

**City College of the City University of New York
Bernard and Anne Spitzer School of Architecture**

Visiting Team Report

B. Arch (160 undergraduate credit hours)

M. Arch (undergraduate degree + 108 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
26 October 2011

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

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Team Findings	
1. Team Comments and Visit Summary	
2. Conditions Not Met	
3. Causes of Concern	
4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	
II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation	
1. Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	
2. Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	
III. Appendices	
1. Program Information	
2. Conditions Met with Distinction	
3. Visiting Team	
IV. The Visiting Team	
V. Confidential Recommendation and Signatures	

I. Summary of Team Findings

Thanks to the Dean, Senior Administrators, Students, Staff, and Faculty for a clear and exceptionally well organized team room. The well-orchestrated schedule allowed for full participation by all. Special thanks to Gordon Gebert for the advance planning.

1. Team Comments and Visit Summary

Strengths

The team noted a number of strengths in the architectural program at CCNY School of Architecture including:

Strong experienced administrative team, outstanding faculty, and a diverse student body

The program is served by an engaged and supportive administration with the dean, chair, deputy chair, and graduate program director. The president and provost are enthusiastic and supportive of the school's vision and activities. The dean is an effective leader.

The faculty (both full time and adjunct) are collaborative with one another and accessible and responsive to students. The faculty is actively engaged in practice and highly committed to the school. Faculty research is extensive and relevant to contemporary needs within the field. Faculty diversity increased significantly through recent hires, and the program's goal is to continue to diversify the faculty.

One of the greatest strengths of the school is the diversity of its student body.

The new building

The new building offers spaces that allow for collaborative teaching and learning, cross-studio pollination, community and alumni events, visibility, and pride of ownership. It is a tremendous new resource for the program.

The city of New York

The city itself offers a rich environment for experimentation and realization of a range of projects and student experience. The new J. Max Bond Architectural Center extends the legacy by providing opportunities for student and faculty research and outreach.

The potential offered by the endowment

The Bernard and Anne Spitzer Endowment provides potential for greater visibility, enhanced opportunities for faculty and students, and the continuation of the educational mission of both the school and the university. Used wisely, this gift will continue the vision of the City College of New York's founder Townsend Harris, who stated, "Open the doors to all. Let the children of the rich and the poor take their seats together and know of no distinction save that of industry, good conduct, and intellect."

Interdisciplinary collaborations

The curriculum allows for many opportunities for interdisciplinary education.

2. Conditions Not Met

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures (second time)

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees (soon to be corrected)

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs (condition corrected during the visit)

3. Causes of Concern

A.. University communications infrastructure: The program's ability to communicate with students and the public is impaired by institutional information infrastructure limitations, including an email system that students are apparently reluctant to use, the lack of a database of active email addresses for the architecture student body, insufficient wireless bandwidth, and a school web site whose development, evolution, and maintenance was slowed by an ineffective hosting arrangement and cumbersome, time-consuming update and maintenance procedures.

B. Building refinement: Faculty and students want a café in their new facility. Since this is a 24/7 facility, it would be safer to have such a facility within the Spitzer School of Architecture. This building refinement would also provide a place for interaction between and among faculty and students.

C. Level of need-based scholarship funding: Although the tuition is very reasonable at the Spitzer School of Architecture, the ability to provide some level of need-based scholarship funding would both meet the mission of the CCNY and allow the school to attract students who are offered funding at competing institutions.

D. Staff support for new programs: Three new programs—Master of Architecture, Master of Landscape Architecture, and Master of Urban Design—have been added to the responsibilities of the current staff. Additional staff support would greatly improve the service to these programs.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2006)

Condition 2, Program Self-Assessment: *The accredited degree program must show how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives and how it assesses the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The assessment procedures must include solicitation of the faculty's, students', and graduates' views on the program's curriculum and learning. Individual course evaluations are not sufficient to provide insight into the program's focus and pedagogy.*

Previous Team Report (2006): The involvement of faculty members, students, and alumni/ae in program self-evaluation was not adequately demonstrated. Anecdotal evidence of faculty engagement in self-assessment during faculty meetings was presented to the team, but these discussions were not documented. Students seemed unaware of the school's self-assessment processes and of their potential participation in these processes. The school does not have any standardized mechanism for gathering student feedback about the program. The elected student representatives were also not participating in program self-assessment. A select group of alumni/ae, including recent graduates, provides feedback through the dean's advisory council, but this too was not documented.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is still not met. For the past several years the architecture program has been going through an exciting time of rapid and significant change including the creation of a graduate program, the receipt of a large endowment that has prompted many new initiatives, the move into a new building, and the hiring of 10 new full-time faculty members. The team appreciates the challenge of negotiating change on so many fronts and is impressed with the ability of the administration, faculty, staff, and students to create/retain positive equilibrium and coherence as they have moved through this time. The administration and faculty have worked hard and made smart choices that have enabled the program to make significant advances and take full advantage of its many new and ongoing opportunities.

In this state of flux, self-assessment has taken place in informal and largely anecdotal venues such as reviews of student work and discussions at faculty meetings but has not

yet been developed into a set of formal methods and metrics. A fuller, more formalized, and much more directed self-assessment, however, is critical as the SSA moves forward.

Decisions about what and how to make meaningful self-assessments must be made relative to the goals of the SSA as set forth in a finalized Strategic Plan or similar document. As noted in section I.1.4, a long-range plan including target dates, implementation strategies, and the criteria by which the success of each aspect of the plan will be measured, is critical to the process of assessment.

Condition 3, Public Information: *To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.*

Previous Team Report (2006): The college catalog (in both print and electronic forms) does not use the current required language from Appendix A, but rather the language from the 1998 *Conditions and Procedures*. No equivalent of the required statement is available on the school's web site. However, the school does provide the student performance criteria on its web site.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is not met; the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5, is found on the SSA web site for both the graduate and undergraduate programs. In the City College of New York Bulletin found on the CCNY web site, the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5, is found in the Undergraduate Bulletin but not in the Graduate Bulletin. The school has requested the correct language be added to the Graduate Bulletin for the next printing.

Condition 5, Studio Culture: *The school is expected to demonstrate a positive and respectful learning environment through the encouragement of the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff. The school should encourage students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers.*

Previous Team Report (2006): We found no evidence of a studio culture policy produced by students and faculty, nor evidence of its implementation and maintenance and adherence to it. The faculty drafted and approved a policy, but the students were unaware of it and did not participate in formulating it.

2011 Team Assessment: The team found this condition met.

Criterion 13.1, Speaking and Writing Skills (2004): *Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively*

Previous Team Report (2006): The ability to listen and speak effectively was evident in the studio presentations of all years; a comparable level of ability in reading and writing was not evident.

2011 Team Assessment: This condition is now met. The visiting team found the ability to read, write, listen, and speak evident in studio presentations and written course work. Written material is evident in studio presentations in the form of research. Written assignments are also evident in the required course work, including Architectural Management, Structures, Survey of World Architecture, and others. It is evident that an effort has been made to improve reading and writing skills across the curriculum.

Criterion 13.4, Research Skills: Ability to *gather, assess, record, and apply relevant information in architectural coursework*

Previous Team Report (2006): A minimally adequate level of written research does not exist in any architectural courses. There is research in the studios that is presented in visual documentation, making it possible to infer its presence in coursework from the projects of some, but not all, students. Highly directed research in the early years, beyond precedent studies, is not leading to an ability to accomplish the same among students in the last year, when they must define and pursue the research themselves.

2011 Team Assessment: This condition is now met. The visiting team found the ability to gather, access, record, and apply relevant information in architecture course work across all years and at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Criterion 13.26, Technical Documentation: Ability to *make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design*

Previous Team Report (2006): This criterion is not met because there is no evidence that students have the ability to write outline specifications. However, the ability to make technically precise drawings is well met. Beginning in the first sequence and continuing through the last, students are required to explore various documentation media. Examples of freehand and drafted pencil and ink drawings are a welcome inclusion in the pedagogy. Hand-built wooden models are well done and the quality and complexity of these increases throughout the years. Computer-generated work is rigorously pursued and demonstrated. A well-equipped wood shop and dedicated faculty member in charge are credited with the opportunity the shop offers to students.

2011 Team Assessment: This condition is now met. The 2011 visiting team found ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design met through the Comprehensive Studios. This criterion is now met in the M. Arch program and well met in the BArch program.

II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

I.1.1 History and Mission: *The program must describe its history, mission and culture and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context.*

The accredited degree program must describe and then provide evidence of the relationship between the program, the administrative unit that supports it (e.g., school or college) and the institution. This includes an explanation of the program's benefits to the institutional setting, how the institution benefits from the program, any unique synergies, events, or activities occurring as a result, etc.

Finally, the program must describe and then demonstrate how the course of study and learning experiences encourage the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects.

[X] The programs have fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence.

2011 Team Assessment: Administratively the City College of New York (CCNY) is part of the City University of New York public system. CCNY has a rich history and dynamic currency based on serving students from a wide spectrum of race, culture, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status in alignment with the goals of its parent institution. The Bernard and Anne Spitzer School of Architecture serves a broad population of students, offering a rich, diverse, and well-rounded architecture education.

The 2009 endowment from Bernard and Anne Spitzer has allowed the school to move into a newly renovated building that provides students and faculty with space much more conducive to studio education. This endowment has also enabled the program to move into new realms such as design-build projects, including a successful entry in the Solar Decathlon. It has funded the purchase of much-needed equipment and new opportunities for student and faculty research, study abroad, etc.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

- *Social Equity: The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual*

orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.

[X] The programs have demonstrated that they provide a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The programs have demonstrated that they provide a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2011 Team Assessment: It is clear from every indicator that the SSA provides a welcoming, collegial environment among and between faculty, students, and staff. The 2011 visiting team observed an inclusive culture dedicated to teaching/learning.

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

- A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community.** *That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching.¹ In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.*

[x] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2011 Team Assessment: The SSA is one of two accredited architecture programs in the New York state public educational system and is the only such program in New York City (the other is in Buffalo). The presence of a school of architecture in the midst of such a dense population center ensures that many students who would not otherwise be able to embark on an educational career can do so. This allows CCNY to offer an educational experience unique to the New York City metropolitan region.

On a regular basis the school offers lectures and exhibits that are free and open to the university community and often to the larger public beyond the college. The faculty also participate in teaching in the required General Education course titled “Freshmen Inquiry and Writing Seminar” and serve on college and university committees as part of their service.

The president of CCNY is extremely enthusiastic about the potential role of the school as a major player in the chancellor’s “Decade of Science” initiative. Her particular interest is currently focused most clearly on design-build projects on and off campus and development of both relationships and projects in Harlem, the neighborhood in which the SSA is located. These initiatives have begun and their continuation is guaranteed by the Spitzer endowment.

¹ See Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2011 Team Assessment: Though the visiting team found ample policies and products that support the intent of this NAAB Perspective, perhaps the most telling evidence was the meeting the team had with the students themselves. In that meeting the students—representative of all years of the BArch and MArch programs—articulated their appreciation for the personal support of the faculty and for the diversity of thought of their fellow students. (Some students with specific challenges approached the team after the general meeting to express gratitude for support the faculty had given them.) It was clear from the conversation that “difference” is a quality that is not simply tolerated but genuinely celebrated.

A significant number of students indicated they were in positions of governance on school committees and/or in student organizations. This was especially notable in a student body +/-70% of whom work to support themselves and pay for school (rough estimate based on a show of hands). Student representatives from each studio in both the BArch and MArch programs interface with the administration twice a semester, facilitating the exchange of information.

These student representatives are given a copy of the Studio Culture Policy every year and asked to review it and suggest changes. They, in turn, pass this request along to their classmates. In our meeting, the students articulated that they had never suggested changes to the Studio Culture Policy because it is adequate in its current form. We found this to be a “thoughtful, deliberate, informed” response. It was made clear to the team that members of the SSA community treat each other with mutual respect and have reasonable expectations.

The students in the program have dedicated themselves to attaining an architecture education that for many, if not most, of them is neither easy nor inexpensive relative to their financial resources. Based on their commitment at this point in their lives, there is significant evidence to suggest they have gained or are gaining the self-motivation, curiosity, and savvy necessary to be lifelong learners.

Overall the conversation between the team and students and among the students themselves during that meeting suggested a mature, articulate student body, well-acquainted with and respectful of one another but clearly in possession of strong individual opinions. They understand they operate in the context of a university budget and policies, the necessity of prioritizing choices, and the difference between personal desires and actions taken for the greater good.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2011 Team Assessment: In 2010 the newly appointed IDP Coordinator formally addressed the entire first year B. Arch and M. Arch student body to distribute and discuss information about IDP and the ARE. This event will take place annually. In the team’s meeting with the students, the

majority indicated they were aware of IDP requirements and comfortable that they could get any questions they might have answered by the faculty and/or the IDP Coordinator.

In the APR the school expressed concern about the percentage of SSA students passing the ARE. The team appreciates the program's concern and supports more research into the causes of this issue as well as the planned offering of an ARE workshop for graduates this spring.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2011 Team Assessment: The vast majority of the full-time and adjunct faculty of the SSA are registered architects actively engaged in practice; they bring their professional experience into the studio. This fact is borne out not only by the faculty credentials but also by discussions with both faculty and students, who indicate this is a particular strength of the program. In addition, the alumni are extremely active and engaged in the current activities of the school, including but not limited to studio reviews, studio consultations, and consultations in support of the recent Solar Decathlon project. In addition, studio projects are almost universally embedded in real sites in and around NYC and sometimes involve clients with whom the students interact.

The roles of related disciplines are experienced directly in the MArch program through collaboration with studio consultants and a collaborative studio between Architecture and Landscape Architecture taken by all graduate students in the 4th semester of the program. The comprehensive project on the BArch level includes meetings with eight different consultants. The team is impressed by the graduate program commitment to having a collaborative studio with Landscape Architecture and supports the desire expressed by both Architecture and Landscape Architecture faculty to include this experience for every student in the BArch program as well.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2011 Team Assessment: The approach to architecture education endemic at the SSA prepares students to be active and engaged "citizen-architects." The projects they engage almost uniformly respond to distinct environmental and social contexts requiring thoughtful intervention. Because nearly all studios, technology courses, and seminars are taught by registered architects actively engaged in practice, there is an increased level of authenticity to the students' experiences. The issues, questions, and design problems the students are asked to consider can rely less on purely theoretical situations and more on actual contextual situations. It is clear that the constant presence of practitioners in the school also makes issues such as ethics, client roles, economics,

and other issues of practice in the public realm generally more pervasive across a broad spectrum.

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

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

2011 Team Assessment: The long-range plan is divided into three components: 1) goals and examples of targets and actions of the 2000 strategic plan, 2) the draft strategic plan outline dated February 2011, and 3) the Spitzer School's goals and targets. This list is comprehensive but would be helped by having these three components combined into one list of goals with a timeline of dates and implementation strategies, including who is responsible and the measures for evaluating success. See *1.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures*.

1.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: *The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:*

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

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

[X] The program's processes do not meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2011 Team Assessment: For the past several years the architecture program has been going through an exciting time of rapid and significant change including the creation of a graduate program, the receipt of a large endowment that has prompted many new initiatives, the move into a new building, and the hiring of 10 new full-time faculty members. The Team appreciates the challenge of negotiating change on so many fronts and is impressed with the ability of the administration, faculty, staff and students to create/retain positive equilibrium and coherence as they have moved through this time. The administration and faculty have worked hard and made smart choices that have enabled the program to make significant advances and take full advantage of its many new and ongoing opportunities.

In this state of flux, self-assessment has taken place in informal and largely anecdotal venues such as reviews of student work and discussions at faculty meetings but has not yet been developed into a set of formal methods and metrics. A fuller, more formalized, and much more directed self-assessment, however, is critical as the SSA moves forward.

Decisions about what and how to make meaningful self-assessments must be made relative to the goals of the SSA as set forth in a finalized Strategic Plan or similar document. As noted in section 1.1.4 a long-

range plan including target dates, implementation strategies, and the criteria by which the success of each aspect of the plan will be measured is critical to the process of assessment.

FINAL

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES**I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:**

- *Faculty & Staff:*
 - *An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions².*
 - *Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.*
 - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.*
 - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.*
 - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.*
 - *Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.*

[X] Human Resources (Faculty and Staff) are adequate for the programs.

2011 Team Assessment: The faculty of 25 full-time members and approximately 60 adjunct part-time members is adequate for the program. An IDP Coordinator has been appointed and trained in the issues of IDP and has regular communication with students concerning the requirements for IDP. Many of the students are already enrolled in IDP.

The faculty is provided with opportunities for professional development, and faculty members contribute to the program's improvement. They are provided opportunities to travel to conferences, sabbatical leave (for tenured faculty), and publishing support (augmented by the Spitzer Fund).

Three new programs—Master of Architecture, Master of Landscape Architecture, and Master of Urban Design—have been added to the responsibilities of the current staff. Additional staff support would greatly improve the service to these programs.

- *Students:*
 - *An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This documentation may include, but is not limited to application forms and instructions, admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshman, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.*
 - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.*

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

² A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.

2011 Team Assessment: The school's admission process, including the Creative Challenge test (available on the City College web site), was provided. The Lewis Mumford Lecture Series and the Sciame Lecture Series both have a long tradition at the school. Students are supported by student teaching assistantships, graduate assistantships in History and Theory, field trips, summer programs, and internships. Funding is available for their attendance at AIAS membership and conferences. In addition, travel scholarships are available to deserving students.

1.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the programs.

2011 Team Assessment: The administrative structure is clear and cohesive. The administration is understaffed, however, by two full-time staff positions. With the addition of new graduate programs and other new initiatives (made possible by the Spitzer Endowment) more staff support is required.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the programs.

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence of opportunity to participate in the overall governance of the architecture institution was observed in the APR and verified through direct observation as well as faculty, student, and staff dialogue. The administration conducts meetings with student leaders regularly for them to voice their concerns. Staff members expressed that they work in an environment of trust where they are able to bring forward new ideas to enrich the learning environment.

1.2.3 Physical Resources: *The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:*

- *Space to support and encourage studio-based learning*
- *Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.*
- *Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.*

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the programs.

2011 Team Assessment: The program is now operating in the new Vinoly-designed Bernard and Anne Spitzer School of Architecture facility. There is excitement and pride among the staff and student body in their dedicated building. The 130,000-square-foot facility houses 31 studios, a greatly expanded library, classrooms, faculty and administrative offices, a model shop, and computer labs organized around a 60-foot-high atrium with a public gallery at its base. The rooftop amphitheater takes in a panoramic view of the New York City. At the ground level the new J. Max Bond Architectural Center has been recently funded. In addition to the new building, Bernard and Ann Spitzer have given a generous endowment to fund future initiatives.

1.2.4 Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.*

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the programs.

2011 Team Assessment: The program has provided very detailed financial information on the Bernard and Anne Spitzer endowment to the program. The Spitzer's have generously pledged \$25 million to fund an endowment for the school to add new activities or substantially enhance existing activities and have provided an initial gift of \$1 million.

Future financial reports would be assisted by comparative reports that show revenue from all sources and expenditures for each year since the last accreditation visit.

I.2.5 Information Resources: *The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.*

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

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2011 Team Assessment: The information resources support professional architecture education. The resources include journals, books, and a visual resources library. Journals held by the library include 50 of the 54 titles suggested by the Association of Architectural School Librarians (AASL). The library (books and journals) has a dedicated space for housing the collections, including a reading/individual study area and an electronic classroom. The library is prominently located in the building adjacent to the main entry, encouraging its use. The visual resources library occupies a separate space in the building but is also accessible. The library is overseen by an architectural librarian who is a member of AASL.

PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports³. Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

- Program student characteristics.
 - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
 - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
 - Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.
 - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
 - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
 - Time to graduation.
 - Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.
 - Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.
- Program faculty characteristics
 - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
 - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
 - Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.
 - Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.
 - Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.
 - Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
 - Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.
 - Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.

B. Arch

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

M. Arch

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

2011 Team Assessment: Statistical reports are provided, but in many cases it is not easy to compare current numbers with numbers from previous B. Arch and M. Arch program visits. For future APRs it would help to report information in a comparative manner so it can be reviewed in context.

I.3.2. Annual Reports: The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2009 NAAB Procedures. Beginning in 2008, these reports are submitted electronically to the NAAB. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the NAAB will provide to the visiting team all annual reports submitted since 2008. The NAAB will also provide the NAAB Responses to the annual reports.

³ In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.

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

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

B. Arch

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

M. Arch

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

2011 Team Assessment: Reports were found in the team room.

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

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

B. Arch

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

M. Arch

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

2011 Team Assessment: Documentation was provided in the form of faculty-produced books, a rotating digital slide show, and a composite publication highlighting faculty work.

⁴ The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

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

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

2011 Team Assessment: The documents as enumerated in Appendix 3 were available.

CONFIDENTIAL

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM**PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE -- EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA**

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria: The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:

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

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

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The visiting team found the ability to read, write, listen, and speak evident in studio presentations and written course work. Written material is evident in studio presentations in the form of research. Written assignments are also evident in the required course work, including Architectural Management, Structures, Survey of World Architecture, and others. It is evident that an effort has been made to improve reading and writing skills across the curriculum.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is evident in B. Arch studio design work.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is evident in M. Arch studio design work.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Hand drawings and digital technology skills are well developed and displayed in the team room across a variety of BArch studios.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Hand drawings and digital technology skills are well developed and displayed in the team room across a variety of M. Arch studios.

- A.4. Technical Documentation: *Ability to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.***

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Technical documentation is evident in the Construction Technology courses and in the Comprehensive Studios in the B Arch program.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Technical documentation is evident in the Construction Technology courses and in the Comprehensive Studios in the M Arch program.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through Design Studio 35100 and Site Technology 35302.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through Site Design 73500 and Architecture Studio 74100.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH 35100 (Design Studio 1) and ARCH 36100 (Design Studio 2). These two courses provide a strong foundation for basic architectural and environmental principles of design.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH 61100 (Architecture Studio 1.1) and ARCH 62100 (Architecture Studio 1.2).

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Precedent studies are met in Design Studios 1 and 2 (ARCH35100 and 36100).

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met in Visual Studies ARCH62001 and Architecture Studio 1.3 (ARCH73100).

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through AES12000 and AES24000. The documentation demonstrates understanding of ordering systems and dimensional design through the syllabus and process and presentation examples.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH61100 and ARCH62100. The documentation demonstrates understanding of ordering systems and dimensional design through the syllabus and process and presentation examples.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through AES23202, AES2402, ARCH35202, and ARCH47202. The documentation demonstrates understanding of historical traditions and global culture through the syllabus, student exams, and research papers. The professors are architectural historians involved in academic research.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH61202, ARCH62201, ARCH73201, and ARCH85201. The documentation demonstrates understanding of historical traditions and global culture through the syllabus, student exams, and research papers. The professors are architectural historians involved in academic research.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through AES 23202, 24202, Arch 35202, 47202 Survey of World Architecture history courses.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through Arch 61202, 62201, 73201, 85201 Survey of World Architecture history courses.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through AES23202, AES2402, ARCH35202, and ARCH47202.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH61202, ARCH62201, ARCH73201, and ARCH85201.

A.11 **Applied Research: *Understanding* the role of applied research in determining function, form, and systems and their impact on human conditions and behavior.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through Design Studio 3 (ARCH47100) and Comprehensive Design (ARCH52100)

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through Architecture Studio ARCH73100 and ARCH74100

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The students in the program have dedicated themselves to attaining an architectural education which for many of them is neither easy nor inexpensive relative to their financial resources. Based on their commitment at this point in their lives, there is significant evidence to suggest they have gained or are gaining the self-motivation, curiosity, and savvy necessary to be lifelong learners.

The students are mature and articulate, well-acquainted with and respectful of one another but clearly in possession of strong individual opinions. They understand they operate in the context of a university budget and policies, the necessity of prioritizing their choices and activities, and the difference between personal desires and actions taken for the greater good. As a whole the student body is adept at communicating visually as well as verbally. They do so through both analog and digital means in drawings and models employing a variety of media. In addition, many express critical thinking through their writing as evidenced by the fact that the student journal “Informality” won the 2009 Douglas Haskell Award for Student Journals. This award was “founded to encourage student journalism on architecture, planning and related subjects, and to foster regard for intelligent criticism among future professionals.” National recognition of the quality of the students’ entry is evidence of the strong critical thinking and representation skills described in Realm A.

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

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

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through course work and also through examples of studio work displayed in the multiple studios visited by the team throughout the visit. This criterion is met specifically through Arch 51100 and 52100, where students dedicate a large part of the semester's course work to the investigation, preparation, and assessment of client and user needs.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through course work and also through the many examples of studio work displayed in the multiple studios visited by the team throughout the visit. This criterion is met specifically through Arch 85100 and 86100, where students dedicate a large part of the semester's course work to the investigation, preparation, and assessment of client and user needs.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH47100 and ARCH48100 as well as ARCH35100 and ARCH36100.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH62100 as well as ARCH73100 and ARCH74100.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through multiple BArch courses. The topic is integrated throughout the curriculum.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through multiple Arch courses. The topic is integrated throughout the curriculum.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH35302 as well as ARCH36100 and ARCH47100

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH73500 as well as ARCH61100 and ARCH62100

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met throughout the studios and specifically in ARCH47100 and ARCH48100

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met throughout the upper-level studio work and specifically in ARCH62100.

- B. 6. Comprehensive Design: *Ability* to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student's capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following SPC:**

A.2. Design Thinking Skills

A.5. Investigative Skills

A.4. Technical Documentation

A.8. Ordering Systems

**A.9. Historical Traditions and
Global Culture**

B.2. Accessibility

B.3. Sustainability

B.4. Site Design

B.5. Life Safety

B.7. Environmental Systems

B.9. Structural Systems

B. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the B. Arch Comprehensive Studio.

M. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the M. Arch Comprehensive Studio. Eight consultants are introduced in the studio to assist in the development of comprehensive building design projects. The disciplines include structures, MEP, envelopes, landscape, lighting, cost estimation, and specifications.

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

B. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through studio projects in ARCH48100 complemented by ARCH51200. The students are also expected to be versed in a wide variety of issues that include professional practice issues such as building costs, acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating.

M. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through studio projects in ARCH73100 complemented by ARCH85600. The students are also expected to be versed in a wide variety of issues that include professional practice issues such as building costs, acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating.

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

B. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH47301 as well as ARCH48301.

M. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH61500 as well as ARCH74500.

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

B. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through a two-semester series of structural engineering courses teamed with studio work; ARCH35401, ARCH36401.

M. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through a three-semester series of structural engineering courses teamed with studio work; ARCH62400, ARCH73400, ARCH7440.

- B. 10. Building Envelope Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.**

B. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH35301 and ARCH36301. The documentation demonstrates understanding of envelope systems through the syllabus, examinations, projects, and assignments.

M. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH61300 and ARCH62300. The documentation demonstrates understanding of envelope systems through the syllabus, examinations, projects, and assignments.

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

B. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH47301 and ARCH48301. The documentation demonstrates understanding of building service systems through the syllabus, examinations, projects, and assignments.

M. Arch

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH65100 and ARCH74500. The documentation demonstrates understanding of building service systems through the syllabus, examinations, projects, and assignments.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the construction technology ARCH35301 and ARCH63601 and is reinforced through studio application.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the construction technology ARCH61300 and ARCH62300 and is reinforced through studio application.

Realm B: Team Commentary:

The students create building designs with well-integrated systems. Life safety systems, accessibility, and constructability are evident in the studio work. Sustainable design is a priority embedded in the curriculum. The program benefits from a faculty that is licensed and practices in the New York City area. A significant number of the faculty is nationally and internationally recognized.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:

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

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

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through an undergraduate-level collaborative studio and the successful Solar Decathlon project built in Washington, D.C., in 2011.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the graduate level in collaborative studio work researching site analysis and precedent studies in groups, and also in a collaborative studio with the landscape architecture department within the college.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through Survey of World Architecture 3 ARCH35202, Survey of World Architecture 4 ARCH47202

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through Survey of World Architecture 3 ARCH73201, Survey of World Architecture 4 ARCH85201

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the Architectural Management course ARCH 51200

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the Professional Practice course ARCH 85600

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the Architectural Management course ARCH 51200.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the Project Management course.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH51200. The documentation demonstrates an understanding of all facets of running an architecture practice business. The syllabus, student exams, and report papers are part of this documentation as well as an interview with the instructor. The professors are licensed and in many cases linked to internships within the school.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through ARCH 85600. The documentation demonstrates an understanding of all facets of running an architecture practice business. The syllabus, student exams, and report papers are part of this documentation as well as an interview with the instructor. The professors are licensed and in many cases linked to internships within the school.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the Architectural Management course ARCH 51200.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the Architectural Management course.

C. 7. Legal Responsibilities: *Understanding of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.*

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the Architectural Management course ARCH 51200

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through the Architectural Management course at the graduate level.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met in the Architectural Management course ARCH 51200.

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met in the Project Management course at the graduate level.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met through Survey of World Architecture 3 ARCH35202 and Survey of World Architecture 4 ARCH47202

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is met in Survey of World Architecture 3 and 4 (Arch 73201 and Arch 85201).

Realm C. General Team Commentary:

The approach to architecture education endemic at the SSA prepares students to be active and engaged “citizen-architects.” The projects they engage almost uniformly respond to distinct environmental and social contexts requiring thoughtful intervention. Because nearly all studios, technology courses, and seminars are taught by registered architects actively engaged in practice, there is an increased level of authenticity to the students’ experiences. Many studios also include meetings with various architecture consultants as well as individuals or organizations that serve as clients. It is clear that the constant presence of practitioners in the school makes issues such as ethics, budgets, client roles, and other aspects of responsible practice in the public realm generally more pervasive across all activities of the school.

Students have opportunities to undertake design-build projects, most recently the 2011 Solar Decathlon competition. They researched, designed, calculated costs for, and built an urban solar rooftop pod. This was CUNY’s first experience entering this highly complex and demanding competition. The students’ project was chosen as one of twenty finalists from around the world and was on public display in Washington, D.C. This project embodies the core goals of leadership and practice described in Realm C.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Regional Accreditation: *The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).*

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The Middle States Commission on Higher Education reaffirmed accreditation on June 26, 2008.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The required minimum credit distributions for the B. Arch and M. Arch programs have been met.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Ample evidence of curriculum coordination and development is evident across the course work of the SSA. While the Curriculum Coordination Committee, BArch year-level coordinators, and graduate program coordinator bear official responsibility for consistent overview and changes to the curriculum, the entire faculty—tenure-track, tenured, and adjunct members—have the opportunity to participate in oversight and changes to the curriculum.

PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

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

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The program has a clear system for the evaluation of pre-professional education that requires documentation from the previously attended program be submitted for evaluation before the program will waive a student's requirement to take the course. The school has established specific requirements for the waiver of course requirements.

FINAL

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION**II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees**

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

[X] Not Met

2011 Team Assessment: The exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5, is found on the SSA web site for both the graduate and undergraduate programs. In the City College of New York Bulletin found on the CCNY web site, the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5, is found in the Undergraduate Bulletin* but not in the Graduate Bulletin.**

*Undergraduate Bulletin: <http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/CCNYBulletin/upload/CCNY09-11UG-REV.pdf>

**Graduate Bulletin: <http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/CCNYBulletin/upload/CCNY-Graduate-Bulletin-2008-10-2.pdf>

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The SSA web site provides a link to these documents from its web site. This link is found under the tab “Resources” > “NAAB Student Performance Criteria” (<http://ssasite.info/resources/NAAB.html>).

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:

www.ARCHCareers.org

The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects

Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture

The Emerging Professional’s Companion

www.NCARB.org

www.aia.org

www.aiaa.org

www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The SSA web site provides a link to these documents from its web site. This link is found under the tab “Resources” > “NAAB Student Performance Criteria” (<http://ssasite.info/resources/NAAB.html>).

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

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

All Annual Reports, including the narrative

All NAAB responses to the Annual Report

The final decision letter from the NAAB

The most recent APR

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

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

[X] Not Met

2011 Team Assessment: The required resources cannot be accessed electronically nor have they been made available to the public in hard copy. They were, however, placed in the library during the team visit.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education.

Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The SSA web site provides a link to these documents from its web site.* This link is found under the tab “Resources” > “NAAB Student Performance Criteria” > “Information and Links” at <http://ssasite.info/resources/NAAB.html>.

*<http://www.ncarb.org/ARE/ARE-Pass-Rates/Pass-Rates-by-School>

III. Appendices

1. Program Information

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

A. History and Mission of the Institution

The City College of New York evolved as a dynamic reflection of the social and political conditions fermenting in New York City in the Nineteenth Century, at a time when educational opportunities were constrained by socioeconomic status, culture, religion, and race. Designed to counter these historical barriers, it became the country's first such public institution of higher education. Founded in 1847 as The College of the City of New York (CCNY), it was first located in lower Manhattan and moved to its present location, the Hamilton Heights Campus, in 1905. Architect George B. Post was chosen the winner of an open competition for the design of the new complex, a geographical move partially made possible by the active extension of the Broadway IRT subway to 137th Street. A true symbiosis was created between the College's new location and the transportation system to get there: Manhattan Schist, the rock excavated from the subway's route, was used by Post as a building material for the new Collegiate-Gothic style that characterized City College buildings.

The College pioneered in providing an excellent education for all those with the ability and motivation to meet rigorous academic requirements. It has always been a vehicle for introducing the children of the working class, including many minority populations, into the educated ranks of American Society. In the 1930s it was world renowned for its immigrant European students. And from that same period its graduate population was awarded 7 Nobel Prizes, the largest number of awards achieved by a single institution in the nation, a distinction it retained for decades until achieving second place status, which it holds today.

Over time, a number of public colleges emerged and in response, the Board of Higher Education and later The City University of New York was founded as an umbrella mechanism for coordinating development efforts and providing the overall administration of such diverse institutions as Brooklyn College, Hunter College, The Graduate Center, a number of community colleges, and of course, the University "flagship", City College. The Chancery and Board of Trustees continue with authority from the State of New York and the City of New York to provide city-wide administrative responsibility for the public colleges, taking an active role in all academic decisions and maintaining close control of all public state and city funding to the colleges.

Following a long tradition, the University and particularly City College is educating a broad but special segment of the population. Our students continue to come from diverse cultures. In addition to the traditional origins of immigration such as eastern Europe, students now come from the culturally diverse populations of Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, the Middle East and Asia: specifically those of Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Peru, Egypt, Israel, Nigeria, China, Japan, South Korea, Vietnam, and additional contributions from over 50 other countries. Almost three-fourths of the student population were born outside the United States with a language other than English as their first language. More than 80 percent are of the first generation of their families to attend college.

The Bernard and Anne Spitzer School of Architecture

(Formerly the School of Architecture, Urban Design, and Landscape Architecture)

After its founding in the School of Engineering in 1961, first as a small intra-departmental program and later as a department, the Architecture Program became an independent school in 1968. In 1969, with the addition of programs in Urban Landscape and Urban Design as allied career alternatives, and a completely new curriculum, the School was transformed into the School of Architecture and who was also responsible for a number of the campus buildings including the present facilities of the School of Architecture.

Environmental Studies, and later was re-named the School of Architecture, Urban Design and Landscape Architecture to more clearly reflect the professional identity of its academic programs.

Bernard P. Spring, founding dean, led the School from 1968 to 1980. Maria Rosaria Piomelli was dean from 1980 to 1983; Donald Mintz, acting dean, from 1983 to 1985; J. Max Bond, Jr., dean from 1985-1991, and Gordon A. Gebert, acting dean from 1991 - 1995.

In the spring of 1995, during a major University-wide budget crisis and reorganization, the School lost its independent status, the dean's position assigned to it was withdrawn, and the School became a unit in the College of Professional Studies. Professional Studies, with its own dean assigned, included several departments formerly part of the Art and Performing Arts School, and the School of Education as well as the School of Architecture and Environmental Studies. From 1995 through 1999, the School had an ambiguous status as a division of the College of Professional Studies under deans David Bushler and Sam Frank.

During that interim period, although represented at the College level by the Dean of Professional Studies, all internal leadership and administrative efforts were provided by the elected chairpersons – Donald Ryder from 1995 through 1998, followed in 1999 by Lance Jay Brown who was appointed as director for a period.

However, since the University-wide Board of Trustees refused to ratify the Colleges' recommendations for its own reorganization, the College reaffirmed the Architecture Program's status as an independent school and initiated a search for a new dean of the school which resulted in the appointment in 1999 of George Ranalli as the dean of the School of Architecture and Environmental Studies. One of Dean Ranalli's first acts was to recommend the School's name be changed to the "School of Architecture, Urban Design and Landscape Architecture" which was approved by faculty and trustees in late 1999.

During this period, the university further affirmed its long-term commitment to the school and its programs by allocating funds to study the feasibility and available alternatives for expanded and improved space. This resulted in a major state and university commitment of substantial funds which led in the fall of 2009, to the school moving from its outdated and outgrown spaces in Shepard Hall to all new quarters in a completely renovated 135,000 s.f. stand-alone building dedicated to its programs including offices, class rooms, studios, library and supporting spaces.

Following the commitment of a generous gift, the school's name was changed by faculty approval and board of trustee action to The Anne and Bernard Spitzer School of Architecture in the Spring of 2009.

The School currently offers: 1] the Bachelor of Architecture, the first professional degree, after the completion of ten semesters; 2] the Bachelor of Science in Architecture, an

option after the successful completion of the first eight semesters of the B. Arch curriculum; 3] the Master of Architecture 1, the first professional degree, after the completion of the six-semester program; 4] the Master of Architecture 2, a non-accredited second professional degree program, after the completion of the three-semester program, 5] the Master of Landscape Architecture I, the first professional degree, after the completion of the six-semester program; 6] the Master of Landscape Architecture II, the second professional degree, after the completion of the two-semester program, and, 7] the Master of Urban Planning, after the completion of the first professional degree in Architecture or Landscape Architecture, and two additional semesters of Urban Design concentration. The City College Architectural Center, the outreach and research arm of the school, is currently in transition with a joint initiative underway by the university, college and school to reaffirm and refocus its mission, and provide new permanent leadership and staffing.

From their beginnings, the Urban Design and Landscape Architecture programs have been led by prominent leaders. Jonathan Barnett, who initially directed the graduate Urban Design program, was succeeded by the prominent urban designer and author Michael Sorkin. The renowned landscape architect M. Paul Friedberg, who established the undergraduate Landscape Architecture program, was succeeded as director by the gifted landscape architect Lee Weintraub, followed by the accomplished landscape architect and educator Achva Benzinberg Stein, who became the first director of the school's two newly established graduate Landscape Architecture programs. Denise Hoffman-Brandt, an emerging scholar and practitioner, is currently the director of the Landscape Architecture program. The Master of Science in Sustainability in the Urban Environment, a joint program of architecture, engineering, and science, and which first admitted students in the fall of 2010, is directed in the Spitzer School of Architecture by Hillary Brown, who has broad experience in sustainability policy and design issues. A search for the director of the former City College Architectural Center is underway.

B. History and Mission of the Program

The following mission statement was ratified by the School's faculty and endorsed by its Dean on April 7, 2005.

The City College School of Architecture, Urban Design and Landscape Architecture is deeply committed to providing the finest education in the art, theory and technology of architecture, urban design and landscape architecture to a broad and diverse student population. It is concerned with the quality of life of the larger community in our complex urban environment, and is thus committed to partnerships with institutions and agencies in the University, the City of New York and beyond. Our goal is to educate students who will create sustainable, equitable, and beautiful solutions for the global community of the 21st Century, working in the spirit of CCNY's Ephebic Oath: "To transmit the city, not only not less, but greater, better and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

Accredited Architecture Programs

The Bachelor of Architecture and Master of Architecture entities in the school each carry the university status of "programs" as do most degree-granting entities.

The Bachelor of Architecture program was the kernel around which the school grew from its founding. Currently enrolling the largest number of students in the school –

approximately 260—it is in many ways the core of the architecture programs—three in all. The Bachelor of Architecture program is overseen by the chair and deputy chair of the department of architecture.

While the Master of Architecture 1 program is a separate entity with an emerging identity and director of its own, it is nevertheless an integral part of the school and shares many resources and facilities with the Bachelor of Architecture program as well as with the landscape architecture, urban design, CCAC community outreach, sustainability program, and other components of the school.

C. Long-Range Planning

The School of Architecture, Urban Design and Landscape Architecture definitively stated in February 2000, its long-standing and ongoing commitment to providing the finest education in the art, theory, and technology of architecture, urban design, and landscape architecture to a broad and diverse student population, while improving the quality of life of the larger community in our complex and highly diverse urban environment. It is committed to partnerships with institutions and agencies in the university, the city of New York, and beyond.

The goals and examples of targets and actions of the 2000 strategic plan are listed below:

1. Redefine (reconfirm) the School Community Identity and Character
Determine optimal school size, maintain diversity, integrate programs, create better communications systems including robust web site
2. Extend Opportunities for Development and Enrichment
New travel and exchange programs, enhance lectures series, increase co-op and IDP, increase joint programs with other departments, increase faculty travel and conference involvement
3. Expand Educational Offerings and Opportunities
Develop masters programs
4. Achieve and maintain a 'state-of-the-art' information technology capability.
Install information infrastructure, provide equipment, software, and improved support
5. Evaluate the Physical Environment of the SAES and invest in a plan for its enhancement
Begin feasibility and programming toward new facilities
6. Replace and/or develop the appropriate SAES Human Resources
Increase admin support, additional digital technician, permanent lab technician for mod. shop
7. Enhance the SAES Institutional Advancement program
Increase fund-raising program, enhance alumni relations, create public relations program

These goals guided major school and program actions, and significant progress was recorded. Several of the goals, including those dealing with new facilities, development of human resources, and institutional advancement, have been realized with excellent results: a new dedicated building, significant progress toward full staff coverage, and receipt of major gifts and grants. However, a number of the goals remain, especially those meant to guide the school to continuous improvement.

In 2007, in response to a college-wide self-study process for an upcoming team visit from the Middle States Commission, and to engage meaningfully in the university-wide

Program Management Process, the school reformulated its goals and targets and continues to do so annually with mid-year reviews taking place on a regular basis.

The generous gift from Bernard and Anne Spitzer provided support and impetus to launch a number of new initiatives. A broad plan was developed by the school in spring 2010, including a detailed financial analysis with various program configurations based on funding flows and endowment return. Several alternatives were projected into the year 2025. That report with the analyses will be available in the team room or is available upon request.

To guide the school's future in the context of this and other emerging opportunities resulting from the school' and college's fund-raising efforts, a long-range plan was drafted and is currently under review. This plan will assist in the assessment of our efforts for continual development and improvement and will aid and inform decision-making, particularly with regard to resource allocation. Flowing from the university Program Management Process (PMP) and strategic planning processes the following outline of Goals and Targets has been developed and is currently being presented to, and reviewed by several groups and committees toward formal adoption. The School Executive, Personnel and Budget, and Curriculum Coordination Committees along with the Architectural Alumni Association Board of Directors and the Dean's Advisory Committee will have the opportunity for plan review through spring 2011. The Student Advisory Committee has also reviewed this document and will likely take it up at its several spring 2011 meetings.

The following is from the draft which was updated after preliminary comments were received during an initial round of reviews.

D. Self-Assessment

The school's self-assessment process is deeply rooted in the culture of City College and the school and is reflected in various policies, procedures, documents and agreements, as well as in the very structure of the institution and the school.

Structured self-assessment procedures are hierarchically arrayed within the University Program Management Process which provides for a set of University goals and general targets which are annually reviewed and updated. These are addressed by the college resulting in a set of local goals and associated targets. These in turn are addressed by the schools and divisions which develop targets, objectives and actions based on such things as individual and specific context, needs, programmatic character, and program accreditation.

Periodically, the college-wide Middle States Commission on Higher Education self-evaluation process presents the occasion for a thorough and broad review of institutional mission, goals and assessment processes. In addition strategic plans and the processes by which they are formulated are examined and re-directed as deemed necessary. During this process the school's mission and goals come into focus. Last carried-out in 2007, the School's goals, targets, and strategic planning were closely reviewed for consistency and viability within the larger framework resulting in a general confirmation of most components and a reformulation of several. In addition, a set of documents outlining actions and programs that responded to the college goals and targets were developed and presented. While the Middle States Commission does not review professional architecture programs, the institution-wide process caused a self-examination at the school level which resulted in confirmation of most of our goals and targets and a reformulation of several. While not assessing the professional schools, the Middle

States visit did occasion a close review within the School of such things as assessment, retention, student services, and academic standards.

Beginning in the spring of 2007, the college Provost's office required each school, academic division, and administrative group to submit a self-assessment. While the required points and format suggested a less rigorous and somewhat different approach than requested by NAAB, the effort resulted in the school's carrying-out a self-examination process and prompted another look at the procedures in place and data available. This process continues.

Assessment and The Governance and Committee Structure

As mandated by the by-laws of the university, the college and the school, various faculty committees are the source of all assessment, accountability, and major decisions regarding curricular and academic personnel. The College Review Committee on which the Dean of Architecture is a standing member, reviews all academic policies and evaluates and approves all appointments and re-appointments including those for tenure and promotion

Faculty appointments are recommended by the Department's Executive Committee, an elected body consisting of the Chairman (elected also, but separately), and four full-time departmental faculty. Annually all faculty being considered for promotion or tenure are evaluated by the students in their respective classes on a variety of criteria, both judging their professional abilities and their ability to teach. These evaluations are computer coded, and anonymous, to be shared only by the Executive Committee and the faculty member in question. In addition, faculty peer reviews result in a written observation on the faculty's performance in class, and allow a discussion of that observation between the observer, the observee, and the Departmental Chairperson. Notes on that discussion (as well as the observation report) are available to the Executive Committee.

The Personnel and Budget Committee (P&B) reviews the decisions of the Executive Committee in light of both personnel and budgetary priorities. Members include the chairperson of the department, the director of the Master of Architecture program, the director of the Master of Landscape Architecture program, and the director of the Master of Urban Design Programs, two elected members of the full-time faculty, and the Dean ex-officio, as chairperson, but without vote.

Students may be elected to sit on the Executive Committee with voice if approved by the faculty and the students poll a minimum number of votes. Alternatively, students may form a committee which advises the School Executive Committee. Students in the school have not exercised these options for some time, though the opportunity remains open.

In the Curriculum Coordination Committee, the effectiveness and success of the School, relative to its educational mission, is continually being monitored and evaluated. The input and emphasis of the committee are decided by the faculty through the election of representatives. Each member of the curriculum committee in turn confers with the faculty and subcommittees for the area they are elected to represent, for reassessment on a regular basis. In this way, all teachers are involved and their opinions, information and input become part of the curriculum assessment process. Elected members represent the areas of Design, History/Theory and Technology and are joined by the Dean, Departmental Chairperson, and the Directors of the Master of Architecture, the Master of Urban Design and the Master of Landscape Architecture Programs. Meetings of the committee are open to all faculty – part-time and full-time – and to student representatives. Based on need perceived by faculty and/or students and after appropriate review and careful deliberation, formal curricular changes are proposed by the Curriculum Committee to the Faculty Council (the entire full-time faculty) for approval.

Curricular changes including new courses must be approved by the Faculty Council, recommended by the Dean to the Provost and President, and finally endorsed by the Board of Trustees of the City University (CUNY).

Peer Evaluations

In keeping with the College mandate and collective bargaining agreement, peer observations and/or evaluations are carried out each semester, focusing on adjunct faculty, the full-time faculty members who are on tenure-track and those who have not yet attained the rank of professor. Written observation reports are submitted to the Departmental Chairperson by the assigned Observer and following this the Chairperson, Observer and Observed faculty member meet to discuss any points of interest or concern to any of those persons involved. These observations are to be referred-to in the Chair's Report, required for every faculty member seeking reappointment, tenure, or promotion. These observations also play an important role in the mid-term tenure reappointment evaluation process which involves a more detailed report by the chair, and an independent meeting between dean and candidate and a report by the dean.

Public Reviews

An important component of the School's self-assessment remains the tradition of the open, public jury review process that is used for all design courses and most other courses which include a studio or project component. This process, which is carried out in a public forum and open to all students, faculty and outside professionals, experts, and often 'clients' allows for a critical and on-going review and general assessment of the projects, the programs, the individual faculty's instruction and the individual student's work and indeed, the curriculum itself. The School has a long standing and on-going relationship with a wide circle of professionals, community members and many alumni, who visit the School regularly. Therefore, a great deal of reliance for assessment of performance and adequacy is placed upon the visits and feedback of these guest critics.

Student Work Public Exhibit and Publication

The public review process is culminated at the end of each academic year by a school-wide exhibit of student work in which student work from every design class is exhibited from late May through early September, affording ample opportunity for thorough and thoughtful review of the entire arc of student output for the year by faculty, alumni, professionals, the institution, the college community, and the public.

Student work, principally in design, is collected each semester for digital archiving and for publication. This year, the fourth annual edition of "City Works" will be published. Including selected work from each of the approximately 31 design sections each semester, this publication is an in-depth exposition of the quality and extent of student design work, providing a compact but potent tool for assessment of the extent to which design education is fulfilling the goals and objectives of the school.

School Convocations

To further involve the students of the School in the self-assessment process, the Dean conducts a biannual School Convocation that brings together during the first week of classes the whole school community to introduce new faculty and students, to discuss current events of general interest and to elicit comments or feedback from the students regarding past, current, and future concerns. This has proved to be a very successful means of overall engagement with students for the purposes of general curriculum and learning context assessment.

Data for Assessment

A vast amount of institutional data useful for assessment and reporting (including the annual NAAB reports) is gathered, archived, and distributed by the College Office of Institutional Research Administration. The annual publication, City Facts, contains extensive data in a number of useful reports. In addition, the institutional research office produces custom reports from the disaggregated data it has archived. In addition, the Office of Enrollment Services (admissions and registrar) and the office of the Vice President for Finance and Management provide information from their respective domains which is used for assessment and reporting.

The effectiveness of Student Course and Teaching Surveys in past years has been somewhat inconsistent. An online survey system was inaugurated by the college in 2004. Response rates, said to be similar to national averages, have been quite low, typically below 30%. The school is exploring means of increasing the response rate including using different technology or bringing the effort into the school using more conventional paper forms. This has come to the forefront at the college level as the provost announced that the spring surveys would be done using paper forms collected by the Schools and departments to be processed centrally. Return to this method, it is hoped, will improve response rates to the pre-electronic period when rates consistently exceeded 60% or more in virtually all courses.

Student Organizations

The school is supportive of student organizations and alumni activities. The Dean meets frequently with students including the elected representatives, and with alumni including the alumni association. The potential for more and deeper involvement of alumni and students in the school and particularly in self-assessment has been further formalized. A senior faculty member, Prof. Feigenberg, serves as alumni coordinator. While the Dean meets with and interacts with alumni, Prof. Feigenberg is the direct point of contact providing continuity and communications with the alumni. Likewise, Prof. Gebert is the student coordinator, charged with the responsibility of being the immediate point of contact with students and with the elected student representatives. These two coordinators will bring to their respective groups on a more frequent basis, aspects of self assessment as well as various school issues, proposals and policies for group review, discussion and input.

The Bernard and Anne Spitzer School of Architecture Newsletter

The school newsletter, edited and composed by a dedicated faculty member, and first published in the spring of 2009, serves as broad-based report of activities, programs, and events in the school available for review and assessment by students, faculty, alumni, and professionals.

Advisory Council

In addition, an Advisory Council has recently been formed to serve as a resource vehicle, “sounding board,” consultative body, and professional referral and contact group to the school. Members are drawn from the professional architecture, building design, landscape, and construction industry and may include such other professions as shall be conducive to and consistent with the council’s objectives. Through this council, the school will be able to broaden its professional expertise and enhance its ability to respond to and create academic and professional opportunities. As well, the council provides systematic and rigorous evaluative information from the perspective of the professional community. Currently the council consists of six distinguished persons serving two-year terms. Additional members are being considered but in no event shall this group exceed approximately thirty members.

Non-Faculty Performance Assessment

In addition to the faculty assessment outlined elsewhere, non-faculty personnel including professional staff (Higher Education Officers), Office Assistants, College Laboratory Technicians, and others are subject to yearly performance evaluations.

Assessment and the Future

The school recognizes the need to constantly review and reevaluate its mission, goals, and targets – a continuous self-assessment process involving students, alumni, and faculty as well as school and institution administrators and the several major school committees. As described elsewhere, alumni and student organizations, and a committee structure exist to realistically allow increasing levels of effective involvement in the self-assessment process of the school's programs. To further the process, the school's leadership and the program administrators will increase utilization of the explicit goals and the results of assessment when making decisions and distributing resources. There is also major resolve to organize an event such as a retreat or a series of directed meetings which will be for the sole purpose of reviewing, reformulating, and promulgating an updated mission for the school with coordinated statements for each program.

2. Conditions Well Met

- A 6 Fundamental Design Skills
- A 7 Use of Precedents
- B 3 Sustainability
- B 7 Financial Considerations
- B12 Building Materials and Assemblies

3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the NCARB

Ann Chaintreuil, FAIA

CJS Architects LLC

500 S. Ocean Blvd.

Suite 1205

Boca Raton, FL 33432

(561) 926-8385

(585) 244-1294 fax

achaintreuil@cjsarchitects.com

Representing the ACSA

Thomas Fowler, IV, AIA, NCARB, Director (CIDS)

Collaborative Integrative-Interdisciplinary Digital-Design Studio

Architecture Department

California Polytechnic State University

One Grand Avenue

San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

(805) 756-2981

(805) 756-1500 fax

tfowler@calpoly.edu

Representing the AIAS

Matthew Barstow

716 72nd Street, NW

Albuquerque, NM 87121

(505) 615-6113

matb514@msn.com

Representing the AIA

Richard L. Hayes

Director of Knowledge Management

The American Institute of Architects (AIA)

1735 New York Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 626-7539

rhayes@aia.org

Representing the ACSA

Betsy C. West

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

College of Architecture

9201 University City Boulevard

Charlotte, NC 28223-0001

(704) 687-4030

(704) 687-3353 fax

bcwest@uncc.edu

IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Ann Chaintreuil, FAIA
Team Chair

Representing the NCARB

Thomas Fowler, IV, AIA, NCARB
Team member

Representing the ACSA

Matthew Barstow
Team member

Representing the AIAS

Richard L. Hayes, Ph.D., CAE. AIA
Team member

Representing the AIA

Betsy C. West
Team member

Representing the ACSA