. The course syllabus states that assessments are made through quizzes and exams—the quiz and exam analysis evidence student performance, which evaluates performance and improves questions for future tests. The Self-Assessment Table identifies planned improvements based on the data.

The program has demonstrated how it effectively assesses student learning related to this criterion and utilizes assessments to improve the curriculum. During the site visit, meetings with students and staff demonstrated a strong understanding of licensure pathways and career options. The Career Services Office supports students with internships and job placement, while a robust alumni mentorship program further enhances career guidance. These three components reinforce students' knowledge of licensure and career progression. Additionally, the Architecture Licensing Advisor provides information on licensure to prospective and admitted students, with key touchpoints throughout the program reinforcing this knowledge. Students indicated that they understand the paths to licensure and career.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
As described in the APR (pg.23-24), the program relies on ARC 585: Professional Practice to ensure students understand the paths to licensure and the range of career opportunities. This course is taught in both the M.Arch. and B.Arch. programs. The supporting documentation for Lectures 1A & 1B includes detailed information on the profession and education, experience requirements for licensure, and available career opportunities that utilize the discipline's skills and knowledge through the curriculum and required non-curricular activities.

The program has demonstrated how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address this criterion. The course syllabus states that assessments are made through quizzes and exams—the quiz and exam analysis evidence student performance, which evaluates performance and improves questions for future tests. The Self-Assessment Table identifies planned improvements based on the data.

The program has demonstrated how it effectively assesses student learning related to this criterion and utilizes assessments to improve the curriculum. During the site visit, meetings with students and staff demonstrated a strong understanding of licensure pathways and career options. The Career Development Office supports students with internships and job placement, while a robust alumni mentorship program further enhances career guidance. These three components reinforce students' knowledge of licensure and career progression. Additionally, the

Architecture Licensing Advisor provides information on licensure to prospective and admitted students, with key touchpoints throughout the program reinforcing this knowledge. Students indicated that they understand the paths to licensure and career.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
As noted in the APR (pg.24-26) and in the primary evidence provided, students in ARC 208: Architectural Design IV evaluate the design process through multiple factors and scales, simultaneously questioning tectonics, craft, and fabrication. This work is enhanced with precedent studies and original design exercises. This criterion directly maps to the program's Learning Outcome 2: Design Synthesis. The primary course ARC 208 was assessed with an established benchmark for tectonics and five other courses (ARC 108, 207, 307, 409, 181) assessed myriad aspects such as the integration of analytical and creative work, relationships to landscape, understandings of urban context and culture, systems thinking, and visual communication. The Undergraduate Chair and studio coordinators meet a minimum of three times each semester. For spring 2024, +95% of the students achieved the established benchmark of 90% completion. In response to the assessment, the program is implementing several changes, such as additional time for precedent studies, enhanced concept development phases, and further integration of analog and digital visual communication techniques.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
As noted in the APR (pp. 26-29) and the primary and environmental systems, they are active agents in spatial, aesthetic, and conceptual expression. The primary course, ARC 607, assessed integration across contexts with an established benchmark and six other courses (604, 605, 606, 681, 682, 650) established benchmarks for an array of topics such as systems, integration of design processes, design research methodologies, and visual communication. For spring 2024, +87% of the students achieved the established benchmark of 90% completion. In response to the assessment, the program is implementing several changes, such as establishing an international travel component with construction site visits (e.g., Switzerland 2025 spring break trip), adding more drawing and software tutorials, and dedicating more time to design iterations.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**

As described in the APR (pg.30-31), this condition is mapped to the 1-Environmental Impact Learning Outcome and the program relies on three courses to ensure that students have a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to responsibly mitigate climate change through ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities: ARC 121: Introduction to Building and Structural Systems, ARC 222: Building Systems Design I, and ARC 322: Building Systems Design II.

The supporting instructional materials and course lectures demonstrated how the curriculum, structure, and other experiences address this criterion, primarily achieved in ARC 322: Building Systems Design II. The course syllabi state that students will be primarily evaluated on projects and quizzes. The Self-Assessment Table provides benchmarks and results and also identifies planned improvements. Examples include grading rubrics and evaluation spreadsheets have been provided to demonstrate how students are evaluated.

The program has demonstrated how it effectively assesses student learning on a recurring basis related to this criterion. A review of student work from ARC307 and ARC409 and student discussions about their assignments and design solutions demonstrated their understanding of the relationship between natural and built environments, influence, and response to environmental conditions.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
As described in the APR (pg.31-33), this condition is mapped to the 1-Environmental Impact Learning Outcome and the program relies primarily on ARC 622: Building Systems Design II, with support from ARC 606: Architectural Design III, ARC 607: Architectural Design IV, and ARC621: Building Systems Design I, to ensure that students have a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to responsibly mitigate climate change through ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities.

The supporting instructional materials have demonstrated how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address this criterion. The course syllabi states that students will be primarily evaluated on project work. The Self-Assessment Table provides benchmarks and results, also identifying planned improvements. Example grading rubrics and evaluation spreadsheets have been provided for ARC 621 and 622 to demonstrate how students are evaluated.

The program has demonstrated how it effectively assesses student learning on a recurring basis related to this criterion. Student work from ARC606 and ARC607 and discussions with students about their assignments and design solutions demonstrated their understanding of the relationship between natural and built environments. The program's study abroad opportunities also give students a global perspective on how their designs influence and respond to environmental conditions.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The program ensures an understanding of PC.6 Leadership and collaboration through ARC 133: Introduction to the History of Architecture I and ARC 134: Introduction to the History of Architecture II and two theory courses, ARC 141: Architectural Theory I and ARC 242: Architectural Theory II. Experiences include the School of Architecture's lecture series. The program provides the syllabus, instructional materials, schedule, and exams for review. The APR (pg.33-35) includes the program's assessment for PC. 4 listed four learning outcomes that address the knowledge in the criterion, assessment methods that include exams, writing, presentations, and research, and documented benchmarks that range from 80% to 90% to demonstrate students' achievement in 3 of 4 learning outcomes. For one learning outcome, the students met the benchmark through a research paper and did not achieve the benchmark on exams. The program has identified actions for improvement based on the results, including study sessions, feedback, and course activities. During the visit, the team verified this evidence through discussions with program faculty and students.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The program ensures an understanding of PC.6 Leadership and collaboration through (name of courses ARC 641: Introduction to Architecture and ARC 631: Studies in Architectural Histories, ARC 642: Architectural Theory and Methods, and ARC 639: Architectural History Principles.

The program provides the syllabus, schedules, and instructional materials for review. The APR (pg.35-37) includes the program's assessment table for PC. 4 that addresses the knowledge in the criterion by identifying four student learning outcomes, the assessment methods, benchmarks, results, and actions for improvement. Students demonstrated achievement in 3 of 4 goals. For one learning outcome, the students met the benchmark through a research paper and did not achieve the benchmark on exams. Based on the results, the table and narrative indicate the program has identified areas for improvement: assignments, discussion, study sessions, and quizzes, and is implementing those changes.

The team verified this evidence during the visit through discussions with program faculty and students.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**

The Syracuse University School of Architecture prepares students to engage in architectural research and innovation through a structured curriculum integrating research-driven coursework, faculty-led investigations, and applied learning experiences. Research is embedded throughout the B.Arch. program, ensuring that students develop critical inquiry skills and the ability to test and evaluate innovations in the field. This integration is evident in how studio topics progress throughout the program, fostering a research-oriented approach to architectural education.

Technical and studio courses introduce and reinforce research methodologies, enabling students to apply investigative approaches to design challenges. The visiting team found evidence of assignments incorporating case studies, precedent analysis, and discrete studio exercises that encourage the exploration of specific design factors within studio courses and building systems coursework. At the culmination of the program, ARC 498 Directed Research serves as a capstone project, requiring students to undertake a substantive, independent research project aligned with faculty expertise across four research-based courses. This ensures that students gain a comprehensive understanding of research methodologies, theoretical exploration, and applied innovation relevant to their future practice.

Assessment of research engagement is structured through formal rubrics for ARC 498, measuring student proficiency in research methodology, critical inquiry, and its application in design. The program has also made curriculum adjustments to align with evolving topics and faculty research areas. During the site visit, the visiting team confirmed the program's commitment to research by discussing how research shapes learning and practice with students and faculty. Additionally, the team reviewed assigned work in ARC 498 and ARC 409 and observed studio and technical courses to assess how research is integrated into coursework. These observations affirmed that research is a fundamental component of the student experience at Syracuse Architecture.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The Syracuse University School of Architecture prepares students to engage in architectural research and innovation through a structured curriculum that integrates research-driven coursework, faculty-led investigations, and applied learning experiences. Research is embedded in the progression of studio topics throughout the M.Arch program, ensuring that students develop critical inquiry skills and the ability to test and evaluate innovations in the field.

Technical and studio courses introduce and reinforce research methodologies, enabling students to apply investigative approaches to design challenges. The visiting team found evidence of assignments incorporating case studies, precedent analysis, and discrete studio exercises that encouraged exploration of specific design factors within studio courses and building systems coursework. In addition, ARC 650 Architecture Research provides a foundation in architectural inquiry, equipping students with analytical tools to engage in research that may be applied to design exercises. At the culmination of the program, ARC 698 Directed Research serves as a capstone project, requiring students to undertake a substantive, independent research project aligned with faculty expertise across four research-based courses. This ensures that students gain a comprehensive understanding of research methodologies, theoretical exploration, and applied innovation as they relate to professional practice.

Assessment of research engagement is structured through formal rubrics for ARC 650 and ARC 698, measuring student proficiency in research methodology, critical inquiry, and its application

in design. The program has also adjusted its curriculum to align with evolving topics and faculty research areas. During the site visit, the visiting team confirmed the program's commitment to research by discussing how research shapes learning and practice with students and faculty. Additionally, the team reviewed assigned work in ARC 698 and ARC 607 and observed studio and technical courses to assess how research is integrated into coursework. These observations affirmed that research is a fundamental component of the student experience at Syracuse Architecture.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The program ensures an understanding of PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration through ARC 409: Architectural Design VIII and ARC 585: Professional Practice. Experiences include cultural events, student organization activities, teaching and tutoring programs, and a living-learning community.

The program provides the syllabus, schedule, exams, assignments, and lecture materials for review. The APR (pg.40-41) includes the program's assessment table for PC. 6, listing three learning outcomes that address the knowledge in the criterion. The table consists of assessment points, assessment methods, benchmarks, results, and planned improvements. The table indicates that for one goal, the benchmark is 90%, and the result is 84.4% based on a quiz. The results of the other two learnings indicate that all students met one goal and that all students engaged consultants meeting the other goal. The program has identified areas for improvement, such as providing additional examples, emphasizing the organization of collaboration and field study, and implementing those changes.

During the visit, the team verified this evidence through discussions with program faculty and students.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The program ensures an understanding of PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration through ARC 605: Architectural Design II, ARC 607: Architectural Design IV, and ARC 585: Professional Practice. Experiences include the School of Architecture's lecture series, cultural events, teaching and tutoring programs, student organization activities, and student-led mentoring.

The program provides the syllabus, schedules, lectures, and instructional materials for review. The APR (pg.42-43) includes the program's assessment table for PC. 6, listing three learning outcomes that address the knowledge in the criterion. The table indicates the learning goal, assessment point, benchmark, results, and planned improvements. The results showed that set benchmarks were achieved in 2 of 3 learning goals. For one goal, the benchmark was 90%, and the result was 84.4% based on quizzes. Improvement based on the results includes adjustments to the schedule, organization of collaborations, and additional examples from practice. The program is in the process of implementing those changes.

During the visit, the team verified this evidence through discussions with program faculty and students.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
In the B.Arch. program, courses ARC 181, ARC 182, and ARC 207 are taught in hands-on environments that require students to share ideas, present work to one another, and incorporate the feedback of others in their work. For ARC 207: Architectural Design III, the grading rubric provided includes a section on ''Engagement and Attitude'', encouraging students to come to class on time and prepared, and to show kindness and support to peers.

The APR (pg.43-45) notes that since the last assessment cycle, the program has built up the Student Mentor Squad and Academic Advising Staff to provide further mentorship to students and help mediate between students and faculty. Staff advisors meet with students before they matriculate to ensure understanding of courses required during the B.Arch.'s first four semesters. Another check-in is held during the fourth semester to help students plan out electives and choose minors for their remaining semesters. Outside of these mandatory advising checkpoints, students are free to request meetings with advisors, and note that advisor support has been key to student success.

During the site visit, staff reported that the school provided them funding and paid time to attend conferences and skills workshops and pursue advanced degrees. Faculty are also offered research leave and grants coordinated by the Office of the Dean to aid their research efforts. The yearly staff and faculty retreat was cited as key to building camaraderie and setting shared goals for the school.

B.Arch. students expanded on the Architecture Student Organization (ASO) role, which hosts social events for students, including a Beaux Arts Ball. These events allow students to meet and spend time together outside class, building community in the student body. In the classroom, all students noted that studio assignments are often completed in teams.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
In the M.Arch program, courses ARC 606, ARC 681, and ARC 682 are taught in hands-on environments that require students to share ideas, present work to one another, and incorporate the feedback of others in their work. In ARC 606: Architectural Design III, students and instructors start the semester by signing a ''design studio work contract'' to use class time productively and maintain a reasonable work/life balance. Notably, the first term in the contract is that students ''will not pull a single all-nighter''.

During the site visit, staff reported that the school provided them funding and paid time to attend conferences and skills workshops and pursue advanced degrees. Faculty are also offered

research leave and grants coordinated by the Office of the Dean to aid their research efforts. The yearly staff and faculty retreat was cited as key to building camaraderie and setting shared goals for the school.

A new extracurricular offering described is the construction of the graduate pavilion at the school's annual Open House showcase, which is designed and built collaboratively by M. Arch students. Additionally, the visiting team spoke with leaders of the Graduate Student Association (GSA), which provides support and advocacy for graduate students. The GSA leaders meet regularly with the M.Arch. program chair, and their input is sought during faculty searches and when curriculum improvements are made.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The APR and supporting material demonstrate that the program gives students an understanding of diverse cultural context and teaches them to incorporate it in the built environment. The history courses ARC 133 and 134 not only treat Western and non-Western as equally important, but discusses distinctions between facts and perceptions in architectural history. For instance, the difference between Orientalism and actual architectural practices in Asian cultures is included in the ARC 133 lecture schedule. The theory classes, ARC 141 and 242, expose students to a variety of often conflicting viewpoints that have shaped architectural practice. Students compile bibliographies with sources from authors that are diverse in culture, gender, and race. Also, students specifically conduct research on influential women and non-white designers. Using grades for these assignments as a benchmark, the program has determined 90% of students understand the importance of diversity in the profession.

Overall, the history/theory sequence helps students understand the historical role architecture has played in excluding people and groups, and encourages them to create sensitive, inclusive design decisions as an alternative. Planned course improvements include offering more tutoring and study sessions to students.

The program enhances students' understanding of diversity in architecture through a broad offering of study abroad/away programs. The majority of B.Arch. students reported participating in one of these programs, and cited the inspiration they gained on these trips as key to their development as designers.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The APR and supporting material demonstrate that the program gives students an understanding of diverse cultural context and teaches them to incorporate it in the built environment. In the history courses, ARC 631 and ARC 639, lectures focus on "significantly different locations and eras" to give students an understanding of the diversity that has shaped global architecture. Students then apply these concepts in written papers.

Similarly, the theory courses ARC 641 and ARC 642 use sources from a diverse set of authors to give students a framework to evaluate the theories that have shaped architectural practice. ARC 642 specifically includes discussion of social/political concepts such as human rights and environmental violence.

Finally, in the studio course ARC 606, students synthesize what they have learned about diverse contexts by conducting research on different regions of the US and considering the different types of healthcare that may be needed in different communities. Using course grades as a benchmark, the program found that about 80% of students were able to create a clear argument regarding the needs of the communities they studied and potential solutions.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
As described in the APR (pg.52-55), the program relies on ARC 108: Architectural Design II, ARC 141: Architectural Theory I, ARC 207: Architectural Design III, ARC 307: Architectural Design V, ARC 311: Structures II and ARC 585: Professional Practice to ensure that students understand the impacts of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.

The supporting instructional materials have demonstrated how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address this criterion.

The syllabi states that students will be primarily evaluated on project work. The Self-Assessment Table provides benchmarks and results, also identifying planned improvements. The program has demonstrated how it effectively assesses student learning on a recurring basis related to this criterion.

Student work from ARC409 and ARC423 and discussions with students about their assignments and design solutions demonstrated that they understand how their designs impact the built environment and health safety and welfare of the public at multiple scales.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
As described in the APR (pg.55-56), the program relies on ARC 606: Architectural Design III, ARC 612: Structures II, ARC 623: Advanced Building Systems III and ARC 585: Professional Practice to ensure that students understand the impacts of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.

The supporting instructional materials have demonstrated how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address this criterion.

The syllabi states that students will be evaluated on research, project work, quizzes and exams. The Self-Assessment Table provides benchmarks and results, also identifying planned improvements. Example grading rubrics and evaluation spreadsheets have been provided for ARC 612 and 623 to demonstrate how students are evaluated. The program has demonstrated how it effectively assesses student learning on a recurring basis related to this criterion.

Student work from ARC 606 and ARC 623 and discussions with students about their assignments and design solutions demonstrated that they understand how their designs impact the built environment and health safety and welfare of the public at multiple scales.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
Syracuse University School of Architecture requires ARC 585 Professional Practice in both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, ensuring that students develop a comprehensive understanding of professional responsibilities and ethics, business considerations, and evolving practice models.

Evidence included lectures, assignments, and case studies covering LEED certification, AIA contracts, project cost, project delivery methods, marketing and client acquisition, and building codes. The course is taught by an active professional within the community and reflects current issues around contemporary practice.

Assessment methods in the program include quiz result benchmarks that measure student comprehension. The faculty has demonstrated a commitment to continuous improvement by reviewing lecture content and modifying courses to align with current industry practices.

Beyond the classroom, the School fosters engagement with practicing architects and industry professionals through initiatives such as SHOP Talks (interactive discussions with practitioners), interview publications, and other professional engagement opportunities. These experiences expose students to a real-life perspective and highlight alternative career paths.

The program maintains a forward-thinking approach by addressing emerging topics in special workshops, such as the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on practice and the ethical framework and attribution of intellectual property in portfolio creation.

Through conversation with students, the team found evidence the strong alumni network is a resource for seeking advice about career paths and practice.

The opportunities to study and work in the New York, Miami, and Los Angeles locations were also reported through on-site discussions with faculty to offer students an insight into differing practice models through interaction with professionals as part of the program.

Overall, the visiting team found that the School of Architecture at Syracuse University takes professional ethics and judgment seriously, embedding these discussions throughout the curriculum and co-curricular activities while maintaining a critical awareness of new and emerging challenges in the profession.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
Syracuse University School of Architecture requires ARC 585 Professional Practice in both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, ensuring that students develop a comprehensive understanding of professional responsibilities and ethics, business considerations, and evolving practice models.

Evidence included lectures, assignments, and case studies covering LEED certification, AIA contracts, project cost, project delivery methods, marketing and client acquisition, and building codes. The course is taught by an active professional within the community and reflects current issues around contemporary practice.

Assessment methods in the program include quiz result benchmarks that measure student comprehension. The faculty has demonstrated a commitment to continuous improvement by reviewing lecture content and modifying courses to align with current industry practices.

Beyond the classroom, the School fosters engagement with practicing architects and industry professionals through initiatives such as SHOP Talks (interactive discussions with practitioners), interview publications, and other professional engagement opportunities. These experiences expose students to a real-life perspective and highlight alternative career paths.

The program maintains a forward-thinking approach by addressing emerging topics in special workshops, such as the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on practice and the ethical framework and attribution of intellectual property in portfolio creation.

Through conversation with students, the team found evidence the strong alumni network is a resource for seeking advice about career paths and practice.

The opportunities to study and work in the New York, Miami, and Los Angeles locations were also reported through on-site discussions with faculty to offer students an insight into differing practice models through interaction with professionals as part of the program.

Overall, the visiting team found that the School of Architecture at Syracuse University takes professional ethics and judgment seriously, embedding these discussions throughout the curriculum and co-curricular activities while maintaining a critical awareness of new and emerging challenges in the profession.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
As described in the APR (pg.58-61), the program relies on ARC 121: Intro to Building and Structural Systems, ARC 211: Structures I, ARC 307: Architectural Design V, ARC: 311 Structures II, ARC 322: Building Systems Design II, ARC 409 Architectural Design VIII, ARC 423: Advanced Building Systems and ARC 585: Professional Practice to ensure 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.

The supporting instructional materials have demonstrated how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address this criterion.

The syllabi state that students will be evaluated on project work, class assignments, quizzes, and exams. The Self-Assessment Table provides benchmarks and results and also identifies planned improvements. Example grading rubrics and evaluation spreadsheets have been provided for ARC 121, 211, 311, 322, and 423 to demonstrate how students are evaluated. The program has demonstrated how it effectively assesses student learning on a recurring basis related to this criterion.

Student work from ARC307, ARC322, ARC 409 and ARC423 and discussions with students about their assignments and design solutions demonstrated that they understand building and site regulations and how to integrate regulatory requirements into their designs.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
As described in the APR (pg.61-63), the program relies on ARC 611: Structures I, ARC 622: Building Systems Design II, ARC 612: Structures II, ARC 623: Advanced Building Systems III, ARC 585: Professional Practice and ARC 607: Architectural Design IV to ensure that students learn 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.

The syllabi state that students will be evaluated on project work, class assignments, quizzes, and exams. The Self-Assessment Table provides benchmarks and results and also identifies planned improvements. Example grading rubrics and evaluation spreadsheets have been provided for ARC 611, 612, 622, and 623 to demonstrate how students are evaluated. The program has demonstrated how it effectively assesses student learning related to this criterion.

Student work from ARC606, ARC607, ARC622 and ARC623 and discussions with students about their assignments and design solutions demonstrated that they understand building and site regulations and how to integrate regulatory requirements into their designs.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
As noted in the APR (pg.63-65) and the primary evidence provided, students in ARC 423: Advanced Building Systems understand established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building constructions and methods and criteria for assessment through exercises in conceptual and environmental analysis of an existing building. Content is enhanced with a focus on optimization using software for performance analysis. This criterion directly maps to the program's Learning Outcome 3: Emerging Technology.

The primary course ARC 423 was assessed with an established benchmark for integrated building technology. For spring 2024, only 85% of the students achieved the establish benchmark of a 90% completion. In response to the assessment, the program is implementing a detail design prompt to reinforce understanding through application.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
As noted in the APR (pg.66-68) and in the primary evidence provided, students in ARC 623: Advanced Building Systems III examine design and deployment of environmental, energy, structural, and enclosure systems. The evaluate conceptual integration, material assemblies, and simulation to visualize and interpret data for creating adaptive designs.

The primary course ARC 623 was assessed with an established benchmark addressing emerging systems and technologies, building assemblies and construction, and assessment in the evaluation of design, economics, and performance against performance objectives. For spring 2024, only 85% of the students achieved completion against the 90% benchmark. In response to the assessment, the program is implementing a detail design prompt to the application exercise.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating the synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions. This is primarily achieved through ARC 307: Architectural Design V and ARC 322: Building Systems Design II, which address critical aspects of design integration. ARC 307 focuses on design at the city scale, addressing site issues encompassing regulatory and

environmental design. At the same time, ARC 322 emphasizes building system integration, ensuring that students engage with regulatory requirements and environmental considerations.

In ARC 307, students are provided with a high-level program, but there is an inconsistent presentation of user requirement synthesis. While the course introduces regulatory requirements, evidence of life safety considerations was found in some projects; however, few examples demonstrated a comprehensive application of code or zoning regulations. Additionally, accessible design considerations were inconsistently applied across student work.

ARC 322 effectively supports students in analyzing and iterating designs based on site conditions, such as orientation relative to wind, shade, sunlight, and heat stress, and in evaluating the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions. However, as most projects occur in flat, urban environments, there was little evidence of topographic analysis.

Both ARC 307 and ARC 322 were assessed in Fall 2023, with supporting instructional materials demonstrating how the curriculum structure and coursework address this learning criterion. The syllabi indicate that students are evaluated on semester-long project work, and the program's Self-Assessment Table provides benchmarks, results, and identified areas for improvement. Example evaluation spreadsheets for ARC 322 further illustrate how student performance is assessed.

Student work from ARC 307, ARC 322, and ARC 409, along with discussions with students regarding their assignments and design solutions, demonstrated that they have developed the ability to make informed design decisions based on user and regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and the measurable environmental impacts of their design choices.

The program has effectively established assessment mechanisms to ensure student learning in these areas and continues to refine its curriculum to enhance alignment with these essential competencies.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Not Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The M.Arch. program has not demonstrated that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating the synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and the measurable environmental impacts of their design choices. This is primarily addressed through ARC 606: Architectural Design III, ARC 607: Architectural Design IV, and ARC 622: Building Systems Integration. While addressing user requirements, ARC 606 focuses on extensive research and analysis of site conditions, including physical elements, historical contexts, and demographics. ARC 607 emphasizes accessible design, and ARC 622 concentrates on integrating building systems with a particular focus on environmental impact considerations.

While the program has demonstrated a structured approach to design synthesis, there are inconsistencies in the application of regulatory requirements. Although some macro-level analyses of zoning and code were present, there was little evidence that students consistently apply these regulations in their design work. The supporting instructional materials have not fully

demonstrated how the curriculum, structure, and other experiences comprehensively address this criterion.

Student work from ARC 606, ARC 607, and ARC 622, along with discussions with students about their assignments and design solutions, demonstrated their ability to incorporate user input, site conditions, accessible design, and environmental considerations into their projects. However, evidence of a consistent application of regulatory requirements was lacking. Strengthening the integration of zoning and building codes into coursework will be necessary to fully meet this learning outcome.

Assessment of ARC 606 and ARC 622 took place in fall 2023, while ARC 607 was assessed in spring 2024. The program has mechanisms to evaluate student learning, including semester-long project evaluations, benchmarks identified in the Self-Assessment Table, and example evaluation spreadsheets provided for ARC 622. While these measures demonstrate a commitment to assessing student performance, additional emphasis on regulatory requirements in coursework will enhance the program's ability to address this criterion fully.

**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)

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Not Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The B.Arch. program develops students' ability to integrate building systems in design but lacks measurable building performance application in projects. As outlined in the APR (pg. 71-72), the program relies on ARC 409: Architectural Design VIII and ARC 423: Advanced Building Systems to ensure that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while integrating building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, construction processes, and the measurable outcomes of building performance. ARC 409 focuses on integrating these systems within the design process, while ARC 423 provides an in-depth analysis of building systems, with a particular focus on their performance.

While both courses address the integration of essential building systems, student work from ARC 409 and ARC 423 demonstrates that students can effectively incorporate building envelope systems, structural systems, environmental control systems, and life safety systems into their design decisions. However, evidence was not found that students are consistently able to measure the outcomes of building performance on their design projects. In ARC 409, the focus on building systems is present, but there is limited integration of lifecycle assessment and measurable performance outcomes. ARC 423 offers a thorough analysis of building performance metrics, but this knowledge is primarily applied to precedent studies, rather than directly to students' own design projects. This gap in the application of building performance measurement prevents students from fully realizing the potential impact of their design decisions on building performance.

Further complicating this, students who are away for two semesters do not take ARC 409 and ARC 423 concurrently, meaning they cannot apply the analysis from ARC 423 to their ARC 409 projects. This limitation reduces the opportunity for students to connect theoretical analysis with practical application within their design projects.

The supporting instructional materials, such as the syllabus and the Self-Assessment Table, demonstrate how the program assesses student learning related to this criterion. Students are evaluated on their final building design projects, with benchmarks and results outlined in the Self-Assessment Table and example evaluation spreadsheets provided for ARC 423. These materials indicate that the program is committed to regularly assessing student progress. However, there is a need for further integration of measurable building performance outcomes into student design work to ensure that students not only understand but can also apply building performance metrics to their own projects.

## M.ARCH.

**Team Findings: Not Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**

The M.Arch. program develops students' ability to integrate building systems in design but lacks measurable building performance application in projects. As described in the APR (pg. 72-73), the program relies on ARC 623: Advanced Building Systems Design II and ARC 607: Architectural Design IV to ensure that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating the integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance.

However, evidence was not found demonstrating that students consistently apply measurable building performance outcomes in their design work. While precedent studies within the curriculum introduce building performance metrics, this knowledge does not translate into applied analysis within student projects. The absence of measurable building performance outcomes remains a gap in student learning.

The program has provided instructional materials demonstrating how it assesses student learning related to this criterion. The syllabus indicates that students are evaluated through final building design projects. The Self-Assessment Table outlines benchmarks, results, and planned improvements. Additionally, example evaluation spreadsheets from ARC 623 illustrate the assessment process. Student work from ARC 607 and ARC 623, along with discussions with students, confirmed their ability to integrate building envelope systems, structural systems, environmental controls, and life safety systems into their designs.

**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)

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
This condition is met. A letter from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education dated June 21, 2018, was included in the evidence and indicates that Syracuse University's accreditation term is 2018-2027. The APR indicates the university has begun its next self-study with a review in 2026-2027.

**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.

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
4.2.1 Professional Studies - The APR (pg.74-75) notes the required 111 credits for the B.Arch.

4.2.2 General Studies –Students take 54 credits, with 18 in open electives. There is a discrepancy between how studio credits are counted in the APR and online due to the reclassification of ARC 498: Directed Research. The regional accreditor does not specify a credit requirement for general studies but rather a "sufficient scope" to prepare students and expand their intellectual experience as well as cultural and global awareness and sensitivity. To achieve this, there are the Syracuse University Shared Competencies in six areas. Additionally, all students take an IDEA course to explore social justice broadly.

4.2.3 Optional Studies – Students are required to take 12 credit hours of Professional Electives.

4.2.4 Bachelor of Architecture – As noted in the APR and the online catalog, and verified on-site, the program requires 157 credit hours. See
https://courses.syracuse.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=38&poid=19011

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**

4.2.1 On-site meetings and the APR (pg.75-76) note 92 credits required within the M.Arch program.

4.2.2 General Studies—As noted in the APR (pg.80), these are satisfied by students' baccalaureate degrees and are subject to verification by the Student Enrollment Office.

4.2.3 Optional Studies – Students have 6 credit hours of open electives

4.2.5 Master of Architecture - As noted in the APR (pg.83) and the online catalog, and verified on-site, the program requires 92 credit hours. See https://courses.syracuse.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=39&poid=19901

**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.

**B.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
**4.3.1:** In the APR, the program documented its process for evaluating a student's coursework prior to admission. Because the B.Arch is a first professional degree, applicants are not required to complete any NAAB coursework before enrolling.

Syracuse Architecture's admissions staff confirmed that the majority of students transferring into the B.Arch program come from within the university. To qualify, students must have a minimum 3.0 GPA, pass a pre-calculus course, and submit a portfolio for review. Interviews with applicants are scheduled at the discretion of the program.

In the case of external B,Arch transfers, admissions staff from both the program and the university work together to review applications on an individual basis. The majority of transfer students are required to start the studio sequence in the first year.

**4.3.2:** In the B.Arch program, advanced standing for studio is only granted at the approval of the Undergraduate Program Chair, after a student has submitted proof of studio coursework and submitted a satisfactory portfolio. To determine transfer credits for courses other than studio, faculty conduct individual course equivalency reviews based on documentation submitted by

applicants. Such documentation may include course syllabi, course grades, and examples of completed work. Students are also required to meet with a faculty member with expertise in the course they are seeking transfer credit for, prior to the start of classes.

**4.3.3:** During the visit, admissions staff confirmed that reviews for transfer credit are handled on a case-by-case basis. Upon admission to the program, students receive a personalized "map" of the courses they need to take to complete the B.Arch, based on the transfer credits they have been granted.

**M.ARCH.**
**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
**4.3.1:** In the APR, the program documented its process for evaluating a student's coursework prior to admission. Because the M.Arch is a first professional degree, applicants are not required to complete any NAAB coursework before enrolling.

In the M.Arch program, program faculty are fully responsible for reviewing student applications. The review committee includes the Graduate Program Chair and several faculty members who are teaching/have taught in the M.Arch program. Standardized test scores, transcripts, applicant essays, letters of recommendation, and a portfolio are holistically reviewed during the application process. The review process and criteria are documented in the APR.

**4.3.2:** In the M.Arch program, students may receive equivalent credit for up to 27 out of the total 92 credits in the course, based on a review of undergraduate coursework. Advanced standing for studio, allowing students to receive equivalent credit for the first year of studio, is determined by the Graduate Admissions Committee based on the level of work presented in the student's portfolio. For advanced standing in required structures and history courses, students must pass an equivalency exam. Advanced standing in other non-studio coursework is determined by faculty review of course syllabi and course grades submitted by students. Students are also required to meet with a faculty member with expertise in the course they are seeking transfer credit for, prior to the start of classes.

The above was documented in the APR and confirmed in conversations with program leaders and admissions staff during the visit.

**4.3.3:** During the visit, admissions staff confirmed that reviews for course equivalency are handled on a case-by-case basis. Upon admission to the program, students receive a personalized "map" of the courses they need to take to complete the M.Arch, based on the equivalent credits they have been granted.

## 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.

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
**5.1.1:** Administrative Structure
The Syracuse University School of Architecture is positioned within the broader university structure with a clear and well-documented administrative hierarchy. The program has comprehensively described its position within the university, outlining the leadership team, an organizational chart, and detailed staff roles as presented in the Architecture Program Report (APR).

The School operates with a sufficient degree of autonomy, facilitated by the Responsibility Center Management (RCM), which allows for financial discretion and strategic planning to support continuous improvement within the School. Academic and curricular decisions are made at the School level, ensuring discipline-specific governance and responsiveness to programmatic needs. These decisions undergo institutional review through a committee chaired by Provost Lois Agnew, which provides oversight while preserving the school's ability to direct its academic mission.

The administration of the School of Architecture includes Dean Michael Speaks, Associate Dean and Associate Professor Kyle Miller, the Undergraduate Chair, Associate Professor Daekwon Park, and the Graduate Program Chair Julie Larsen. Kyle Miller also fulfills the Associate Dean for Research duties, a position that is vacant through spring 2026. Overall, the School of Architecture's administrative structure supports its academic mission and provides a framework for sustained excellence and adaptability within the larger university system.

**5.1.2:** Governance
Beyond the administrative structure described above, the governance structure of the Syracuse University School of Architecture, as described in the Architecture Program Report (APR), includes faculty committees for curriculum, promotion and tenure, and new hires. Each of these committees consists of a non-voting student representative, ensuring a structured approach to decision-making.
Both faculty and staff have the ability to serve on university committees.

The curriculum committee includes faculty members selected on a rotating basis and staff member Karen Baris, Director of Advising and Records, to assist with the continuity of prior decisions. Karen Baris also participates in a university-wide curriculum committee to exchange best practices, and other examples of engagement with university governance and resources were described.

Students engage in broader university-wide conversations about campus and community issues through a variety of options for interactions. These contributions allow students to voice concerns, propose initiatives, and collaborate on institutional improvements. Additionally, student organizations—including AIAS, NOMAS, AIA, ASO, and GSA—serve as platforms for advocacy, leadership development, and policy influence, reinforcing student engagement in decision-making. The Graduate Students in Architecture (GSA) particularly advocates for needs of the graduate students in curriculum and student support. Additionally, there is the Graduate Employees United.

On-site discussions with faculty and students provided concrete examples of how issues have been addressed through this governance framework, often informally through conversations with the Dean, Associate Dean, Chairs, faculty, and staff.

The team observed that many mechanisms used to promote involvement in institutional governance and ensure faculty, staff, and student input are based on practice rather than structured policy. For example, Involvement of staff in governance is informal although their roles have been expanded.

The team found through conversations with students and administrators that the staff of the Student Engagement Office is very engaged with supporting students in academic and non-academic concerns, and has built a trusted resource for students.

Overall, the culture the team observed on-site evidenced an informal yet supportive, engaged environment responsive to various needs within a hierarchical structure.

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

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

- 5.2.1 The program's multiyear strategic objectives, including the requirement to meet the NAAB Conditions, as part of the larger institutional strategic planning and assessment efforts.
- 5.2.2 Key performance indicators used by the unit and the institution.
- 5.2.3 How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated multiyear objectives.
- 5.2.4 Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program as it strives to continuously improve learning outcomes and opportunities.
- 5.2.5 Ongoing outside input from others, including practitioners.

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

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**

The School of Architecture demonstrates a process for continuous improvement for both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, which the team verified during the site visit.

**5.2.1:** The programs' multi-year strategic objectives and assessment plans are integrated into the institutional assessment plans. The APR describes the coordination with the University's Institutional Effectiveness office, which manages assessment, program review, shared competencies, course feedback, and strategic planning to support evidence-based decision-making. The APR describes the five strategic priorities of the university's initiatives, the School's eight learning outcomes, and the NAAB Program and Student criteria. The team confirmed these by reviewing strategic plans and meetings with administrators and faculty.

**5.2.2:** The APR describes the key performance of the programs, and the university uses. The indicators address curricular areas for increased offerings, providing support for experiential learning, faculty research, and public and private support of research initiatives. For each indicator, the programs detail the matrix and target goals. The team confirmed these by reviewing the strategic plan and assessment documents and meeting with administrators.

**5.2.3:** The APR described how the program tracks progress towards multi-year objectives detailed in the School of Architecture's Strategic Plan. The APR highlights the program's progress towards achieving goals and initiatives, which include supporting new faculty, initiatives for inclusive teaching, communicating the value of design, committing to architectural design

research, and assisting students with personal and professional development. The team confirmed these by reviewing strategic plans and meetings with administrators.

**5.2.4:** The APR identifies the program's strengths: providing a sense of belonging for all students, engaging emerging building technologies to address environmental issues, and immersing students in global engagement. The areas for improvement identified include developing teaching and advising, expanding tutoring programs, peer mentoring, strategies for academic assessment, increasing access, experiential learning, and recruitment for the M.Arch program. The team confirmed these strengths and challenges on-site.

**5.2.5:** Alumni, practitioners, trustees, and community members actively engage with the architecture program. The School of Architecture Advisory Board advises the faculty and administration. The team confirmed this engagement on-site through meetings.

**5.3 Curricular Development** (*Guidelines*, p. 19)
The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for assessing its curriculum and making adjustments based on the outcome of the assessment. The program must identify:

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

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

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
This condition is met. As noted in the APR (pg109-113), supported in the evidence, and verified through numerous on-site meetings, the program has an integrated process for assessing the curriculum, which has additional support from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness that assists with curricular mapping alongside university-wide Student Learning Outcomes.

The Curriculum Committee comprises five elected members with voting privileges and non-voting administrative and student members. The five elected members are on staggered two-year terms with representation across levels: two tenure-track, two tenured, and one Associate Teaching Professor. A recent change in the committee reduced the number of elected seats to lessen the service burden across the school. Acknowledging that the committee no longer has a designated disciplinary representative (e.g., architectural history/theory, architectural technology, etc.), the school has convened curriculum area working groups to address specific questions and targeted areas for development.

**5.3.1:** In 2021, the school established eight Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for the B.Arch and M.Arch, aligned with the 2020 NAAB Conditions. The alignments with the PCs and SCs are presented in the APR (pg.7-8)—the cross-pollination of the PLOs and NAAB criteria present opportunities for connecting topics across courses.

**5.3.2:** The APR outlines the structure and responsibilities of personnel and committees engaged in curricular agendas and initiatives (pp. 112-113).

**5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development** (*Guidelines*, p. 19)
The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate and adequately funded human resources to support student learning and achievement. Human resources include full- and part-

time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. The program must:

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

5.4.2 Demonstrate that it has an Architect Licensing Advisor who is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. These duties include attending the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay up-to-date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.

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

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

**Team Findings: Not Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**

**5.4.1:** The team finds this condition not met. While the APR describes how it promotes student and faculty achievement, the team finds that growth in the B.Arch. enrollment and an increase in the number of architecture minors is causing imbalances in the workload of full-time and part-time faculty and stressing the program. The programs ensure that faculty are assigned to teach courses in their areas of expertise, encouraged to contribute to university and school committees, conduct research, maintain professional licensure, and provide a methodology for determining research and other leave. The Office of the Dean facilitates and supports the faculty in their course development and research and offers annual grant opportunities. The school provides students and faculty with a range of exposure to architectural practice through lectures, electives, and other programs. The description meets the criterion. However, there is no information about how faculty workloads are balanced.

**5.4.2:** Director of Career Services, Kristen DeWolf, serves as the school's architect licensing advisor. The description in the APR demonstrates that Ms. DeWolf is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. This criterion is satisfied.

**5.4.3:** The APR states that the Office of Academic Affairs is committed to creating a supportive and enabling environment for all faculty members by providing a broad range of programs and services that support faculty teaching, research, and professional development. This includes faculty professional development through funding attendance at national conferences and research. Staff professional development opportunities are financially supported, including conference attendance, continuing education/professional advancement, and professional membership. This criterion is satisfied.

**5.4.4:** The APR describes the support services available to students in the program which is supported by the Director of Advising and Records and includes two full-time undergraduate academic advisors and one half-time graduate student advisor. Undergraduate students are required to meet with their academic advisor at three specific points in their five years and graduate students are encouraged to meet with their academic advisor each semester. All students have access to Syracuse University's Barnes Center, which serves as a hub for student wellness. Career guidance, internship, and job placement are supported by the career services

office which takes an individualized approach to students' differing career goals, including emphasis on licensing. This criterion is satisfied.

The team will add confirmation of evidence for 5.4.1-5.4.4 during the site visit.

**5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion** (*Guidelines*, p. 20)
The program must demonstrate its commitment to diversity and inclusion among current and prospective faculty, staff, and students. The program must:

- 5.5.1 Describe how this commitment is reflected in the distribution of its human, physical, and financial resources.
- 5.5.2 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's faculty and staff demographics with that of the program's students and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.
- 5.5.3 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its students since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's student demographics with that of the institution and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.
- 5.5.4 Document what institutional, college, or program policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other social equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.
- 5.5.5 Describe the resources and procedures in place to provide adaptive environments and effective strategies to support faculty, staff, and students with different physical and/or mental abilities.

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
**5.5.1:** The APR describes a variety of physical resources and inclusive gathering places the university makes available to students. Examples include the DEIA (Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Access) Office and Intercultural Collective, Hendricks Chapel, and La Casita Cultural Center. Representatives from these offices are frequently invited to Slocum Hall, the architecture building, to meet directly and engage with B.Arch. and M.Arch. students. Notably, DEIA forums are hosted for every cohort in the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs. Regarding human and financial resources, the program employs a full-time Assistant Director of Enrollment Management and Student Engagement, Gus Nascimento. As part of his role, Mr. Nascimento serves as chair of the college's DEIA council and ensures DEIA principles are integrated into the academic environment.

**5.5.2:** To continue hiring diverse faculty, the APR notes the program's existing partnerships with organizations including Asians in Higher Education, Hispanics in Higher Education, Disabled in Higher Education, and others. Over 40% of the program's current faculty identify as non-White, reflecting the student body's diversity.

**5.5.3:** According to statistics provided by the program, the student body is notably diverse. No race holds a majority, and 38% of students are from outside the US. Recently, the program has expanded its outreach efforts to include more schools and community organizations serving underrepresented groups. In 2024, 40% of students in the program identified as either Black, Hispanic/Latino, or Native American, representing a 22% increase compared to the prior accreditation cycle. Several student organizations, such as NOMAS, Women in Design, and the International Mentor Squad, exist to support B.Arch and M.Arch students from groups historically

underrepresented in the profession. To recruit a diverse body of prospective students, Syracuse Architecture's admissions staff confirmed they work with the university on outreach to schools and community groups service underrepresented populations.

**5.5.4:** At the institutional level, the university's commitment to DEIA is supported and furthered by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. The School of Architecture recently formed a DEIA Council at the program level to "address needs of students, staff, and faculty at the intersection of education, health, well-being, and identity". The Council has three main goals: to diversify course content, enhance student advocacy, and improve teaching/advising practices. Within the School, program leadership solicits informal feedback from students and works with students to host a variety of events promoting diversity and inclusion. As noted by staff, such events often become well-known throughout the university, one example being the school's annual Lunar New Year celebration.

**5.5.5:** At the institutional level, the university offers numerous accommodations to students with disabilities, including ASL interpretation, reasonable accommodations, and more. The university's Center for Disability Resources manages these services.

**5.6 Physical Resources** (*Guidelines*, p. 21)
The program must describe its physical resources and demonstrate how they safely and equitably support the program's pedagogical approach and student and faculty achievement. Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

- 5.6.1 Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- 5.6.2 Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including lecture halls, seminar spaces, small group study rooms, labs, shops, and equipment.
- 5.6.3 Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- 5.6.4 Resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.
- 5.6.5 Plans for disaster and recovery of information.

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.

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
**5.6.1:** Studio Learning: The team found evidence in the APR and on-site of studio space to support student learning, including plans of Slocum Hall, and verified descriptions of study-abroad facilities with faculty and administrators.

Added space for studio desks in Smith Hall was described and verified on-site. Renovations over the last 8 years, including a major one, were detailed, including dividers at desks, HVAC, security, and technology upgrades. Slocum Hall underwent extensive renovations in 2008 and continued systems-level improvement, particularly after 2021, to support hybrid learning.

The team observed multiple studio spaces with ample daylight and desks suitable for digital work and creating physical models in various media. Students enrolled in the studio have a desk for their exclusive use. Through on-site discussions, students reported a high usage of the studio space for work and other courses and generally valued the interaction with other students that the studio environment offered.

**5.6.2:** Didactic and Interactive Learning: The team found evidence in the APR, including building plans and descriptions of various spaces, including lecture halls, reviews for special workshops, classrooms, and the fabrication lab. The team verified the spaces and features on-site through tours of the various spaces.

**5.6.3:** Faculty support: The team found evidence of sufficient office space for faculty members in the central location, Slocum Hall, within plans in the APR and on-site observation. Full-time faculty have permanent offices within the building, and part-time faculty are provided with desks in an open office environment. The program has added desks, storage, and technology upgrades to support more faculty.

**5.6.4:** Learning Formats: All learning formats and pedagogies are represented, particularly evolving technologies for digital presentation. All instruction, with certain exceptions, is in-person at various locations, including the main facilities in Syracuse and remote locations in Florence, London, New York, Miami, and Los Angeles. Information on facilities at off-site locations was provided through the APR and descriptions by staff and faculty.

The team found evidence in the APR and through on-site observations that the program provides well-equipped facilities to support architectural education.

Studio spaces are designed to accommodate both digital work and the creation of physical models using a variety of media. These spaces are equipped with desks that allow students to seamlessly transition between digital and hands-on design processes, fostering an integrated approach to architectural education.

The recent expansion of the Fabrication Labs has further enhanced the program's resources, offering multiple types of 3D printers, laser cutters, and traditional woodworking and metalworking tools. These additions provide students with access to a wide range of fabrication methods, allowing them to explore materiality, structure, and form more fully in their design work.

In addition to studio and fabrication spaces, the program has secured Rooms 101 and 104 for exclusive use by the School of Architecture. These rooms serve as venues for classes, special workshops, faculty presentations, and design reviews, creating dedicated environments for focused learning and collaboration.

The availability of video displays and projectors throughout the buildings further supports instruction and presentations, enabling dynamic visual communication and critique sessions.

Finally, the central atrium in Slocum Hall serves as a vital space for critique and exhibition. Its open layout facilitates cross-communication between students and faculty, encouraging an exchange of ideas across different program levels. This shared space reinforces a culture of engagement and discourse within the school, contributing to the learning environment.

**5.6.5:** The University has implemented disaster recovery and business recovery plans. General information to address a variety of scenarios for faculty, students, and parents is available on a designated website, with links to school-specific plans.

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

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

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The APR describes adequate financial resources to support student learning. It also provides information on financial resource allocation, student learning expense categories, revenue categories, scholarship/fellowship, grant funds, planning reductions or increases, changes in funding models for faculty compensation, and planned or in-progress institutional development campaigns.

Syracuse University uses a Responsibility-Centered Management budget model, so the revenue generated by the programs determines the resources available. The programs establish short— and long-term goals for enrollment and instruction revenue and fundraising goals to ensure annual budget proposals are based on revenue and expense projections. Scholarships are available for undergraduate students, and fellowships are available for graduate students. Faculty have access to internally awarded research funds in addition to the University's Office of Academic Affairs, which provides faculty support through several programs.

Meetings with administrators and staff confirmed that enrollment has been stable and is projected to remain so. The university is committed to providing the financial resources for the continued operation and development of the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs.

**5.8 Information Resources** (*Guidelines*, p. 22)
The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient and equitable access to architecture literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in architecture.

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

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The Syracuse University Libraries support the programs, and there is a dedicated subject specialist: Barbara Opar, Librarian for Architecture. The Syracuse University Libraries sponsor her position, and she is only one of two entirely on-site subject librarians. There is a robust, hybrid collection, and the program benefits from the dedicated King + King Architecture Library located within Slocum Hall, which holds books and the Working Drawings Collection. s Collection. Opar's office is located in this space and the school sponsors student assistants to support the architecture collections and library.

The school has access to the Special Collections Research Center and their rare books, manuscripts, and folios. The digitization project of the slide library was halted by COVID and there is rich potential if this project was to restart to augment visual resources such as those available through JSTOR. Beyond the university's collection housed in the Byrd Library, there are Inter Library Loan services through SHARES to New York City institutions and a special direct borrowing relationship with Cornell University. When students are in London and Florence, they have access to dedicated Syracuse resources as well as a wealth of other resources; this access and elements related to other study abroad/away sites is outlined in the APR (pg.131-137).

The team verified the information in the APR through tours of the King + King Architecture Library and the Byrd Library, as well as on-site meetings with faculty and students to confirm access and usage.

**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.

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The team was informed that detailed information about the M.Arch program is provided at a separate link, which is not included in the APR. Specifically, the relevant information regarding the M.Arch program can be found on the School of Architecture's accreditation webpage, which is available at https://soa.syr.edu/school/accreditation/. This resource offers insights into the program's compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation and other related details.

**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)

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The team verified the required documents available on the school's website. All required documents, including Interim Reports and Annual Reports from 2016 onward were available as PDFs. Relevant text from the 2020 C&P was included on the website, with a link to NAAB's full document text. The team accessed the material prior to the website using browsers for desktop and mobile devices.

**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.

**Team Findings: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
Career Services provides students and graduates with access to career development resources. In addition to individual consultation, there are online resources that provide information on careers and professional networking. Links provided in the APR demonstrated available resources and information.

The team found evidence in the APR that a variety of resources on Career Development were available to students, including lectures in ARC 585 on the Path to licensure, access to counseling and connections to internships through the Career Services office; Special sessions on AXP and ARE; ethics and portfolio design, IP; Alumni Portfolio Review, SHOP Talks with local practitioners. Students participate in a "Career Blitz" to interview with hiring firms on-site, and are able to meet with advisers at the Career Center. The school provided statistics on a relatively high percentage of graduates finding employment within the field. The team verified through conversations with students, staff, and administrators that professional placement after graduation was highly valued.

During the on-site visits, through meetings with the students and staff, evidence was found that students have robust access to career development resources. This criterion is satisfied.

**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) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB awarding accreditation or candidacy
b) The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit
c) NCARB ARE pass rates

**Team Findings:**
**B.ARCH.: Met**
**M.ARCH.: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The APR provides links for the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs on the program website, which provides access to the Conditions, Procedures, NAAB decision letters and responses, the previous APR, the most recent Visiting Team Report, Interim Progress Report, and NCARB Pass rates. The team confirmed that the links are active and provide the required information.

**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

**Team Findings:**
**B.ARCH.: Met**
**M.ARCH.: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
The required applications forms and instructions are available in the APR (pg. 140), with examples provided in the appendix and additional information online for the B.Arch and M.Arch, outline requirements for the university, architecture portfolio, and (M.Arch only) advanced standing.

The program provided links to the university's financial aid office and to need-based, academic merit, and talent-based scholarships.

**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.

**Team Findings:**
**B.ARCH.: Met**
**M.ARCH.: Met**

**2025 Team Analysis:**
6.6.1 The B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs has met the condition by providing verified links to resources that demonstrate students have access to current information and advice regarding financial aid. These links were reviewed and confirmed during the accreditation process.

6.6.2 The program has met the condition by providing verified links to resources that offer an initial estimate of all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials required throughout the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program. These links were reviewed and confirmed during the accreditation process.

## E. The Visiting Team

**Team Chair, Educator Perspective**
Robert McKinney, Ed.D., M.Arch., Architect, NCARB
Professor Architecture and Design
Weatherford International Endowed Professor
School of Architecture and Design
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
Lafayette, LA 70504-3628
robert.mckinney@louisiana.edu
https://www.linkedin.com/in/robert-mckinney-18252716/

**Team Member, Practitioner Perspective**
Christine West, AIA
Principal, KITE Architects
Providence, RI
cw@kitearchitects.com
https://www.linkedin.com/in/christinemaleckiwest/

**Team Member, Regulator Perspective**
Mary Morissette, FAIA NCARB LEED AP
Principal Architect, 4-M Design
Denver, CO
mary@4-mdesign.com
https://www.linkedin.com/in/mary-morissette-faia/

**Team Member, Student Perspective**
Tiffany Chang, Assoc. AIA, NOMA
MG2 Design
Bellevue, WA
tiffany.chang@mg2.com
https://www.linkedin.com/in/tiffany-chang-/

**Team Member, 2nd Educator Perspective**
Danielle S. Willkens, PhD, Assoc. AIA, FRSA, LEED AP BD+C
Associate Professor; Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA
danielle.willkens@design.gatech.edu
https://www.linkedin.com/in/archdsw/

**F. Report Signatures**

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**Robert McKinney, EdD, Architect, NCARB**
**Team Chair**

**Tiffany Chang, AIAS, NOMA**
**Team Member**

**Mary Morisette, FAIA, NCARB**
**Team Member**

**Christine West, AIA**
**Team Member**

**Danielle S. Willkens, PhD, Assoc. AIA, FRSA, LEED AP BD+C**
**Team Member**