

## ***Visiting Team Report***

Thomas Jefferson University  
College of Architecture and the  
Built Environment (Jefferson)

M.Arch.

Visit Dates: February 21-23, 2022

The logo for the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). It features the letters 'NAAB' in a large, bold, white, sans-serif font. The letters are slightly overlapping, with the 'N' and 'A' overlapping the 'A' and 'B', and the 'A' overlapping the 'B'. The background is black.

National  
Architectural  
Accrediting

## Visiting Team Report (VTR)

2020 Conditions for Accreditation

2020 Procedures for Accreditation

To be completed by NAAB Staff:

<b>Institution</b>	<b><u>Thomas Jefferson University</u></b>
<b>Name of Academic Unit</b>	College of Architecture and the Built Environment
<b>Degree(s)</b> <i>(check all that apply)</i>  <b>Track(s)</b> <i>(Please include all tracks offered by the program under the respective degree, including total number of credits. Examples:</i>  <i>150 semester undergraduate credit hours</i>  <i>Undergraduate degree with architecture major + 60 graduate semester credit hours</i>  <i>Undergraduate degree with non-architecture major + 90 graduate semester credit hours)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Bachelor of Architecture</u> Track:  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Master of Architecture</u> Track I: Pre-professional architecture degree + 49 TJU graduate semester credit hours  Track II: Non Pre-professional degree + 100 TJU graduate semester credit hours  <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Doctor of Architecture</u> Track:  Track:
<b>Application for Accreditation</b>	<b>First Term of Continuing Accreditation</b>
<b>Year of Previous Visit</b>	2018
<b>Current Term of Accreditation</b> <i>(refer to most recent decision letter)</i>	Initial Accreditation (Three-Year Term)
<b>Program Administrator</b>	David Kratzer, AIA, Chair, Department of Architecture
<b>Chief Administrator</b> for the academic unit in which the program is located <i>(e.g., dean or department chair)</i>	Barbara Klinkhammer, Dean, College of Architecture and the Built Environment
<b>Chief Academic Officer of the Institution</b>	Mark Tykocinski, MD
<b>President of the Institution</b>	Steven Klasko, MD, MBA

## I. Summary of Visit

### a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The visiting team would like to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of David Kratzer, Evan Pruitt, and their student assistants in documenting, assembling, and coordinating the digital sharing of work under review by the team. Furthermore, the team appreciates the virtual hospitality, participation, and contributions of the administrators, including Dean Klinkhammer, Chief Academic Officer Dr. Matt Baker, and Provost Dr. Mark Tykocinski, during the virtual team visit. The visiting team appreciates the time that faculty contributed in collecting syllabi, course schedules, other course documents, and student work samples for the NAAB team to review. The team also recognizes the additional efforts of faculty and staff to organize Zoom course meetings during the visit so that team members could drop into scheduled classes for firsthand experiences of teaching and learning at Jefferson.

During the visit, the team interacted with upper-level administrators committed to the success of the College of Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), describing it as foundational to the mission of the merged universities of Philadelphia University and Thomas Jefferson University, now “Jefferson.” Provost Tykocinski described a vision for a new signature building for CABE to be included in a university plan 5-7 years from now, well within a possible cycle of NAAB accreditation. Described as the “University of the Professions,” Jefferson values professional programs such as the M.Arch. program and B.Arch. program. CABE administrators echoed these values and a commitment to continued growth in the M.Arch. program, reflected in several targeted staff positions in the process of being filled. The M.Arch. program, while young and small, benefits from its placement in a well-established, foundational academic unit on Jefferson’s campus.

The M.Arch. program takes advantage of the multiple disciplines within CABE. Students highlighted the variety of elective courses offered within the college, and students also expressed satisfaction with the cross-disciplinary nature of studios and studio projects as well as dedicated graduate-level seminars. Students reflected on the value of intellectual collaboration within these integrated, vertical studios and allied courses. Alumni of the program reflected on the networking opportunities that benefitted from close relationships in other disciplines. One recent graduate also pointed to the Solar Decathlon project as a pivotal learning experience for her professional development. While the M.Arch. program is small, it draws from other disciplines in CABE to provide students with transformative experiences.

Although the young M.Arch. program benefits from the well-established B.Arch. program, the visiting team did take note of several situations that have resulted from leveraging the pre-existing B.Arch. program’s resources. By cross-listing courses in the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, graduate students are learning in the same space and time as undergraduate students. Both groups of students remarked on the positive aspects of these shared experiences; however, M.Arch. students described a lack of community or identity resulting from their taking classes with undergraduate students. This lack of identity is reflected in the M.Arch. program’s nonexistent dedicated physical space for this cohort of students to work or meet on a regular basis. Recognizing this nomadic and somewhat isolating experience, program directors Kratzer and Pruitt have recently instituted social chairs in the M.Arch. program, students charged with the task of fostering a sense of community and identity among the graduate students.

The team heard from multiple groups about the impact that COVID had on the M.Arch. program, from a reduction in applications to international students’ travel restrictions. Like other universities, Jefferson has adapted to the evolving global pandemic, and faculty and students have leveraged platforms like Zoom to continue teaching and learning remotely when necessary. Despite the impacts of COVID on the M.Arch. program, students appreciate the supportive and accessible nature of the faculty in the College of Architecture and the Built Environment’s M.Arch program.

- b. Conditions Not Achieved (list number and title)

### SC.5 Design Synthesis

### SC.6 Building Integration

## II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

**2014 Student Performance Criterion B.2 Site Design:** *Ability to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation, in the development of a project design.*

**Previous Team Report (2018):** Evidence of student achievement regarding the ability to respond to soil was not found in student work prepared for the suggested courses, nor in additional student work reviewed.

**Team Assessment:** The APR (p. 5) references two courses, ARCH 642 TECH 2 *Passive Systems + Building Envelope* and ARCH 652, that have since focused more attention to address students' ability to respond to soil in design development. The team found evidence of this SPC's now being met in the supporting documentation for ARCH 642 Tech 2 *Passive Systems + Building Envelope*, namely a series of lectures focused on site sustainability, land use, grading, topography, and drainage. Student work from ARCH 615 Design 5 *Comprehensive Studio* demonstrates students' ability to respond to site conditions (SC.5) in design decisions.

**2014 Student Performance Criterion B.6 Environmental Systems:** *Ability to demonstrate the principles of environmental systems' design, how design criteria can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This demonstration must include active and passive heating and cooling, solar geometry, daylighting, natural ventilation, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.*

**Previous Team Report (2018):** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found in student work prepared for the suggested courses nor in additional evidence reviewed concerning the principles of acoustics.

**Team Assessment:** The APR (p.5) mentions that the program has expanded its unit on acoustics covered in ARCH 643 Tech 3: *Dynamic Environmental Systems*. The team confirms that there are two weeks in the detailed schedule for this course focused on acoustics. The 2020 Conditions do not explicitly mention acoustics; however, there are projects from Tech 3 that address acoustics, specifically sound absorption and reverberation time calculations.

**2014 Student Performance Criterion B.10 Financial Considerations:** *Understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.*

**Previous Team Report (2018):** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level concerning project financing methods and feasibility was not found in student work prepared for the suggested courses, nor in additional evidence reviewed.

**Team Assessment:** Students' understanding of building costs, financing methods and feasibility is covered now by ARCH 661 *Professional Management*. Evidence was found in one of the assignments called "Budget Sketch Assignment: Cost and Value Engineering." This skill is now subsumed under SC-2, Professional Practice, which is also reported to be met (see below).

**2014 Student Performance Criterion D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture:** *Understanding of the relationships among key stakeholders in the design process—client, contractor, architect, user groups, local community—the architect’s role to reconcile stakeholders needs.*

**Previous Team Report (2018):** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level regarding the relationships among key stakeholders in the design process was not found in student work prepared for the suggested course, nor in additional evidence reviewed.

**Team Assessment:** This criterion is now addressed in PC-6, Leadership & Collaboration, and SC 2 Professional Practice. The team found evidence that this Program Criterion and the Student Criterion are adequately covered in a number of courses, but primarily ARCH 661 *Professional Management*. The course is taught by an adjunct faculty member who takes students through an actual project; all the stakeholders—client, contractor, architect, community—are identified and discussed.

**2014 Student Performance Criterion D.3 Business Practices:** *Understanding of the basic principles of a firm’s business practices, including financial management and business planning, marketing, organization, and entrepreneurship.*

**Previous Team Report (2018):** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level regarding financial management and business practices was not found in student work prepared for the suggested course, nor in additional evidence reviewed.

**Team Assessment:** This criterion is now covered by Student Criteria 2, Professional Practice. In addition to ARCH 661 *Professional Management*, which covers the business of architecture and best practices, many students are also getting credit for internships in Philadelphia architecture firms. There they will certainly see best business practices in action.

### III. Program Changes

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

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that the program was actively engaged in transitioning to meet all 2020 conditions during this visit. The Program was given the choice to be evaluated under the 2014/15 Conditions or the 2020 Conditions and chose the latter which required numerous changes implemented in a relatively short time frame. The curriculum remained substantially the same but was evaluated against the new 2020 Shared Values, PCs, SCs and the course learning outcomes they require. The Program implemented updated self-assessment systems and continuous evaluations were underway at the time of the APR writing.

Some realignment of studios and their attendant learning outcomes were made throughout the three years to better prepare students for rigors of simultaneous research and design activities. The program faced many of the same challenges and benefits in innovation that the global pandemic brought with it.

#### IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

##### 1—Context and Mission

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

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

##### [X] Described

**Program Response:** Thomas Jefferson University’s Master of Architecture program, housed in the College of Architecture & the Built Environment (CABE), is a first-professional graduate degree program designed to prepare students for the new challenges of professional architectural practice in the 21st century through the development of high-level sustainable design and technology skills, knowledge of project management and innovative delivery methods, and collaborative experiences in an interdisciplinary environment. The M.Arch graduate program aligns with, collaborates and complements the already proven Jefferson 5-year Bachelor of Architecture program.

The M.Arch Program is designed for students with undergraduate degrees in any field of study and offers advanced standing for students with undergraduate degrees in pre-professional architecture or related design programs.

The College of Architecture and Built Environment is guided by the Strategic Plan Core Values of; Design Excellence, Social Equity, and Sustainability; in implementation of the following Mission:

*The College of Architecture and the Built Environment is committed to educating the next generation of leaders in the architecture and allied professions to be stewards and innovators of the built environment for a socially equitable and sustainable future.*

The architecture programs, in concert, are guided by the additional Mission:

*The Jefferson architecture programs are founded on the belief that architecture has the power to improve lives by activating, facilitating and substantiating pioneering design in all communities and environments. Faculty with diverse perspectives and backgrounds foster an innovative, interdisciplinary academic experience that positions architecture at the dynamic center of our shared social, technological and physical environment. A commitment to design excellence, social equity and sustainability is evident throughout the curriculum, equipping graduates with the creativity, competence, compassion and conviction to be positive agents of change.*

**Analysis/Review:** The Thomas Jefferson University context is an attractive campus (Jefferson East Falls) at the edge of Philadelphia, with connections to their urban Center City campus. Thus they offer a combination of urban and natural environments for students, faculty, and staff. In 2017, Thomas Jefferson University and Philadelphia University merged into what is now Thomas Jefferson University, or simply “Jefferson.” The College of Architecture & the Built Environment (CABE) is one of three primary academic

units on the East Falls campus, and the relatively young M.Arch. program resides in CAFE along with approximately twelve other programs, including the NAAB-accredited B.Arch. program.

The APR documents that the faculty provide connections to other Jefferson programs, and other programs outside the university, for what appears to be an active, multi-disciplinary context. The visiting team heard from students and alumni that those interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary opportunities are valued, and many students take elective courses in other departments. Given that the M.Arch. program is co-located with the fully accredited and established B. Arch. program, there is synergy between the masters and undergraduate program that is beneficial to both programs. If there is a contextual issue, it is that the graduate program does not have one place or room to call its own “home.”

The mission of Thomas Jefferson University includes the following statements:

“preeminence in transdisciplinary, experiential professional education, research and discovery” sets the bar high, and the mission of the CAFE and M. Arch programs reinforce that aspiration—

“A commitment to design excellence, social equity and sustainability is evident throughout the curriculum, equipping graduates with the creativity, competence, compassion and conviction to be positive agents of change and stewards of the built environment.”

There is evidence throughout the APR and confirmed by the visiting team that students are actively engaged in class assignments, field trips, and other activities within the city of Philadelphia. The visiting team’s session with students confirmed that the city has been used for design sites, architectural case studies, and neighborhood engagement activities. By the third year in fact, students stated that they are happy to study precedents, buildings, and sites outside of Philadelphia.

The visiting team found consistency between the stated values and missions of Jefferson and CAFE and the team’s observations throughout the virtual visit.

## 2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

**[X] Described**

**Analysis/Review:** The APR responds in full to this multifaceted requirement. There is commitment to **design**, as expressed in their programs, curricula, mission statements and allied professional programs. To quote the APR, “Design Excellence” is one of their three core values, which they pursue through research, knowledge, programming, and technology. The “act of making” “permeates the actions and educational environment of the architecture programs.” Our observations of classes and student work corroborate this emphasis.

Sustainability is their second core value, which aligns with **Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility**. The College’s first graduate program was the Master of Science in Sustainable Design, MSSD, which puts teeth into the assertion that sustainability is part of their core mission. There are Sustainable Design required courses—the 3 credit SDN-601 Principles and Methods of Sustainable Design—as well as popular electives, such as the Solar Decathlon competition.

**Social equity** is also a core value; they clearly understand the issue and are marshaling resources to address it. Beyond recruitment, they are committed to faculty and student retention. They are actively working to increase diversity of the faculty, and to retain those they have. In conversation with faculty and administrators, there was a clear commitment to DEI, but in such a competitive market, they’ve experienced some losses, and find it difficult to improve the diversity of the faculty.

While the students in the program are more diverse, this is in large part due to international student enrollment. 56.7% of the 550 CABA students (which is a larger base of students than the MArch program) are white; 10.5% non resident; 7.1% black or African American. Faculty and administrators are clearly motivated to improve equity, diversity, and inclusion in this program. It is a positive sign that they are members of JADE, the Justice Alliance for Design Education in Philadelphia.

Gender diversity in the faculty is lower than the program’s stated aspirations. While the student enrollment is 53% female to 47% male, the faculty are 40.6% female and 59.4% male. The APR admits that there is “a distinct need to recruit and retain women faculty,” especially given the majority of female students.

**Knowledge and Innovation:** It is clear that the faculty are dedicated to architecture, and to fostering “design thinking.” Given that the faculty teach both graduates and undergraduates, they benefit from a long-established program that is highly structured. The teaching staff includes a mix of tenured, tenure track, and adjunct faculty that allows for cross fertilization and collaborative thinking. There is a current proposal in the works to reduce the teaching workload of tenure-track faculty so that they may pursue additional research and scholarly initiatives. Academic administrators expressed the goal of moving from an R-2 to a R-1 University –indicating an increased emphasis on research and innovation in all Jefferson units.

**Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement:** As mentioned further below in Program Criteria 6, leadership and collaboration are infused throughout the school. Most design classes have both team projects and individual efforts. Given the small size of the M.Arch class, many of these efforts are conducted with undergraduate students, mixing the diversity of the teams and furthering mentorship for the more experienced student. A tutoring program is offered for students needing help, taught by students knowledgeable in the subject and given financial aid for those services, fostering student leadership and financial support. Community engagement outside of the department is robust—with a number of classes and activities available in the city of Philadelphia. Where we found “community” lacking was in the identity



of the M.Arch. program itself. Students are dispersed and somewhat isolated, which may be a byproduct of the pandemic, but it may also be for lack of outreach and a place to “land” in the department.

**Lifelong Learning:** The curriculum and course offerings of the M.Arch. program, outlined in the APR and corroborated by the team during the virtual visit, ground students in the body of knowledge in the discipline of architecture, its histories and theories, and its social, economic, and cultural contexts. Within the TJU setting, architecture faculty model the value of lifelong learning. During meetings with the NAAB team, faculty members confirmed that the college offers stipends to attend conferences and present papers, chair sessions, or work on research and manuscripts. Adjunct faculty members model lifelong learning by connecting practice to academia. During another NAAB team session, students mentioned the engaging lecture series, which connects students to scholars and practitioners who model continuous improvement and innovation in their work.

### 3—Program and Student Criteria

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

#### 3.1 Program Criteria (PC)

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

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

##### [X] Met

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that the program meets this criterion in the student work samples of ARCH 661 *Professional Management*, namely Quizzes 1, 2, and 3 and the Firm Profile assignment. This course also provided students with guest lectures and panel discussions from local and regional practitioners. The team found evidence that the program further meets this criterion through extracurricular activities such as a public lecture series and AXP/NCARB presentations focused on licensure. The NAAB team’s meeting with current M.Arch. students confirmed an awareness of career development opportunities and resources on and off campus; however, the students had not entirely availed themselves of those opportunities and resources.

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

##### [X] Met

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence throughout the program’s curricular and extracurricular offerings that the program instills in students the role of the design process at multiple scales and in a variety of contexts. More specifically, the visiting team found evidence that the program meets this criterion in the assignment descriptions of the class sequence of the design & representation, ARCH 601 INTRO TO DESIGN and ARCH 611 DESIGN 1 *Urban Site + Context* through ARCH 616 DESIGN 6 *Masters Project*. The series of classes provide readings and lectures that go into detail about this criteria. Additionally, the program offers alternative classes such as SDN 622 *Sustainable Design Studios* that speak to this criterion. Outside of the classroom, the program provides non-curricular activities like lectures, exhibitions, and workshops to further students’ understanding of the design process.

**PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility**—How the program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to

mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities.

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that the program is committed to integrating ecological knowledge and responsibility into specific coursework throughout the curriculum. There is a general appreciation and understanding of the relationship between built and natural environments evidenced in components of several architecture studios: ARCH 611 DESIGN 1 *Urban Site + Context*, ARCH 612 DESIGN 2 *Natural Site + Context*, ARCH 614 DESIGN 4 *Sustainability + Tectonics* and ARCH 615 DESIGN 5 *Comprehensive Studio* and allied courses: ARCH 642 TECH 2 *Passive Systems + Building Envelope*, ARCH 643 TECH 3 *Dynamic Systems*, ARCH 644 TECH 4 *Applied Systems*, as well as the required course SDN 601 PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF SUSTAINABLE DESIGN. At various points in the curriculum, attention is focused on helping students to develop both understanding of sustainable design as a practice and their ability to integrate the principles they have learned into their project proposals. SDN 601 PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF SUSTAINABLE DESIGN in particular provides students with lessons in “environmental literacy for the sustainable designer.” The sample lecture slides in that course indicate that students are presented with the case for considering the impacts of design decisions across multiple impact categories. The slides are derived from the Robert Fleming and Saglinda Roberts book *Sustainable Design for the Built Environment*. This is an excellent text that considers the context for sustainable design at multiple scales from global to local and presents a call to action for students to be stewards of our shared environment and engaged leaders that can create positive change through design.

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

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that the program meets this criterion through the syllabi, lectures, readings, and course assessments from ARCH 603 M.ARCH SEMINAR 1 and ARCH 629 HISTORY 1 *Ancient - Medieval* through ARCH 634 HISTORY 4 *Contemporary*. The program's treatise notebook, case studies, and assignment assessment are evidence that the History sequence meets this criterion. Furthermore, the seminar's readings and guest lectures are evidence the program meets this criterion. Outside of the classroom, the program offers semester-long lecture series and broadcasts local architecture festivals and symposiums.

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

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that the program meets this criterion in students' development of theses in their final year of study. The visiting team found additional evidence of this criterion being met in the student work samples of ARCH 630 RESEARCH METHODS, particularly in the thesis proposals that reveal a range of intellectual inquiry. Furthermore, the team found evidence in the student work samples from ARCH 616 DESIGN 6 *Masters Project*, the application of the research methods course in thesis studio projects. In addition, the team found evidence in the case study samples from ARCH 644 TECH 4 *Applied Systems*, for which students researched building envelopes and digital fabrication methods.

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

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** While the COVID pandemic has limited opportunities for in-person leadership and collaboration, the visiting team found clear evidence that student teams have been successful in preparing group projects in most design studios. Student reviews indicate that at least half of them “developed effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems,” which is at the core of this PC. The APR does admit that “finding the right balance of individual skill development versus group collaborative skills is needed” (p. 48). It also states in the assessment that “for many students there are not enough group projects while there are too many for others” (p.48). Their frank discussion is helpful, and clearly collaboration is valued in the program. During meetings with the visiting team, some students expressed a need for more cross-disciplinary teams and learning opportunities, while others praised the cross-disciplinary experiences in studios with students from interiors, sustainable design, and real estate.

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

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The program has met this criterion with the Studio Culture Document, Studio Rules Document, and the mandatory faculty training for full-time and adjunct faculty. Outside of the classroom, the CABE Dean’s Student Advisory Council, Graduate Social Chair, and student organizations like AIAS and NOMAS are further evidence that the program meets this criterion. Additional evidence are the assessment outcomes such as CABE Faculty Canvas Site and Graduate Student Resource Guide.

During the visiting team’s interactions with students, the team observed that the students are aware of the existence of Studio Culture Documents and Studio Rules Document but are not familiar with them in depth. Similarly with the Graduate Social Chair, the students were not aware of that role and who fills it. Although student organizations such as AIAS and NOMAS have been inclusive and engaging with graduate students with leadership roles and events.

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

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that the program meets this criterion in the student work samples of ARCH 611 DESIGN 1 *Urban Site + Context* and ARCH 613 DESIGN 3 *Urban Operations + Programming* which introduce students to the basics of community-based design within Philadelphia neighborhoods. SDN 601 PRINCIPALS SUST. DESIGN connects environmental concerns to the relative resilience individual communities demonstrate and how architecture can intervene in positive ways. Additionally, this program, located in Philadelphia, is aware that it is part of an urban community that has historically faced challenges of equity and inclusion. Students are a part of this social fabric while attending and are given opportunities to participate as people from a variety of neighborhoods express their wants and needs. Students, faculty, and administrators at both the College and University level all were aware of the critical importance DEI issues play in CABE’s future health.

**3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes**

A program must demonstrate how it addresses the following criteria through program curricula and other experiences, with an emphasis on the articulation of learning objectives and assessment.

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

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The visiting team found evidence that the program meets this criterion in the required course curricula of ARCH 661 PROFESSIONAL MANAGEMENT, ARCH 645 TECH 5 *Revit + CDs*, and ARCH-615 DESIGN 5 *Comprehensive Studio*. While scores for tests in ARCH 661 PROFESSIONAL MANAGEMENT were not robust, evidence found in student work demonstrated an ability to meet building code, zoning, and other regulations for buildings.

It is noteworthy that the Jefferson M. Arch. program applies lessons of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to their curriculum, weighing the relative impacts of many factors in the environment on the health, safety, and welfare of residents of Philadelphia. This broader perspective takes full advantage of their urban location.

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

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that the program meets this criterion in the student work samples of ARCH 661 *Professional Management*, namely Quizzes 1, 2, and 3 and the Firm Profile assignment. This course also provided students with guest lectures and panel discussions from local and regional practitioners. The team found evidence that the program further meets this criterion through extracurricular activities such as a public lecture series and AXP/NCARB presentations focused on licensure.

**SC.3 Regulatory Context**—How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project.

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The visiting team found evidence, in the listed coursework and student work examples, that this criterion is met. Specifically, the design studio ARCH 615 DESIGN 5 *Comprehensive Studio* showed detailed analyses of site, code requirements, and zoning in the final drawings prepared by a three-person team. Some of the M. Arch. students also have internships in Philadelphia firms, where code, legal and regulatory requirements are part of the learning environment, as confirmed by the visiting team during its meeting with students. During the visit, the team also observed a lecture by Craig Griffen for ARCH 615 DESIGN 5 *Comprehensive Studio* which provided an overview of building codes and the fundamentals of life safety to be considered in this studio context.

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

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence in numerous technical courses of how the program meets this Student Criterion dealing with established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies. ARCH 641 TECH 1 *Materials and Methods*, 651 STRUCTURES 1 *Linear Forces*, and SDN 601 PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF SUSTAINABLE DESIGN contributes to student understanding of this material and ARCH 642, ARCH 643 TECH 3 *Dynamic Systems*, ARCH 644 TECH 4 *Applied Systems*, and ARCH 652

STRUCTURES 2 *Cols/Beams* provide students with learning experiences that require them to demonstrate how they apply basic principle to the design and appropriate deployment of a variety of discreet building systems, technologies and assemblies. ARCH 615 DESIGN 5 *Comprehensive Studio* in conjunction with ARCH 645 TECH 5 *Revit + CDs* requires students to synthesize and integrate discrete systems into an architectural project. This is a sound curricular sequence, and it is coupled with a robust self-assessment protocol.

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

**[X] Not Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that the program meets many but not all of the sub-criteria of this criterion. The team found evidence of programming and user requirements in some of the ARCH 615 Design 5 *Comprehensive Studio* and ARCH 645 Tech 5 *Revit + CDs* work which were the two courses the program identified as those where student evidence was produced. When interviewed, one of the student representatives mentioned the consideration of user requirements in their description of their design process.

The team found evidence in ARCH 615 Design 5 *Comprehensive Studio* for regulatory requirements. Various drawings show code limitations, exit requirements, zoning limits, and other regulatory limits.

Evidence was found in ARCH 645 Tech 5 *Revit + CDs* and ARCH 615 Design 5 *Comprehensive Studio* satisfying site conditions. Site plans and sections were included in student work from Design 5.

Evidence was also found satisfying accessible design in ARCH 615 Design 5 *Comprehensive Studio* various student drawings such as circulation diagrams, axonometrics, plans and circulation call out details. The team found evidence in ARCH 615 Design 5 *Comprehensive Studio* Syllabus mentioning accessible design, ARCH 615 Design 5 *Comprehensive Studio* Lectures Slides 33 -50 about building codes, egress, and accessibility, Project 01 Rubric - Schematic Design Development document, Assignment 04 Rubric - Egress and Accessibility document, and student's understanding of this aspect in ARCH 615 Assessment Data - Fall 2021 (page 3).

While the team found evidence in both course documents and student work for these first four subcriteria, there was little evidence in ARCH 615 Design 5 *Comprehensive Studio* and ARCH 645 Tech 5 *Revit + CDs* of how measurable environmental impacts play a part in design decision-making in any of the student projects. In conversations with students who were part of that class, the team did not observe any quantitative analysis and metrics-based comparisons used to make final design choices in a synthetic whole. The program does a commendable job in contextualizing larger ecological considerations and, based on what students presented to the team about their experience in other courses, some are also practiced with many analytical software plugins that could easily be used to evaluate a range of options and then make a metrics backed design decision in the ARCH 615 Design 5 *Comprehensive Studio* and ARCH 645 Tech 5 *Revit + CDs* courses.

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

**[X] Not Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence in course syllabi, class schedules, and extracurricular activities' documentation that the program has a curricular and extracurricular framework to ensure that students could meet this criterion. The visiting team, however, found that the student work produced by



the program and randomly selected by the NAAB lacks a clear indication of the students' design decision-making processes, particularly when it comes to the measurable outcomes of building performance.

The team found evidence of integrated design solutions in the work of ARCH 615 Design 5: Comprehensive Studio and ARCH 645 Tech 5. Work from these same courses shows evidence of building envelope systems and assemblies, particularly in various student drawings and models such as wall sections, material diagrams, facade elevations and diagrams, and concept sketches.

The team found evidence of students' ability to integrate structural systems in ARCH 615 Design 5: Comprehensive Studio and ARCH 645 Technology 5, in various student drawings such as structural axonometrics, wall sections, and details. The team found additional evidence in ARCH 615 Syllabus, ARCH 615 Lectures, Slides 58 - 76, Assignment 8: Structural Systems Development Sheet Assignment 8: Structural Systems Development Rubric, "Exemplary marks" on 00-MARCH-615\_Design 5\_Student Surveys, and ARCH-615 Assessment Data - Fall 21 ARCH-615 Assessment Data - Fall 21 with "Target was met with 100% scoring a 'B' or better."

The team found evidence of students' ability to integrate environmental control systems in the student work from ARCH 615 DESIGN 5 *Comprehensive Studio* and ARCH 645 TECH 5 *Revit + CDs*, including various student drawings such as climate analyses, sun studies, HVAC axonometrics and zone diagrams, and sectional environmental diagrams.

The team found evidence of students' ability to integrate life safety systems in the student work from ARCH 615 DESIGN 5 *Comprehensive Studio*, including life safety and egress plans.

While ARCH 645 effectively uses case studies to build student knowledge of a range of building performance systems deployed in precedent work, there was little evidence in ARCH 615 DESIGN 5 *Comprehensive Studio* and ARCH 645 TECH 5 *Revit + CDs* of how measurable outcomes of building performance play an active role in design decision-making in any of the student projects. In conversations with students who were part of that class it seems that quantitative analysis and metrics-based comparisons were not integrated into final design choices. The team observed that Revit as a design documentation tool may be limiting students' ability to quickly explore formal, technical, and other types of design options in an iterative way. Students reported that they were busy learning the software as they were generating and completing their comprehensive design projects. This may be one of the reasons the team did not see the important manipulation of multiple design options over time that is critical to the final design of informed, smart buildings.

## 4—Curricular Framework

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

### 4.1 Institutional Accreditation

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

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

[X] Met

**Team Assessment:** The program provided the most recent signed letter from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education to reaffirm accreditation for Thomas Jefferson University.

#### 4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence in the Jefferson official catalog records that is accurately reflected in the summary charts the program provided in the APR. The upper-level sequence of the 100 credit Master of Architecture is 52 credits of required courses + 12 elective credits for a scheduled total of 64 credits (this leaves a margin of 15 credits that could be given to students for further advanced placement consideration and still meet the 168 minimum credit requirement for an NAAB accredited M. Arch program when combined with a 120-credit undergraduate degree. Internal transfer students are typically graduating from all Jefferson UG design degrees with more than 120 credits.

With respect to the requirements for general studies, Jefferson does not have a requirement for a number of general education credits for graduate programs. Their regional accreditor, MSCHE, defers to state regulations. The Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSE) requires a minimum of 40 general education credits for baccalaureate degree, but no general education credits are referenced/required for master's degrees. The relevant passages have been highlighted in the program's submission of the PASSE policy that was made available to the team prior to the visit.

### 4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education

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

- 4.3.1 A program must document its process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria when it admits a student to the professional degree program.
- 4.3.2 In the event a program relies on the preparatory education experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain accreditation criteria, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these accreditation criteria are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- 4.3.3 A program must demonstrate that it has clearly articulated the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content in the admissions process, and that a candidate understands the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program before accepting an offer of admission.

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence of this process outlined in the APR (p. 78-82), which meets this criterion. The visiting team confirmed this process during the virtual team visit, when the M.Arch. Associate Director, Evan Pruitt, walked the visiting team through the online SLATE system for reviewing graduate applications and addressing admissions decisions. The team observed the M.Arch. program's process for evaluating prior academic coursework, required by 4.3.1, during a meeting with Pruitt and Kratzer on February 22, 2022. In this same meeting, Pruitt shared documentation from several applications to illustrate the process for addressing any gaps in preparatory education, required to meet 4.3.2. Furthermore, Pruitt shared samples of admissions letters between the program and the applicant (included in the APR without identifying information), confirming that the program meets 4.3.3. Pruitt and Director Kratzer displayed innovative methods for reviewing complex applications from international

applicants whose transcripts required translation in terms of language, course equivalents for advanced standing, and student credit hours.

## 5—Resources

### 5.1 Structure and Governance

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

- 5.1.1 **Administrative Structure:** Describe the administrative structure and identify key personnel in the program and school, college, and institution.
- 5.1.2 **Governance:** Describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures and how these structures relate to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

#### [X] Described

**Team Assessment:** The team found clear graphic representations illustrating the various nested relationships of CAFE within Jefferson and in the specific organizational structure of the College.

Opportunities for involvement in governance by the various constituencies that comprise the College are described, and the detailed 2020-2021 Governance Representation List was provided in the APR.

### 5.2 Planning and Assessment

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

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

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

#### [X] Demonstrated

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence in corroborating conversations with multiple representative groups from the CAFE and Jefferson academic and administrative communities regarding goals and objectives that organically emerged out of the merger to meet its mission goals and multiyear objectives. The program has more closely aligned the Key Performance Indicators of: diversity of students; faculty and staff; graduation rates; licensure statistics; job placement data; publications and research dissemination of faculty; awards of students and faculty into its assessment protocols. By these measures that program is making modest but steady progress toward meeting these goals. The program has enumerated self-identified strengths, challenges and opportunities in the APR.

### 5.3 Curricular Development

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

- 5.3.1 The relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including NAAB program and student criteria.
- 5.3.2 The roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

**[X] Demonstrated**

**Team Assessment:** The team found copious evidence of a well-reasoned process for assessing its curriculum and making adjustments based on the outcome of the assessment. Multiple curricular and course-based rubrics were provided that connect learning outcomes to not only NAAB criteria but also to their regional MSCHE standards. Regular review by the chair and members of the faculty were documented. This was in keeping with a general high standard for all internal assessment processes supporting a culture of continuous improvement.

**5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development**

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

- 5.4.1 Demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty in a way that promotes student and faculty achievement.
- 5.4.2 Demonstrate that it has an Architect Licensing Advisor who is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. These duties include attending the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay up-to-date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.
- 5.4.3 Demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- 5.4.4 Describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, mental well-being, career guidance, internship, and job placement.

**[X] Demonstrated**

**Team Assessment:**

**5.4.1:** The APR explains the policies regarding full time teaching faculty, who are expected to teach 12 credits per semester, as well as conduct research and serve the department in various activities. It is stated that such a workload “is considered an industry standard.” Recently, they have changed the weight of studio classes for graduate students in the first year of the 3.5 year Track – Design 1 and Design 2 to 4 credits/semester, and added a 2 credit seminar class for graduate students only. Jefferson plans to explore expansion of this model to the remaining studios after receiving their academic year assessments in summer 2022.

This change puts greater emphasis on specific subjects that inform the design studios but are more technical in nature and require study of written material (and measuring of competence in those areas). During meetings with the visiting team, faculty commented that teaching workloads were balanced and equitable.

Jefferson plans reduce teaching loads for tenure and non-tenure track faculty from 9 credits per semester, or 18 per year, to a total of 15 credits per year to open up time in their schedules for research. The first phase of this change will occur starting academic year 2022-2023, beginning with tenure track

faculty, though Jefferson plans to formally institute this change for both tracks. There is also support for faculty and students in the form of teaching and research assistantships, and mentorship positions.

**5.4.2:** The APR lists the AXP/ NCARB Licensing Coordinators as Associate Professor Carol Hermann (Legacy) and the new Coordinator as of Fall 2021 Assistant Professor Andrew Hart. Jefferson acknowledged that they neglected to note in the APR that their ACSA Faculty Councilor is Professor Craig Griffen. Under SC2, Prof. Practice, non-curricular activities, the visiting team noted that CABA hosts an NCARB Overview presentation every Spring. While it does not currently name the Architect Licensing Supervisor, it was stated that this faculty is respected and often consulted. In our meeting with students, there was a lack of recognition of the subject and a designated Architect Licensing Supervisor. Both senior administrators expressed frustration in getting the word out regarding licensure activities due to the Covid isolation of students, and lack of personal contact. Hopefully, there will be increased attention to this requirement in the future.

**5.4.3:** Professional development funds are allocated to faculty each year, and there is a process of faculty mentoring that provides review and feedback in this area. Faculty confirmed this practice and indicated that the department supported attendance at conferences and to develop manuscripts, among other elective activities in support of their scholarship. The team also confirmed that staff are encouraged to pursue career enhancement opportunities, both online and in person.

Adjunct faculty are active practitioners and as such are required to acquire continuing education for annual licensure renewal. There is a lecture series and numerous research opportunities and support listed on p. 108-9 of the APR, which also points to The Center for Faculty Development and Nexus Learning as a “very important faculty resource” (p. 110).

**5.4.4:** Many supportive resources are described in the APR (p. 111-113), including The Academic Success Center, Starfish, and Student Counseling Center. There is institutional Career Guidance and Internship Courses. Support for International Students is provided on an institutional basis, which was confirmed in commentary from students.

## **5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion**

The program must demonstrate its commitment to diversity and inclusion among current and prospective faculty, staff, and students. The program must:

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

**[X] Demonstrated**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence for 5.5.1 and 5.5.2 in the description in CABA Strategic Plan and the leadership and work of the Chief Diversity Office at the enterprise level such as the monthly newsletters and programming speak to the program meets this criterion on a university level. On the college level, evidence is found in the work of the CABA Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion such as their action plans and reports are evidence that the program meets this criterion.

Based on conversations with alumni, professors leveraged their position to bring in more diverse critics for studio presentations. During the visit, the team was made aware of faculty concerns with the college process of recruiting and retaining the diversity of faculty and staff.

The team found evidence for 5.5.3 in the CABA Strategic Plan 2021-2024 Goal 1: Building Programs of Distinction to Create Larger Market Share and Greater Societal Impact. Additionally, CABA partnership with community colleges, JADE (Justice Alliance for Design Education in Philadelphia), and several student organizations like NOMAS (National Organization of Minority Architecture Students) and AIAS (American Institute of Architects Students) are evidence that this program meets this criteria.

The team found evidence for 5.5.4 in TJU Student Handbook and Faculty Handbook Section 3.3 Commitment to Diversity. The team found evidence for 5.5.5 in the program response "All buildings on the East Falls Campus, the location of CABA, are ADA accessible," in the resource of The Office of Student Accessibility Services, and Office of the Dean of Students.

Based on the conversations with staff, the program implemented a series of training and e-learning to address DEI matters.

## 5.6 Physical Resources

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

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

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

### [X] Demonstrated

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that the program meets these criteria in several places. The program provided a narrated video tour of the program, clearly illustrating the studio-based learning spaces, complete with desks, monitors, 3D printers, pin-up space, and storage space. The video tour also highlights the computer lab spaces and gallery spaces in the Architecture and Design Center. Larger spaces for guest lectures are included in the DEC center, also shown on the walking tour video. Another building, the SEED Center, provides additional studio and classroom space for the M.Arch. program, as illustrated in the video. During the team visit, students, faculty, and staff corroborated the team's preliminary findings with only minor complaints. One faculty member commented that he would like more meeting spaces with better acoustics, and students on multiple occasions stated that they would like to have a lounge, studio, or other common area exclusively for the M.Arch. program.

## 5.7 Financial Resources

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

**[X] Demonstrated**

**Team Assessment:** During the team visit, the Program Director and Associate Director provided overall budget reports for both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs. Certain budget items have been changed since the merger of the two universities, and the program directors described the difficulty of tracking exact overhead expenses at the Department and program level.

Despite this lack of specifics, it is clear there is university support for the M. Arch. program, confirmed by the team in meetings with the Provost and Senior Vice Provost. There have been recent pay increases for tenured and tenure-track faculty, and a similar increase has been requested by the Dean for adjunct faculty in C.A.B.E. We heard from staff that there may be inequities at the staff level between campuses that could benefit from further review.

### **5.8 Information Resources**

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

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

**[X] Demonstrated**

**Team Assessment:** The APR documents the extensive collection of literature and information in the Gutman Library, in physical and digital formats. The video tour of campus provided to the NAAB team briefly showed the library's exterior and its relationship to other campus buildings. The library is within a short walking distance of the facilities used by M.Arch. faculty and students, and students and alumni alike mentioned how convenient and accessible the library has been to them. One thesis-level student remarked on how useful the library has been for finding research materials for her thesis.

Library Assistant Director for Special Collections and Reference, Sarah Slate, MFA, MLIS, is the Liaison to the College of Architecture & the Built Environment and College of Design, Engineering, and Commerce. She was available to the NAAB team during the visit had there been any questions for her, of which there were none.

## **6—Public Information**

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

### **6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees**

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

**[X] Met**



**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that the program meets the criterion with their program response, and their NAAB Accreditation tab and program description on their college's website. The sections are available via the program's website at:

<https://www.jefferson.edu/academics/colleges-schools-institutes/architecture-and-the-built-environment/about/history-and-accreditation/naab-accreditation.html>

### 6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

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

- a) *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*
- b) *Conditions for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2014, depending on the date of the last visit)
- c) *Procedures for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*
- d) *Procedures for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2012 or 2015, depending on the date of the last visit)

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found links to these four required documents via the website links provided by the program in its APR, both prior to and during the virtual team visit. These links are available via the program's website at:

<https://www.jefferson.edu/academics/colleges-schools-institutes/architecture-and-the-built-environment/about/history-and-accreditation/naab-accreditation.html>

### 6.3 Access to Career Development Information

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

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that the program meets this criterion with their Career Development tab on their program website that links out to AIA, AIAS, and the Marianne Able Career Services Center on the university level. Based on student conversations, career development and services are accessible but not widely used on a regular basis. The links are found on the college's website: <https://www.jefferson.edu/east-falls/career-services.html>

Based on the discussions with students and alumni, students are aware of their access to career development resources and that they have a NCARB student liaison. The visiting team heard from a number of students, however, that they are not as intimately involved with career development events and lectures as they would like to be.

### 6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents

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

- a) All Interim Progress Reports and narratives of Program Annual Reports submitted since the last team visit
- b) All NAAB responses to any Plan to Correct and any NAAB responses to the Program Annual Reports since the last team visit
- c) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB
- d) The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit



- e) The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda
- f) The program's optional response to the Visiting Team Report
- g) Plan to Correct (if applicable)
- h) NCARB ARE pass rates
- i) Statements and/or policies on learning and teaching culture
- j) Statements and/or policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The required accreditation reports and related documents are currently posted on the Thomas Jefferson University website (items c - j above). Since this VTR and visit is the First Term of Continuing Accreditation, there are no Interim Program Reports or NAAB Responses to Correct (a. & b. above) yet, and thus are not required.

### 6.5 Admissions and Advising

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

- a) Application forms and instructions
- b) Admissions requirements; admissions-decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (when required); and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing
- c) Forms and a description of the process for evaluating the content of a non-accredited degrees
- d) Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships
- e) Explanation of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** In addition to the TJU website: <https://www.jefferson.edu/academics/colleges-schools-institutes/architecture-and-the-built-environment/programs/architecture-march/admission-requirements.html> with further links to all publicly available statements and forms that materially satisfy this condition, the team was presented with detailed information during the visit about how the admissions process works at TJU's CABE. There is a well-documented and detailed internal process that is used to evaluate applicants. Internal protocols have been established to sort through those who may be candidates to receive advanced placement in the M. Arch program. International applicants must first have all transcripts processed through a third-party reviewer (WES or Educational Perspectives) prior to the College review that evaluates one-to-one (or more-than-one-to-one) course comparisons. This is paired with a thorough qualitative evaluation of a student portfolio submitted. All documents are collected and organized in the central University admissions "Slate" software platform. Once the number of credits is established, a program of study is given to the student outlining a likely semester- by-semester path through the curriculum.

### 6.6 Student Financial Information

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

**[X] Met**

**Team Assessment:** The TJU website has financial aid information available to graduate students, including QR code links to scheduling appointments with financial aid advisors. The APR contains sample letters sent out to accepted M.Arch. students with details regarding the cost of attendance, when pieced together. During discussions with students during the NAAB visit, several students confirmed that they are paired with a “point person” to answer their financial aid questions.

#### IV. Appendices:

##### Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

**PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility.** The team found evidence that the program is committed to integrating ecological knowledge and responsibility into specific coursework throughout the curriculum. There is a general appreciation and understanding of the relationship between built and natural environments evidenced in components of several architecture studios and allied courses, as well as the required course SDN 601 PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF SUSTAINABLE DESIGN. At various points in the curriculum, attention is focused on helping students to develop both understanding of sustainable design as a practice and their ability to integrate the principles they have learned into their project proposals. SDN 601 PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF SUSTAINABLE DESIGN in particular provides students with lessons in “environmental literacy for the sustainable designer.” The course uses the book *Sustainable Design for the Built Environment* by Robert Fleming and Saglinda Roberts. This is an excellent text that considers the context for sustainable design at multiple scales from global to local and presents a call to action for students to be stewards of our shared environment and engaged leaders that can create positive change through design.

**PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion.** The team finds that throughout this program, there is a commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion. We found evidence in the student work samples of ARCH 611 DESIGN 1 *Urban Site + Context* and ARCH 613 DESIGN 3 *Urban Operations + Programming*, which introduce students to the basics of community-based design within Philadelphia neighborhoods. SDN 601 PRINCIPLES & METHODS OF SUSTAINABLE DESIGN connects environmental concerns to the relative resilience individual communities demonstrate and how architecture can intervene in positive ways. In addition, being located in Philadelphia, the program immerses itself in the urban community that has historically faced challenges of equity and inclusion. Students are a part of this social fabric while attending and are given opportunities to participate as people from a variety of neighborhoods express their wants and needs. Students, faculty, and administrators at both the College and University level are aware of the critical importance DEI issues play in CABE’s future health.

**SC-1: Health Safety and Welfare:** It is noteworthy that the Jefferson M. Arch. applies lessons of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to this Student Criterion in an exemplary manner. The criterion requires understanding the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales from buildings to cities. The same courses mentioned above also look at health, safety, and welfare in neighborhoods with differing socioeconomic profiles. Both ARCH 612 DESIGN 2 - Natural Context Studio, and ARCH 613 DESIGN 3 - Urban Operations Studio teach the importance of environmental factors on health, safety, and welfare, and how design can intervene successfully for the benefit of the health and welfare of residents. The urban context of the program inculcates the curriculum. This larger scale understanding stands out in providing a comprehensive understanding of this important Student Criterion.

**4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education.** As the world of architectural education expands, the NAAB requires that graduate accredited programs demonstrate that a “thorough and equitable process is used to evaluate incoming students.” At Jefferson, the process is rigorous, thorough, and capable of evaluating applicants from a diverse range of backgrounds. Internal protocols have been established to sort through those who may be candidates to receive advanced placement in the M. Arch program. International applicants have all transcripts processed through a third-party reviewer prior to the College review that evaluates one-to-one (or more-than-one-to-one) course comparisons. This is paired with a thorough qualitative evaluation of the student portfolio submitted. All documents are collected and organized in the central University admissions “Slate” software platform. Once the number of credits is established, a program of study is given to the student outlining a likely semester- by-semester path through the curriculum. This is a model practice that, together with other supports, will ultimately further enrich the program and the Jefferson community.

## **Appendix 2. The Visiting Team**

### **Team Chair, Practitioner Representative**

Travis Hicks, M.Arch, AIA NCIDQ LEED®AP  
Associate Professor, Interior Architecture  
Director, Center for Community-Engaged Design  
Director, Main Street Fellows Program  
UNC Greensboro  
cell 336.447.5468  
tlhicks@uncg.edu

### **Educator Representative**

John Cays, AIA, NCARB  
Interim Director, School of Art and Design  
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs  
J. Robert and Barbara A. Hillier  
College of Architecture and Design  
New Jersey Institute of Technology  
973.596.6275  
cays@njit.edu

### **Regulator Representative**

Margo Jones, FAIA, NCARB, LEED AP  
Jones Whitsett Architects  
308 Main Street, 3rd Floor  
Greenfield, MA 01301  
T. 413-773-5551 x18  
C. 413-522-7135  
www.joneswhitsett.com  
mj@joneswhitsett.com

### **Student Representative**

Nicole Bass  
B. Architecture Student | Class of 2022  
Bernard & Anne Spitzer School of Architecture  
The City College of New York | CUNY  
nbass000@citymail.cuny.edu

V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,



---

Travis Hicks, AIA  
Team Chair



---

John Cays  
Team Member



---

Margo Jones, FAIA  
Team Member



---

Nicole Bass  
Team Member