

Visiting Team Report

Alfred State SUNY College of
Technology
Department of Architecture +
Design

B.Arch.

Visit Dates: March 21-23, 2022

The logo for the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) is displayed in a large, bold, white, sans-serif font. The letters 'N', 'A', and 'B' are significantly larger than the 'A's, and the 'A's are positioned between the 'N' and 'B', creating a stylized, overlapping effect.

National
Architectural
Accrediting
Board, Inc.

Visiting Team Report (VTR)

2020 Conditions for Accreditation

2020 Procedures for Accreditation

To be completed by NAAB Staff:

Institution	<u>Alfred State SUNY College of Technology</u>
Name of Academic Unit	Department of Architecture + Design
Degree(s) <i>(check all that apply)</i> Track(s) <i>(Please include all tracks offered by the program under the respective degree, including total number of credits. Examples: 150 semester undergraduate credit hours Undergraduate degree with architecture major + 60 graduate semester credit hours Undergraduate degree with non-architecture major + 90 graduate semester credit hours)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Bachelor of Architecture</u> 156 Semester Credit Hours <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Master of Architecture</u> Track: Track: <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Doctor of Architecture</u> Track: Track:
Application for Accreditation	First Term of Continuing Accreditation
Year of Previous Visit	2018
Current Term of Accreditation <i>(refer to most recent decision letter)</i>	Initial Accreditation (Three-Year Term)
Program Administrator	William C. Dean, AIA
Chief Administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located <i>(e.g., dean or department chair)</i>	Dr. John C. Williams, Dean School of Architecture, Management, and Engineering Technology
Chief Academic Officer of the Institution	Dr. Craig Clark, Interim VPAA
President of the Institution	Dr. Steven A. Mauro, Officer-In-Charge

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The team would like to thank all the constituencies of the program and all the people involved who contributed in providing valuable information prior and during the visit. The team has appreciated the particular challenge posed to the program by the fact that it had to address three different sets of accreditation conditions since its initial candidacy, as well as the unusual disruptions created by the COVID-19 pandemic.

In particular, we acknowledge and thank Prof. William Dean, Chair of the Department of Architecture + Design, for the hard work in coordinating the whole visit preparation process. We also thank the faculty, students, and staff for sharing with us their perspectives about the program. Finally, we thank all the administrators involved in this re-accreditation process for having helped the team better understand the program institutional context.

Students are engaged and enthusiastic and feel supported and appreciative of the professional education they experience. Alumni are very proud of their alma mater and grateful for the high level of preparedness they achieved for their careers. Faculty are passionate and committed about providing a top professional education and real-world learning experiences. Staff are proud of their work and of their contributions.

The program enjoys excellent relationships with Dr. John Williams, Dean of the School of Architecture Management and Engineering Technology, and Dr. Craig Clark, Interim VP for Academic Affairs, as well as with the whole college administration.

The team appreciated, as a particular area of excellence, how the program is able to deliver a thorough and effective professional architectural education that allows students to be practice-ready upon graduation.

The team recognized also some challenges that need to be addressed moving forward, namely in the areas of research, building design synthesis and integration, human resources and human resources development.

b. Conditions Not Achieved

SC.5 Design Synthesis

SC.6 Building Integration

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2014 Condition I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies multiyear objectives within the context of the institutional mission and culture.

Previous Team Report (2018): Upon review of the information provided in the APR and visiting the facilities, the program has completed their first draft version of the strategic long-range plan that spans AY 2018-2019 to AY 2033-2034. The draft plan is derived from a regular cycle of assessment already in place and follows the methodology for review and planning per SCUP (Society for College and University Planning).

While the evidence suggests that a long-range draft plan with program goals/objectives has been established with a methodology for assessment, it was not easily usable by the team. The objectives/goals identified in the long-range draft plan are: Promoting Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity; Supporting Student Development; Strengthening Student Development, Fulfillment, and Advancement; Building New Courses and programs; Enhancing Alumni Engagement and Philanthropic Support; Reinforcing Hands-On Education through Spaces and Technologies, and Advancing Our Reputation. A timeline, priority and process of implementation are not apparent for these goals/objectives.

Four chief policies that support the long-range draft plan are in evidence. These plans were reinforced during meetings with college administration. The chief policies are: The Staffing Plan;

the Admissions Recruitment Plan, Academic Portfolio Review, and the Spacing Plan. The Staffing Plan amended in 2017 outlines past performance and future strategy for staffing and recruitment through to 2025. In AY 2017-18 the plan provided a formal curriculum coordinator. The Admissions and Recruitment Plan intends to keep a steady rate of growth of 1% per year through 2025 (this is less than the campus target of 1% to 3%). The Academic Portfolio Review, beginning in 2017, provides a comprehensive review of existing academic portfolio and develops a long-range ten-year plan to examine future growth. The Space Plan will include a “refreshed course structure, studio options and future new faculty” to comply with the NAAB five perspectives. The Space Plan will be part of the campus master plan, which is currently underway. The outcome will require the re-registration of all department programs through New York State. Per the program chair, this re-registration will not affect student or program progress, and is part of the SUNY process.

Team Assessment: During the 2021-22 academic year, SUNY Alfred embarked upon a refresh of the college’s 2017 strategic plan. The Department of Architecture + Design built upon the six strategic action areas to arrive at seven long-term goals. The Department’s self-assessment stated that since the beginning of the refresh they have made satisfactory progress on two of the goals, good progress on three, and exceptional progress on two.

2014 Student Performance Criterion A.6 Use of Precedents: *Ability* to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices about the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

Previous Team Report (2018): Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found. Evidence of the ability to examine was well-documented in student work prepared for ARCH 7306 Design Studio 5. Evidence of the ability to incorporate the principles was not found.

Team Assessment: The team found the response from the program being adequate, with specific new assignments now included in each studio course. The students are now challenged to analyze precedents and document how the lessons learned are incorporated into their projects. The program reports that this is specifically done in ARCH 2394, ARCH 5306 and ARCH 7306. The evidence was found in the APR.

2014 Student Performance Criterion A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity: *Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to sites, buildings, and structures.

Previous Team Report (2018): Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found in student work prepared in the 2017 ARCH 8733 Modern Architecture Theory. The 2018 ARCH 8733 Modern Architectural Theory has been updated to address this criterion. As the course has not yet completed its initial semester, it is not yet met.

Team Assessment: The evidence provided in the APR about how the school has continuously worked to meet this goal is sufficient. These topics, now distributed over multiple courses, are tackled through studio projects, readings, discussions, and response assignments. The program reports that this is specifically done in ARCH 3104, ARCH 5306, and ARCH 8733.

2014 Student Performance Criterion B.1 Pre-Design: *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project that includes an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria

Previous Team Report (2018): Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found. Evidence reviewed in ARCH 3104 Design Studio 1 or ARCH 2394 Design Studio

Fundamentals 2 did not show ability to incorporate the required client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; and an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings).

Team Assessment: Pre-design and programming are formally introduced in ARCH 2394. The APR reports that pre-design is now a progressively sophisticated series of pre-design assignments throughout the entire design sequence from ARCH 3104, to ARCH 4304, and ARCH 7306. The program's response to SC. 1 (2020) further enumerates the specific assignments. The team has found these measures are an adequate response. Evidence of pre-design research and inclusion was found in the design course description and in the scheduled or performed sequence assessments.

2014 Student Performance Criterion B.5 Structural Systems: *Ability* to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravitational, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system.

Previous Team Report (2018): Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found. The evidence reviewed in ARCH 8753 Advanced Structures did not demonstrate ability to apply and incorporate the principles of lateral, seismic, and gravitational forces.

Team Assessment: Structural Systems is now included within SC.4 Technical Knowledge. Since the 2018 visit, the program has made a sufficient effort to integrate the knowledge gained in the 3 required courses dealing specifically with structural design: CIVL 4103 Structure 1, CIVL 5213 Reinforced Concrete and ARCH 8753 Advanced Structural Systems into the studio assignments. This integration and understanding of structural concepts is best demonstrated in ARCH 8306 where students develop a schematic level framing system, with detailed wall sections and foundations.

2014 Student Performance Criterion C.2 Integrated Evaluations and Decision-Making

Design Process: *Ability* to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This demonstration includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

Previous Team Report (2018): Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found. Specifically, evidence of ability to incorporate the principles of evaluating criteria, analysis of solutions and prediction of the effectiveness of implementation was not found in either ARCH 8776 Design Studio 8 or ARCH 8306 Design Studio 6.

Team Assessment: The program has made an effort to improve its pedagogy in order to address the concerns raised during the 2018 visit for SPC C2, and in order to meet its partially equivalent new condition SC5. Students are challenged to integrate user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions analysis, accessible design principles and environmental design principles. However, evidence of integrating evaluating criteria, analysis of solutions and predictions of the effectiveness of implementation into one project was not found in several studio projects indicated by the program as addressing this concern and SC5.

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 was not found. Specifically, evidence of understanding financial management and business planning was not found in either ARCH 8003 Professional Practice or ARCH 8793 Professional Development.

Team Assessment: The team found that the program has provided an adequate response to this former SPC (2018) through the implementation of SC 2 (2020), an integrated series of seven

distinct subject units starting in the second year with ARCH 3014, through ARCH 8003 and ARCH 8793. Specifically, in response to the previous report, ARCH 8003 Introduces an overview of business practices and principles, including business planning, marketing, financial planning, and financial management practices. ARCH 8793 was reorganized to include four applied learning assignments related to a firm's business practices. Documentation of assessment was provided for the courses, including pre-testing.

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: Virtually all changes to the program were in response to the transition to the 2020 Conditions. The program formally approved the following key areas in which to focus their efforts:

- redefine the program mission and structure;
- improve program flexibility and professional opportunities;
- support diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives.

Because of the impact of the pandemic, the plan of "re-imagining" the program in the above focus areas changed to "strengthening."

In updating and refining its mission, the following principles were adopted:

1. Connecting students to the global community
2. Socially aware and responsible design in the public interest
3. Civic engagement as a means to address community needs
4. Applied technology
5. Student preparation for professional practice

To achieve the above, the design studio course sequence builds on the studio culture and grows in complexity and geographic reach. It culminates with a thesis studio that addresses social and environmental issues at a national or international level.

Program flexibility was improved by re-examining concentration/cognate areas. The original four had been expanded to eight. After re-examination, some reorganization resulted in eight new areas being readied for AY 2021-22 and another eight for 2022-23. Three of these new areas will be housed in the Department of Architecture + Design.

In support of the diversity, equity, and inclusion initiative the SUNY system now requires a new general education course of all students. The GLST-2113 Global Perspectives course was written specifically for this purpose. As a result, the program drops from 157 to 156 semester credit hours.

Finally, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic should not be underestimated. Student performance at all institutions has been impacted. With studio culture severely disrupted during the pandemic, converting to, and meeting new NAAB conditions was a formidable task which must be taken into consideration in program assessment.

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:

Alfred State College is a small, public, residential, teaching-focused college located in rural Allegany County, one of the least affluent counties in New York State. It is set apart from other schools by its strong sense of community, hands-on education, affordability, and small class sizes. The college began as a state school of agriculture in 1908 and was incorporated into SUNY, the State University of New York, in 1948. Today, Alfred State is SUNY's premier college of technology, with about 3,700 students, 250 faculty, 150 professional staff, and 80 programs, including over a dozen programs that can lead to green-collar careers. The foundations for the Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch.) program were built over a 70-year period beginning in 1952 as part of the Building Construction Technology curriculum. The Department of Architecture + Design currently has eight full-time faculty members (supported by adjunct faculty and other faculty in the school teaching elective courses) who provide instruction for approximately 213 full-time students across four-degree programs. The program's mission, updated in AY 2020-21, affirms that: "The Alfred State Architecture experience goes beyond the design studio – cultivating engaged and collaborative life-long learners who build meaningful connections with the dynamic regional, national, and global communities that surround us. Students develop into emerging professionals through a carefully planned sequence of applied learning and civic engagement experiences, and apply sustainable solutions to address social and environmental challenges using integrated and innovative digital and building technologies."

Analysis/Review: The program has provided an accurate description of its mission and context in the APR and its supporting materials and links. The team found evidence, in the APR and especially during the visit, that the program holds true to its self-description as a "personable, caring, and peaceful community that emphasizes real-world learning... [while attracting] career-oriented students from across New York State, metropolitan New York City, neighboring states, and increasingly from around the world." (APR, p. 11.)

Through extensive conversations with all the program constituencies, the team had the opportunity to verify all the information provided in the APR.

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: Design - The program adequately describes the course sequence whose objective is to produce graduates who demonstrate design thinking and integrated design solutions that drive positive change culturally and socially, maintaining a mindset devoted to equity with a commitment to economic, social, and environmental responsibility. As an outcome of their 15-Year Long-Range Plan, the program seeks to instill the value of Design through persistent instruction and a vast array of non-curricular activities to stimulate student engagement. While adequately described, the team found the objective was not achieved when reviewing the student work in the terminal studios.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility - Both of these values are instilled in the students through multiple courses. Caring for the environment and using materials wisely are taught in foundational courses which carry over to projects in design studios. The professional practice course touches on ethical practice and the important roles that architects have for the environment, their clients and all others who will ultimately be the users and inhabitants of their work. Besides classroom work, the students participate in non-curricular activities that enhance their commitment to these values. The Southern Tier Architectural (STAR) Resource Center is one such opportunity.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion - The program has sufficiently described its response to feedback received from NAAB's 2018 Visiting Team Report. They have continued efforts aiding students from a variety of economic backgrounds and histories by offering many scholarships and grant opportunities while accepting more transfers from local and regional community colleges directly into the major. These efforts, along with promoting the local NOMAS Chapter, understanding the value of time, acknowledgment of the additional burden studio cost places on students, and encouragement of multiple

perspectives and feedback during projects, help create an inclusive environment for students of all backgrounds.

Knowledge and Innovation - The program has sufficiently described how it responds to this value. The program is committed to offer students multiple ways to grow their technical knowledge and drive to pursue innovation. BIM is introduced early in the curriculum and through the years students are exposed to “AI, machine learning, analytical tools, generative design, algorithmic site planning, and parametric computational plug-ins.” The program plans to further support this commitment with the installation of “VR stations, desktop projected displays, and upgraded technology spaces.” Extra-curricular activities include lecture series and programs through the Center for Architecture and Remote Sensing (CARS).

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement - The program adequately describes how it responds to this value, harnessing faculty/student engagement in real-life, hands-on learning as a constant for developing leadership, collaboration and professional growth. The Urban Design Studio offered in 4th year, focuses on studies of local and regional issues of community revitalization. This civic engagement studio involves collaboration with communities, design professionals and organizations such as the Community Design Center of Rochester and the Southern Tier Architecture Resource Center. Non-curricular student organizational leadership opportunities are provided by the Architecture + Design Lecture Series, the Architecture + Design Student Advisory Board, AIAS and NOMAS.

Lifelong Learning - The program well describes how it instills the value of lifelong learning by supplementing curricular instruction with a range of non-curricular activities. Field study experiences are included in every studio and thus they act as a common thread throughout the program. Practical skill-building, such as sketching and digital communication is incorporated in both required and optional ways. Their lecture series highlights lifelong learning as either a direct presentation or as a topic within other presentations. The Architecture Living Learning Community (a dormitory/laboratory arrangement) is available as an option to all students. And finally, the topic of lifelong learning is formally addressed as a topic in the Professional Practice course. Furthermore, lifelong learning is an outcome cited in the department’s strategic goals to “encourage the growth and progression of developmental capabilities of our students.”

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 Program has a Professional Preparedness Committee composed of faculty that ensures students are aware of the path to licensure, AXP and other career opportunities. There is an Architectural Licensing Advisor as well as a Student Architectural Licensing Advisor, who regularly attend NCARB's Licensing Advisor Summit and mentor the students. At least one course in each year touches on career paths, starting with ARCH 1184 Fundamental Design 1 in Year 1 and culminating with ARCH 8793 (Professional Development) in Year 5 with lectures by eight different practicing professionals. The department hosts two career fairs each year. The students also benefit from the department's non-curricular programs including the annual lecture series "Architecture + Design," as well as events hosted by the AIAS and NOMAS chapters. Alternate career paths are addressed in numerous ways including guest reviewers from different disciplines and those that work outside of traditional architectural practice. The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials, as well as in conversations with the program community.

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 program has a sound assessment process to ensure that students understand and appreciate the role of design in shaping the built environment, while developing the ability to apply its fundamental principles. This is achieved also through a structured design studio curriculum, growing in complexity and geographical reach throughout the studio sequence. The curricular effort in meeting this condition is further augmented by non-curricular activities, such as the Architecture + Design Lecture Series, events sponsored by the AIAS and NOMAS chapters, and the programs offered by the STAR Center.

The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials.

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 program's design studio sequence is congruent with a combination of lecture and lab core courses introducing concepts and strategies directed at environmental stewardship of site, ecology, and environmental resources, across the sequence. These practices are to be incorporated in ARCH 7306 (Design Studio 5), integrated in ARCH 8306 (Design Studio 6), culminating in ARCH 8716

(Thesis Preparation) and ARCH 8776 (Thesis Development). Documentation was provided that demonstrated ARCH 3104, ARCH 3003, ARCH 5306 and ARCH 7003 have met their assessment benchmarks but are considering adjusting measures to further improve student success rates. The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials.

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 Program addresses the condition through several courses, namely in FNAT 1303 (Architectural History I), FNAT 5303 (Architectural History II), ARCH 8733 (Modern Architectural Theory). In addition, students get exposure to theories and best practices through an articulated lecture series. The assessment is sound, and benchmarks are met. The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials.

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: Research and Innovation is included in the learning experience of several courses, such as ARCH 8716 (Design Studio 7), ARCH 7003 (Environmental Controls II), and ARCH 8753 (Advanced Structural Concepts). They are also part of the student experience outside the curriculum, such as with the Center for Architecture and Remote Sensing (CARS). Through the center's programs students learn flight control and piloting techniques for Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS/Drones). In addition, the Southern Tier Architectural Resource (STAR) Center provides other non-curricular opportunities for student-community engagement and opportunities for innovative design thinking in a location that historically would not have access to such a resource. Thus, students are so far engaged and prepared to participate in research, but the insufficient engagement, resources, and incentives for the faculty to pursue research raise concerns about the sustainability of the current model for the future. The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials.

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: The program's response to leadership and collaborative learning operates as an intentional exercise integrated across the five-year experience, beginning with Individual and collaborative exercises in ARCH 1184 (Design Fundamentals 1), Design Studios 2,4 & 5. In ARCH 8793 (Professional Practice), students form teams to collaborate on three assignments: a business plan for their "firm," a response to a Request for Qualifications, and a Request For Proposals. Additionally, an array of non-curricular activities such as the Lecture Series, Southern Tier Architectural Resource Center, AIAS and NOMAS, offer opportunities to stimulate student engagement, leadership, and collaboration. Student Learning Outcomes are assessed on a three-year cycle, at both the program and course levels and include the non-curricular activity assessments. The team agrees that the assessment benchmarking be reconsidered in light of the small number of group evaluations. The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials, as well as in conversation with the program community.

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: During the 2021-22 academic year, SUNY Alfred was successful in their implication and continued support for their Learning and Teaching Culture. The Department of Architecture + Design is constantly adapting and updating the policies including their “Learning and Teaching Culture Policy,” “Studio Culture Policy,” “Student Code of Conduct,” and “Principles of Community.” These continuous improvements are clearly stated in the relevant document identifying who discussed the document, the changes made, and when the revised document was adopted. Additional support informing students of these policies can be found in course syllabi, and on their website: (<https://catalog.alfredstate.edu/current/department/architecture-design/>). The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials.

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 APR clearly identifies the schools' continuous efforts into Social Equity and Inclusion. These efforts, while sometimes difficult to achieve in remote areas with limited demographics, are found to be evident throughout the entirety of the B.Arch program in multiple projects from a variety of studios, promotion of local student organizations (AIAS and NOMAS), and guest lectures. Further evidence of this can additionally be found in the faculty commitment of promoting inclusion agendas through publications and a faculty led “21-day Racial Equity Challenge.” The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials, as well as in conversations with the program community.

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 APR states that virtually all studio assignments address some form of HSW progressing upward from basic fundamentals to the development of complex architectural solutions that improve physical, emotional, and social well-being, protect occupants, enable equitable access, elevate the human experience and benefit the environment. Documentation provided by the program indicated that eight courses and studios thus far assessed by testing or rubrics exceeded the stipulated benchmarks and included some suggestions for continuous improved student outcomes. The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials.

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: Since the 2018 Visit, the professional practice sequence has been expanded to four courses: ARCH 3014 (Construction Technology 1), ARCH 4014 (Construction Technology 2), ARCH 8003 (Professional Practice) and ARCH 8793 (Professional Development). Students are encouraged to

integrate specific areas of interest, introduced in the lecture sequence, to their assignments and projects. The team has appreciated the program's response and recognized the student learning outcome. The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials, as well as in conversations with the program community.

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: Evidence was found that the students learn about and demonstrate their knowledge of pertinent regulations, including building codes, life, safety and welfare issues, accessibility, zoning, and environmental permitting, in the following courses: ARCH 3003 (Environmental Controls 1) has a unit on Fire Protection which involves public safety, ARCH 3014 (Construction Technology 1) introduces the requirements for reviewing zoning ordinances and use of the ICC as well as New York state-adopted codes, ARCH 4013 (Municipal Codes and Regulations) gives the students an in-depth look at building codes, NFPA, zoning codes and ADA. In ARCH 7003 (Design Studio 6), a vignette assignment requires students to perform a complete code analysis for their project. The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials.

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: Evidence was found that the students are introduced to building assemblies in an orderly process beginning with foundations through roofing then to interior components such as stairs in ARCH 4014 (Construction Technology 2). This course focuses on commercial buildings with a complete set of drawings produced over the course of the semester in 3-D as the final assignment. The syllabi explains that materials and methods are changing rapidly in the built environment. In ARCH 8306 (Design Studio 6), the students have lectures that cover such topics as sustainable energy systems and an in-depth look at various building cladding systems that achieve different design aesthetics, price points and performance. ARCH 8753 (Advanced Structural Concepts) further offers lectures in building assemblies including rainscreens, structural glazing, heavy timber, and modular construction. The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials.

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 carefully analyzed the APR, its supporting materials, its related student work examples, and additional student work requested by the team. The program did make an effort to meet this SC, also as a result of the not-met outcome for SPC C2 (2015 Conditions), as assessed by the visiting team in the previous site visit. However, as noted in our assessment on Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (Part II of this report), the progress has not been sufficient. While some student projects showed a good level of ability (especially in ARCH 7306, 8306, 8716 and 8776, if considered together, as allowed by the NAAB), a good number of student projects (more than 50%) did not show a

sufficient level of ability. Therefore, the achievement of the SC at the ability level was not consistent across the student work.

In addition, the various aspects of the SC were addressed separately for the most part, without showing the kind of integration that is expected for this SC.

Finally, studies for measurable environmental impacts of design decisions were not found in 7003, nor in the 7306, 8306, 8716 and 8776 studios (4th and 5th year studios). The analysis conducted in these latter studios, a Neighborhood Development Analysis, does not sufficiently address measurable environmental impacts of design decisions, such as, for example, a carbon footprint analysis.

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 carefully analyzed the APR, its supporting materials, its related student work examples, and additional student work requested by the team. Similarly, to the SC5, the program did make an effort to meet this criterion, but insufficiently. Also, in this case the various aspects of the SC were addressed separately for the most part, without showing the kind of integration that is expected. While some projects showed some level of ability (in ARCH 7306 and 8306), too many projects fell short (more than 60% of those reviewed). Again, the various aspects of the SC were addressed individually, without a clear demonstration that the students were able to integrate them effectively.

Studies for measurable outcomes of building performance were found in ARCH 7003, such as the application of the software Tally. While the software tool was appropriate, the projects on which the students tested their knowledge were those done in years prior to 4th and 5th year, therefore not using these studies holistically, along with the integrated design of the other systems. The quantitative analysis conducted in 7003 did not feed back into the design process for those projects where an integration of the various building systems was attempted (and not sufficiently achieved across the board).

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: Alfred State SUNY College of Technology is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). A link to the letter granting accreditation from MSCHE is contained within the Architectural Program Report. The college received its last re-accreditation in 2015 and will soon be involved in its next review.

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 B.Arch. Program requires 91 credit hours total of Professional Studies, of which: 52 are in Design, 3 in Theory, 30 in Technical Studies, and 6 in Professional Practice.

The program also includes 47 total credits of General Studies (or General Education and Liberal Arts) courses. The State University General Education Requirement (SUNY-GER) requires all baccalaureate students to satisfactorily complete at least 30 credit hours in basic communication (written and oral) and mathematics, plus additional courses from at least five (out of possible eight) other general education knowledge areas. Alfred State College's institutional accreditor, the Middle States Commission of Higher Education (MSCHE) does not mandate a specific general education credit requirement.

The program also requires 18 total credits of Optional Studies courses in one of eight Cognate Areas of focus: Business, Construction Management, Global Studies, or Graphic Design (offered outside the department), or Building Technology, Interior Design, Sustainability, or Urban Design (offered within the department).

In addition to the NAAB accredited B.Arch. program, the department offers three other degree programs:

- B.Sci. – Architectural Technology
- Associate in Applied Science (AAS) – Architectural Technology
- A.A.S. – Interior Design

The B.Arch. program consists of a minimum of 156 credit/hrs.

The evidence was found in the APR and attached documents.

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 program has clearly documented the process it follows to evaluate preparatory education for transfer students. The program has eight Articulation Agreements in place with community colleges or colleges of technology from the region. Such agreements are subject to auditing on a three-year cycle. All faculty participate in evaluating a student's prior academic coursework, to ensure that the relevant NAAB accreditation criteria and conditions are met. This is done through a two-step approach: a guided self-evaluation by the outward articulating institution and an on-site visit by Alfred State faculty and staff.

Each applicant for transfer must also submit a portfolio, composed along clear guidelines provided by the program, to be evaluated by the majority of faculty and staff.

The program has developed clear tables illustrating which credits may be transferred and transfer students go through a thorough advising process to understand what is expected of them in order to earn the accredited professional degree.

The evidence was found in the APR, conversations with program administrators and staff and through an examination of examples of transfer student files.

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: 5.1.1 Compared to larger institutions and programs, the program characterizes a structure that is flat, inclusive, collegial, and informal. Senior leadership at the dean and department chair level are “working administration” not “executive administration.” Alfred State College is a member of the technology sector within the State University of New York (SUNY) system. SUNY’s leadership structure consists of a Chancellor, Board of Trustees, System Administration Senior Staff, and Campus Presidents. Each official is working together in his or her capacity to advance the mission and vision of SUNY, and its Strategic Plan, “The Power of SUNY.” The team was provided an organizational chart for the college, which documents the positions and reporting lines of the administration. Local SUNY authority is vested in the College Council, an advisory group to the President of the College, which is appointed by the Governor. Information and minutes of the Council are posted on the college website.

5.1.2 The APR outlines that the organizational structure of Architecture + Design consists of the Dean and Program Coordinators. The department meets weekly on matters including curricular planning, assessment, and reports from the six standing committees. The department is one of six departments in the School of Architecture, Management, and Engineering Technology. The Chair is a member of the Academic Affairs Collaborative, which meets regularly with the chairs of other departments. The Faculty Senate of the College is the chief representative governing body of the faculty-at-large. The SUNY University Faculty Senate is an advisory body to the Chancellor of the University. The faculty is represented by United University Professions. Faculty members regularly attend campus union activities and one member from the faculty is a delegate.

Student representation on departmental governance and campus committees is encouraged. The department has a Student Advisory Board, comprised of seven students, one AIAS and one NOMAS representative to give student voice in the development of program policies and procedures.

The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials, as well as in conversations with the program community.

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: 5.2.1 According to the APR, Alfred State College (ASC) has a robust institutional commitment to formal strategic planning and assessment of student learning outcomes and institutional

effectiveness. The program was operating under a 2017 plan at the time of the last visit. In 2020, they revised the priorities adding key performance indicators as a further response to NAAB accreditation. The Long-Term Goals for the Academic Affairs division and the School for Architecture, Management and Engineering Technology additionally includes assessment.

5.2.2 Key indicators identified by the program and used institutionally across the college are: enrollment by age, gender, etc., SAT score, and high school GPA; average time to degree by age, gender, URM status, etc.; acceptance and yield rates, comparing program with institutional enrollment figures; semester GPA for new first year students vs. all students in the program; attrition rates; retention rates for the program compared to the institution; graduation rates for the program compared to bachelor level rates for the institution; employment and transfer rates for the program.

5.2.3 The program is in the fourth year of a 15-Year Long-Range Plan. The assessment reports that progress on the 7 Long-Term Goals lists 2 with satisfactory progress, 3 with good progress, and 2 with exceptional progress.

5.2.4 The Program reports the following:

- Strengths: Affordable and accessible to a wide range of students with different educational backgrounds and economic circumstances. Students are enthusiastic about the resources and software which is often free.
- Challenges: Strengths can be challenges. The accessibility of the program increasingly results in students with deficits in mathematics, writing and general study skills. Recent increases in enrollment are stretching physical and human resources and limiting growth. Rising costs of tuition, room and board coupled with books, materials, and equipment. The faculty is small and lacking in racial, ethnic and gender diversity, compared to the student body, becoming more diverse each year.
- Opportunities: The revised NAAB conditions and the focus of a Refreshed Strategic Plan on continuous improvement. This may result in academic minors and/or micro-credentials resulting in better prepared students moving to the workplace

5.2.5. The Architecture Advisory Board of 20 professionals is routinely surveyed and interviewed for aspects important to the profession such as historic preservation, sustainability, urban design, building science and affordable housing, to name a few. Additionally, the program has started an Emerging Professional Advisory Board to strengthen alumni needs and relationships.

The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials, as well as in conversations with the program community.

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 Program has a sound process for assessing its curriculum and for making adjustments based on the outcome of such assessment. Through an organized structure of program student learning outcomes (PSLOs) and course student learning outcomes (CSLOs), as well as of Course-level SLOs (CLSLOs), the program is able to effectively ensure proper assessment of all curriculum components over a three-year cycle. Roles and responsibilities of personnel and committees for curriculum development are clearly identified at the departmental and college level.

The evidence was found in the APR and in conversations with faculty, staff, and students.

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] Not Demonstrated

Team Assessment: 5.4.1 Per the APR, the faculty currently has between 16-18 contact hours per semester. In the academic world, this amount of contact hours is considered too high. In most cases, program faculty are required to teach two studios per semester (with one faculty teaching three studios in one semester). There is an ongoing effort to reduce contact hours to 14-16, with the hope that more time can be spent on scholarly research. Administrative assistance and help with shop equipment and training are shared with the Civil Engineering program.

5.4.2 Prof. William Dean is the current Architect Licensing Advisor. He has attended the bi-annual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summits. He shares his knowledge with incoming freshmen each year and the information is further emphasized in two courses: ARCH 3014 (Construction Technology 1) and ARCH 8003 (Professional Practice). The program has an added benefit in that one of their new Adjunct Staff serves as the ALA for the Rochester Chapter of AIA. As noted earlier in the VTR, a Student Architectural Licensing Advisor is also appointed to mentor students.

5.4.3 Per the APR, faculty have many opportunities to pursue professional development. On an annual basis, faculty must submit a Faculty Professional Obligation Work Plan. This work plan includes evidence of student learning outcome achievement, student evaluations, any contributions to course development, participation in departmental committees, scholarly research etc. Funding for professional development is available at the departmental and university level. Funding can be used to promote project-based learning, course enhancements, research, professional presentations, and activities in the areas of inclusion, equity and advising. The APR gives a detailed description of the portfolio process used for advancement and tenure. Leaves and sabbaticals are governed by the school's collective bargaining agreement. Although opportunity exists to pursue professional development, the faculty workload most likely prevents them from engaging in these opportunities. From the APR and especially through conversations with faculty and administrators, the team found that professional development is episodic and not sufficiently encouraged nor expected as part of the re-appointment, tenure, and promotion process. The "teaching focus" of Alfred State College, within the SUNY system (where other institutions are clearly more committed to research), is not a valid explanation for the insufficient research engagement among the faculty. Similarly insufficient is the explanation, heard by the team in discussions with faculty and administrators, that professional practice may be considered scholarship, while there is a consensus in academia that only peer-reviewed professional accomplishments (e.g., awards and design competition recognitions) may be considered as such.

5.4.4 Upon entering the program, each student is assigned an advisor. This advisor helps students plan their program of coursework, set academic goals, reviews grades (through a web-based program called Starfish) and evaluates progress towards graduation. The Studio Culture Policy has 13 Cultural Drivers including Time Management, Healthy Lifestyle etc. This policy is displayed prominently in

all classrooms and is discussed each fall at a meeting with students and faculty. Changes are made to the policy as required. A new volunteer mentorship program is being developed. Advanced students are encouraged to be a mentor for a new student. The University has a Student Success Center where structured tutoring, a Writing Center, Math Lab, and Accessibility Services can be found. In discussions with the faculty, the team found an excessive load of advising, which the faculty offers with great commitment and dedication, greatly appreciated by the students. However, it is clear that this service component, in addition to an excessive teaching load, prevents the faculty to develop an even limited research agenda.

In summation, the faculty team is too small (currently eight full-time professors, including the department chair who is clearly charged also with administrative duties), not sufficiently engaged in research, overburdened with teaching, and advising, and without having the diversity appropriate to support student learning (currently, no woman is a full-time faculty).

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 evidence of the program's commitment is sufficient in addressing sections One, Two, Three, Four, and Five under Social, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, even though for section Two commitment is not yet paired with accomplishment (see team's evaluation of condition 5.4). Each APR response from the school clearly identifies and directs interested parties to relevant public documents (an example of this is the link in 5.5.2 directed to the Alfred State Diversity Strategic Plan). Each document is easily accessible and its importance, and relevance, directly stated in the APR. The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials, as well as in conversations with the program community.

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: 5.6.1. The college has allocated to the program 18,000 sq. ft. in the Engineering Technology Building and 2500 sq. ft. elsewhere on campus. In 2020, individual spaces had to be reallocated in response to social distancing. There are 7 studio spaces, and each student has a dedicated workspace and secure storage. Each workstation is equipped with power access and a digital infrastructure allows students to use their own laptops and smartphones.

5.6.2. Supplemental spaces within the department include a Digital Fab Lab, Center for Architecture and Remote Sensing (CARS), Maker Space, Digital Modeling Laboratory, Photography Studio, and Critique/Conference Space. Within the School is a print and plotter room with 3 high speed plotters and large format scanning equipment. Recent major investments include expansion or upgrades to the Maker Space and software resources. All departmental facilities have 24/7 student access.

5.6.3. Each faculty member has ~100 sq. ft. of office space allowing for preparation and research and allow faculty a dedicated space for advising and mentoring. COVID-19 protocols required remote advising.

5.6.4. In addition to the school facilities, the department maintains a living/ learning studio in the Peet Hall dormitory. In the Architecture Living and Learning Community, baccalaureate architecture students entering the program, live, work, and engage with their faculty in their own residence hall. Additional space in the Student Leadership Center is allocated for student civic engagement and applied learning.

The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials, a virtual guided walkthrough of the facilities during the visit, as well as in conversations with the program community.

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: Financial data provided indicate that the SUNY Alfred Architecture program routinely generates income for the college. A long-term budget was not found but it is understood that the school uses a zero-based budgeting system which starts afresh each year. The team was impressed that the cost of materials for models was covered by the program thereby relieving students of this expense which can often be burdensome. In discussions with the Dean and the Interim VP for Academic Affairs, it appears that the program is well-supported and will continue to be funded in future years. They are proud of the achievements of the program and their alumni.

The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials, as well as in conversations with the program community.

5.7 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 Program offers access to architecture literature and information through the Alfred State College Hinkle Library, which has holdings of almost 50,000 volumes, 2,369 of which of the NA classification.

The library offers also access to 36 titles of the AASL Core List of Periodicals.

The Herrick and Scholes Libraries (with a holding of 150,000 volumes and 84,000 respectively), at the nearby Alfred University - a private liberal arts college located in Alfred within walking distance from the Alfred State College campus - are also available to the program students and faculty. In particular, the Scholes Library holds about 2,000 volumes of the NA classification.

In spite of the restrictions posed by the college's Spending Reduction Plan, instituted in April 2020 (to be removed in the near future), the Hinkle Library has a sufficient yearly budget for acquisitions at about \$2,200 for NA titles, and \$500 for NA periodicals.

The library is open 87.5 hours/week and is well accessible to students, faculty, and staff.

The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials, additional information requested by the team, and in conversations with the Librarian, Joe Petrick, and the program community.

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:**

A link to a PDF entitled "Mandatory Professional Licensure Disclosure" was found on the Alfred State SUNY website under the B.Arch program information. There is a tab titled Accreditation with a section called Accreditation Reports and Responses.

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: All of the required NAAB documents were found on the Alfred State SUNY website under the B.Arch program information. There is a tab titled Accreditation with a section called National Architectural Accrediting Board documents.

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 program clearly identifies where Career Development Information is available. This resource helps students with information on internships, a place for firms to sign up for their career fair, and relevant information on who to contact for additional support. The evidence was found in the APR and its supporting materials.

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: Links to all of the required documents listed above were found on the Alfred State SUNY website under the B.Arch program information. There is a tab titled Accreditation with a section called Accreditation Reports and Responses. There is a link provided to "NCARB by the Numbers," which documents the program ARE pass rates. A link to the Studio Culture Policy was found on the website. A statement on equity, diversity and inclusion was also found on the architectural program website.

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: The APR report adequately links all relevant information on the application process and correctly identifies points (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e), as required. All these links direct to the specific webpage on their website and are easily navigable.

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 program clearly demonstrates its commitment to financial literacy among students by providing a guide titled "Financing Your College Education" and its cost estimation page located on their website. This page clearly approximates the estimated cost of attendance and estimated fees allowing students to make an informed financial decision.

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

PC.1 Career Paths

SC.2 Professional Practice

The team found that the program supports and prepare students towards professional practice exceptionally well. The various aspects of practice are well presented and discussed throughout the curriculum and in extra-curricular programs and activities. Faculty, staff, and administrators, at the departmental and the institutional level, go well beyond the call of duty to support the students in the pursuit of their careers. This strength of the program is obviously aligned with its mission, as the program aims at preparing young professionals through real-world learning experiences, with a significant level of community engagement, at the regional, national, and global level. However, the confidence expressed by the students in their professional preparedness, which was enthusiastically confirmed by the alumni through their own experience, demonstrates a high level of achievement for these Program and Student Criteria.

Appendix 2. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator Representative

Maurizio Sabini, PhD, RA, Int'l Assoc AIA
Professor of Architecture
Drury University
Springfield, MO 65802
417.873.7494
msabini@drury.edu

Practitioner Representative

John Senhauser, FAIA
John Senhauser Architects
1118 Saint Gregory St
Cincinnati, OH 45202
513.381.1669
JSenhauser@senhauserarchitects.com

Regulator Representative

Janet Hansen, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Principal, SMRT Architects and Engineers
144 Fore Street
Portland, ME 04104
p: 877.700.7678
d: 207.321.3805
c: 207.807.4676
JHansen@SMRTInc.com

Student Representative

Jack Collins
Bowling Green State University
jackrc@bgsu.edu
614.315.9224

Observer

Julius J. Chiavaroli, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Professor of Architecture
Rochester Institute of Technology
Department of Architecture
585.259.3277
jjcnct@rit.edu

V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Maurizio Sabini, PhD
Team Chair

John Senhauser, FAIA
Team Member

Janet Hansen, AIA
Team Member

Jack Collins
Team Member

Julius J. Chiavaroli, AIA
Observer