

2024 Visiting Team Report

University of California, Berkeley
Department of Architecture

M.Arch.

Track: M.Arch (non pre-professional degree
+ 72 graduate semester credit hours)

Track: M.Arch with Advanced Standing
(pre-professional degree 120 credits)

Continuing Accreditation Visit
March 10-13, 2024

NAAB

National
Architectural
Accrediting
Board, Inc.

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Visit	3
II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	4
III. Program Changes	6
IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation	6
1. Context and Mission	
2. Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession	
3. Program and Student Criteria	
4. Curricular Framework	
5. Resources	
6. Public Information	
V. Appendices	31
1. Team PC/SC Matrix	
2. The Visiting Team	
VI. Report Signatures	34

For Program COF

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

On behalf of the National Architectural Accrediting Board, it has been an honor for this group of individuals to serve as the Visiting Team for the Master of Architecture Program in the Department of Architecture at the University of California at Berkeley. The team extends thanks to the administration, faculty, staff, students, and alumni for sharing the program. We are grateful to Chair Lisa Iwamoto for her role in guiding this visit, as well as Luisa Caldas, Director of the Master of Architecture program, and Elena Lunt, Management Services Officer. Thank you all for everything you did to make the visit an informative and productive experience in service to NAAB.

In the weeks prior to this visit, and during the visit, the team talked with administrators, faculty, staff, students, and alumni. They reviewed numerous digital folders that include course syllabi, schedules, assignments, assessment rubrics, surveys, and narratives on the assessments, benchmarks, and improvement plans. They reviewed student work in particular studios and courses that demonstrated everything from conceptual studies to codes, materials, and constructability. What was sought was an understanding that the program addresses, achieves, and evaluates each condition and criterion of the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation, including clear assessments and improvement plans.

Based on the site visit and conversations with all representatives of the program, the team recognized several elements that make the University of California at Berkeley Master of Architecture program distinctive. The faculty, staff, and administration clearly demonstrate an unwavering commitment to student success and wellbeing. Key to this is Dean Renee Chow, for her dedicated leadership and vision; as well as the GSAOs, Ari Baird and Kayli Minear, who are invaluable resources for student achievement. The students are highly engaged, aware, and nurture each other's learning environments. Bauer Wurster Hall provides a collaborative and didactic home for the program and provides opportunities for synergies with the other programs within the College of Environmental Design. Of note, the fabrication lab run by Semar Prom provides excellent guidance for students learning about the art of making. It is evident that each player in the program is harmoniously driven to cultivate the unique Berkeley culture.

For our preliminary findings, the team notes areas met with distinction and areas not met.

Conditions met with Distinction are a notation made by the team and not a formal NAAB evaluation under the 2020 Conditions. As much, the notes the following areas as met with distinction:

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.

The “bottom-up” approach of the program fosters belonging through an environment of collaboration and collegiality. There is a strong culture of open communication across and among all user groups (students, staff, faculty, administration, etc), exhibiting a flattened hierarchy of decision making particularly within the faculty and staff, and anyone with appointed hierarchical authority listens to understand.

For areas not met, the team notes:

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.

While the program has embarked on the process of developing a strategic plan, this is still in progress and has not been formally completed. During recent faculty and staff retreats, strengths, challenges and opportunities have been identified. However, these strategic objectives were limited to the short term and do not yet demonstrate a multiyear strategy, nor have key performance indicators been created. In addition, the program acknowledges their position in the planning timeline and that there are further steps to develop.

Again, the team thanks the administration, faculty, staff, and students for all the work they have done in preparation for this accreditation visit.

- b. Conditions with a Team Recommendation to the Board as Not Achieved

5.2 Planning and Assessment

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2014 Conditions Not Met

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

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

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and the teacher that promotes student achievement.
- The program must demonstrate that an Architect Licensing Advisor (ALA) has been appointed, is trained in the issues of IDP, has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the ALA position description, and regularly attends ALA training and development programs.
- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including, but not limited to, academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

Previous Team Report (2016): Faculty teaching loads are carefully managed and typically limited to two courses per semester. While faculty research requirements for tenured or ladder faculty are high, faculty often use their research to inform their teaching and syllabi. Through the university, faculty have many resources to develop their teaching and research skills. The program provides faculty workspace for research, course preparation, and student mentorship. Students find faculty approachable and feel comfortable seeking feedback.

The department chair is also the Architect Licensing Advisor. He keeps his ALA-related information fairly current through information he receives from NCARB, although he has not yet attended the Licensing Advisor Annual Conference. As the ALA, he does not meet with students regarding the AXP or ARE, although they are exposed to licensure information in A207d Cultures of Practice.

Faculty are encouraged to pursue professional development outside the college via on-campus startup incubators, startup stipends for research and housing costs (provided to new ladder-ranked faculty in their

first 4 years of employment), and the Center for Teaching and Learning for the development of lecture and teaching skills. In addition, they are encouraged to pursue professional practice outside of teaching and research modes.

Staff are encouraged to participate in professional development both through the university and off campus, but they find it difficult to balance additional professional development between the increasing demands posed by shrinking staff, and budget and time constraints. Annually, advisors are able to participate in university advisor training to increase their awareness of student needs.

Students trust their academic advisors and believe that their curriculum is adequately explained to them. Career guidance is mostly received through faculty in informal connections to opportunities based on availability and annual career fair events set up by both the college and the university.

2021 IPR Board Review: Following a review of the program's Five-Year Interim Progress Report (IPR) in 2022, the NAAB Board of Directors concluded that the program had demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most 2016 Visiting Team Report and Two-Year IPR with respect to I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development.

2024 Team Analysis:

The team found that the faculty and staff workloads are managed and connected to research, when possible. The faculty and staff can engage in professional development opportunities. The NCARB ALA is Keith Plymale, who works with GSAO Ari Baird to speak with students every semester about the path to licensure and other career opportunities. Both GSAOs, Ari Baird and Kayli Minear, serve the graduate students with advising as well as providing numerous other duties for the graduate students and communicating about campus resources.

B.9 Building Service Systems: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems, including lighting, mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems.

Previous Team Report (2016): The team was unable to find evidence of student understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems.

2021 IPR Board Review: Pursuant to the NAAB Board of Directors' Five-Year Interim Progress Report (IPR) Decision Letter dated May 20, 2022," After reviewing the five-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) for the Master of Architecture program submitted by University of California, Berkeley, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has rejected the IPR as not having corrected or demonstrated substantial progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent two-year Interim Progress Report. SPC B.9 is still Not Met. Student work samples included in the five-year IPR do not demonstrate achievement to the prescribed level for all aspects of SPC B.9 Building Service Systems.

Consistent with the 2015 Procedures, Section 10.1.d.ii Interim Progress Reports, pages 81-82, the next accreditation visit is advanced by one calendar year, thereby shortening the term of accreditation, and is now scheduled for spring 2024. The Architecture Program Report (APR) is due September 7, 2023."

2024 Team Analysis:

Evidence identified in the APR (page 64 and page 87) and during the site visit demonstrated that the program had addressed this deficiency by introduction of an integrated drawing set to ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio that focused on the various building systems, including plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems. The team found this issue to be met.

III. Program Changes

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

2024 Team Analysis:

The program summarizes changes from 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation to 2020 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation to include a move from SPCs to PCs and SCs, a recognition of administration and governance to oversee program improvement, and planning and assessment that supports continual improvement. In 2021, UC Berkeley Department of Architecture completed an annual self-assessment survey for all program and student criteria. The survey was completed by faculty at the beginning and end of the semester. In 2023, the department developed an assessment point matrix that used direct assessment measures to track learning benchmarks and set improvement goals. The adoption of this assessment process is a significant change in the program because of the changes in Conditions. A link to the PC and SC matrix was provided in the APR, as well as copies of the Instructor Assessment Survey (completed twice per semester) and Student Learning Assessment Survey. The M.Arch. program committee also reviews survey responses collected, the studio liaisons discuss the results with respective faculty and the M.Arch. chair if significant changes are warranted. Most improvements are self-identified and implemented by the course instructor. Evidence of this self-correction is provided in the Instructor Assessment Survey, which includes benchmark assessments from AY 21-22 and AY 22-23 and subsequent planned actions.

IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

1—Context and Mission *(Guidelines, p. 5)*

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

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

Team Findings:

Met

Program Summary Statement of 1 – Context and Mission

Our context and mission stems from UC Berkeley's strategic priorities and builds on the department's hundred-year legacy as an incubator of architectural activism and design excellence. We seek to provide opportunities to students of all backgrounds to create a culture of belonging and to foster discovery and innovation. At the core of our mission is a focus on the transformation of the built environment for social good. Empowering our students to be leaders for change and discovery through design and research are at the heart of department activities. We approach architectural education as a means to intelligently assess the built environment, to foster social and environmental equity, and to design innovative buildings

with aesthetic and functional rigor. Informed by intersecting knowledge bases in the humanities, technology, and design, we strive to advance the discipline and expand its influence.

Our teaching and research builds on historic strengths in sustainability, social justice, cultural inclusivity, applied design research, and architectural practice. We promote innovation in architectural practice by critically exploring and questioning its context in a continuum of histories, societies, economies, materials, systems, and scales. Particular areas of emphasis include understanding architecture from diverse historical, theoretical, and social perspectives; designing sustainable and healthy building systems; advancing technologies of fabrication and material development; and encouraging originality and invention in design and representation. By equipping students with the conceptual, analytic, and technical skills required for contemporary innovation, we pursue a transformative vision of the architectural profession and its production of a meaningful built environment.

2024 Team Analysis:

UC Berkeley is a land grant university with numerous highly-ranked departments and programs. The campus of over 32,000 undergraduates and 12,000 graduate students has a long history of social engagement, centered on the ideas of “inclusive intelligence, environmental sustainability and justice, democracy, equity, and health” (APR, page 8) examined through research, instruction, and community interaction.

The Department of Architecture is part of the College of Environmental Design, known as the CED. Begun in the 1960s, the collection of the departments of architecture, landscape architecture, and city planning was the first of its kind. Since then, it has grown to include the Institute of Urban & Regional Development and the undergraduate program in Sustainable Environmental Design.

The CED was the first to use “environment” in its name (APR, page 8), creating an understanding of the connections between related design fields that is supported by concurrent master’s degree programs. Students are able to pursue a Master of Architecture/Master of City Planning, Master of Architecture/Master of Landscape Architecture, and a Master of Architecture/Master of Science in Engineering.

The Department of Architecture organizes its curriculum around the three areas of design, building science, technology, and sustainability (BSTS), and history, theory, and society (HTS). Faculty teach in one or more of these areas. The faculty contribute to the liberal arts-based teaching of the university as well as world-class research and involvement in centers, such as the Institute for Urban and Regional Development and the Center for Environmental Design Research.

Students and faculty are involved in both community and campus activities. The AIA East Bay collaborates with the department for lectures and a mentorship program. Students and faculty also benefit from the exhibits hosted by the CED Library, as well as the Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. The Arcus Social Justice Corps provides students studying social justice with tuition support. Faculty are involved in numerous centers across campus and students participate in college team competitions.

2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession (Guidelines, p. 6)

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

Design: Architects design better, safer, more equitable, resilient, and sustainable built environments. Design thinking and integrated design solutions are hallmarks of architecture education, the discipline, and the profession. (p.7)

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: Architects are responsible for the impact of their work on the natural world and on public health, safety, and welfare. As professionals and designers of the built environment, we embrace these responsibilities and act ethically to accomplish them. (p.7)

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: Architects commit to equity and inclusion in the environments we design, the policies we adopt, the words we speak, the actions we take, and the respectful learning, teaching, and working environments we create. Architects seek fairness, diversity, and social justice in the profession and in society and support a range of pathways for students seeking access to an architecture education. (p.7)

Knowledge and Innovation: Architects create and disseminate knowledge focused on design and the built environment in response to ever-changing conditions. New knowledge advances architecture as a cultural force, drives innovation, and prompts the continuous improvement of the discipline. (p.8)

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: Architects practice design as a collaborative, inclusive, creative, and empathetic enterprise with other disciplines, the communities we serve, and the clients for whom we work. (p.8)

Lifelong Learning: Architects value educational breadth and depth, including a thorough understanding of the discipline's body of knowledge, histories and theories, and architecture's role in cultural, social, environmental, economic, and built contexts. The practice of architecture demands lifelong learning, which is a shared responsibility between academic and practice settings. (p.8)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

Design: Three principles serve as the basis for teaching architecture at UC Berkeley. The first is that architecture is taught by both academics and practitioners, linking scholarly and professional work. The second is that education in architecture is informed by the liberal arts, connecting the design profession to broad knowledge. The third is the synthesis of research and design, which combines creativity and innovation. These three principles were clearly described in the APR and validated in the team interactions throughout the visit. Strengths of the program include conceptual and analytical thinking, representation, innovation in materials and systems, and exploration of urban contexts.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: UC Berkeley has a long history of environmental engagement, and the architecture program continues to contribute to this legacy through work in the Building Science, Technology, and Sustainability (BSTS) area. Faculty research flows into the curriculum, including topics such as climate analysis, envelope solutions, dynamic facades, and cutting-edge studies of daylighting. The XR Lab collaborates with the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory to investigate building simulations. Studios, seminars, and research opportunities enable students to engage in these activities. The history of this value and work in the program is a continuing strength.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: UC Berkeley holds the principles of equity, diversity, inclusion, justice, and belonging as a campus-wide priority (APR, page 13). Safe environments and diverse perspectives are supported. The department of architecture is working to increase faculty diversity and improve equity, inclusion, and diversity in both the graduate and undergraduate programs. Fellowships to support diverse students are available, with funding ranging between \$10,000 and \$45,000 based on need and intentions of the type of work after graduation (APR, page 14). Outreach efforts happen with HBCUs and through NOMA, and the transfer options from community colleges are being developed, resulting in an increasingly diverse applicant pool. Internships help provide mentoring for bridging between school and the profession.

Knowledge and Innovation: The research engaged by the UC Berkeley architecture faculty generates knowledge for the profession through innovative means. Faculty members engage in research on mass

timber prefabrication and prototypes, architectural representation and criticism, housing and community development, materials and structure, digital fabrication, climate change, connections between architecture, engineering, and biology, and history, theory, and memory. Many faculty members have national and international reputations in their fields of study. Their research is part of studios, courses, and seminars. Students are able to be involved with the work not only in these academic settings but also as research assistants. The Digital Fabrication Lab and the XR Lab support many of these endeavors.

Lifelong Learning: Lifelong learning is demonstrated by the UC Berkeley architecture faculty as they combine teaching and practice. This provides a myriad of examples of how professional work includes continual learning. This approach influences the studio pedagogy, encouraging students to fuel their activity through asking questions and developing ways to investigate possible answers. The liberal arts education also plays a role in teaching students how to continue learning after their time at the university. Evidence for lifelong learning is seen in the nature of critiques, as open-ended conversations about larger questions, as well as student-led projects such as *Room One Thousand*, a scholarly journal (APR, page 20).

The program clearly models these deeply embedded values and demonstrates its commitment to upholding them.

3—Program and Student Criteria (*Guidelines, p. 9*)

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

3.1 Program Criteria (PC) (*Guidelines, p. 9*)

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

PC.1 Career Paths—How the program ensures that students understand the paths to becoming licensed as an architect in the United States and the range of available career opportunities that utilize the discipline’s skills and knowledge. (*p.9*)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

Career paths are discussed primarily in ARCH 207D - Cultures of Practice, a course in the second year of the program. This course examines the path to licensure as well as discussing other career opportunities that may be possible with an education in architecture. Resume writing, portfolio creation, and researching firms are also part of the course. Career paths are also covered in ARCH 207A - Architecture Lectures Colloquium, in which students read and discuss a more general understanding of the discipline of architecture.

The benchmark for ARCH 207D - Cultures of Practice is “nearly 100%” of students making a B- or better (APR, page 23), which was achieved in both Spring 2022 and Spring 2023. Improvements in the course include requiring a notebook for the course as well as a more comprehensive account of career paths, including both small and large firms and sole proprietorships. Supplemental exposure to understanding career paths was provided by NCARB Architecture Licensing Advisor Keith Plymale who speaks with students to the pathway to achieving licensure at least once a semester.

PC.2 Design—How the program instills in students the role of the design process in shaping the built environment and conveys the methods by which design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities. (*p.9*)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

Design is taught in six design studios as well as related colloquia and seminars. The sequence is structured to begin with introductory studios and topics such as representation and history prior to engaging in urban and integrated design studios. Urban and integrated design studios are supported with construction, systems, and cultures of practice courses. The sequence ends with a final thesis studio, in which students take on an individual design question.

While all six studios are identified as the places in the curriculum that teach design, ARCH 201 - Architecture & Urbanism Studio and ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio are the primary sources of assessment for design. Assessment for ARCH 201 - Architecture & Urbanism Studio consists of reviewing projects for an understanding of scale, program, structure, spatial organization, site response, light, ventilation, and building assembly. Written and oral evaluations relay assessments to the students. Assessment for ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio simulates project workflow in a professional setting, including pre-design, schematic, design development, and documentation. Quality of design, iterations, timeliness, addressing requirements, improvement, and collaboration are assessed in the workflow stages (APR, page 26). For ARCH 201, the benchmark is 95% of the students achieving a “B” or better. In both Fall 2021 and Fall 2022, 93% of the students met this benchmark. Improvements to the course include updating precedents and introducing exercises to help students move from smaller to larger scales. For ARCH 203, the benchmark is 80% of the students receiving a “B+” or better. In both Fall 2021 and Fall 2022, this benchmark was met. Improvements to the course include the introduction of an improved set of drawings and multiple iterations of massing models.

The curriculum changes from 2022 to 2023 included an expanded and more highly detailed scoring rubric that includes evaluations under technical and conceptual criteria as well as studio engagement. Notably, letter grades were assigned to the scoring rubric in 2023 to offer a more quantitative and thus measurable assessment point. This improvement clearly demonstrates evidence of design addressing the shaping of the built environment, including different settings and scales.

PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility—How the program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities. (p.9)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

Ecological knowledge and professional responsibility are introduced in the program during the fall semester of second year in studio and seminar through ARCH 201 - Architecture + Urbanism Studio and ARCH 207B - Architecture Research Colloquium. ARCH 240 - Advanced Study of Energy and Environment and ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio serve as the primary assessment points for student work and instructor evaluation. The studio project encompasses climate analysis, site analysis, daylighting, energy analysis, and renewable energies. The design work and program emphasizes the importance of adaptive reuse for ecological resilience and integrating new design using existing urban infrastructures.

The assessment in ARCH 240 is made at multiple points through successive assignments culminating in design for a net zero building solution. Benchmarks include assignment letter grades (90% better than B+) and participation (85% better than B+). These letter grades are weighted and averaged out. The learned principles in ARCH 240 are applied in the studio project in ARCH 203 through the Final Drawing Set. The benchmark for ARCH 203 is 85% students achieving at least 87/100. While 100% of the

students met the benchmark for ARCH 240, only 67% met the benchmark for ARCH 203. To make improvements in order to meet the benchmark, the instructors propose for AY 23-24 to “improve the emphasis on Environmental Analysis and Observation in the early stages of the student design projects, while guiding site visits with this in mind.”

PC.4 History and Theory—How the program ensures that students understand the histories and theories of architecture and urbanism, framed by diverse social, cultural, economic, and political forces, nationally and globally. (p.9)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis

Architecture and urbanism history and theory are taught in ARCH 230 - Advanced Architecture Design Theory and Criticism and ARCH 270 - History of Modern Architecture. These courses provide perspectives on social and cultural issues rather than deep historical knowledge. Discussions with the faculty acknowledged that the subject of history is condensed because of the compressed nature of the program. ARCH 201 - Architecture + Urbanism Studio, ARCH 207B - Architecture Research Colloquium, and ARCH 204A and ARCH 204B, Thesis Seminar and Thesis Studio, also provide insight on the political, social, cultural, and economic factors that influence the built environment.

The assessment for ARCH 230 - Advanced Architecture Design Theory and Criticism includes class participation, weekly writings, and a final paper, with a benchmark of 75% of the students receiving a B+ or higher on the weekly papers and a benchmark of 85% of the students receiving a B+ or higher on the final. While only 70% of the students met the benchmark for the weekly writings, 85% met the benchmark for the final. Improvement plans include weekly paper class discussions and writing workshops. Those who missed the benchmark included many ESL students, who were identified as needing help with translation. The assessment for ARCH 270 was a mid-term and a final exam, with a benchmark of 90% of the students scoring B+ or better. The students met that benchmark. Improvements for the course consisted of expanding content to include racial and economic justice in the global south, public housing and urban renewal, and disability rights activism.

PC.5 Research and Innovation—How the program prepares students to engage and participate in architectural research to test and evaluate innovations in the field. (p.9)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis

The program prepares students to engage and participate in architectural research to test and evaluate innovations in the field in ARCH 204A - Thesis Seminar and ARCH 204B - Thesis Studio. ARCH 204A - Thesis Seminar expects students to develop a clear thesis ambition and proposal with respect to a specific architectural issue. Students are graded on weekly presentations, and a Final Thesis Book comprised of: (1) Thesis Background to provide context, (2) Written content presented as either an annotated set of images of precedents and original work, a manifesto for an architectural publication, a mission statement for architectural design work, an editorial introduction for an edited publication, or an interview with a journalist, and (3) Preliminary Drawings of the final thesis proposal. The final thesis proposal is evaluated on its articulation of strong intellectual and design position.

The method of assessment is based on the articulation of the design process in relationship to the built environment. 70% of students are expected to achieve a B+ or higher. In AY 22-23, student performance was above the targeted benchmark at 90%. While there are no major changes noted in AY 23-24 to increase performance, the program is aware that the rise in student population will have an impact on presentation, feedback, and discussion time in the classroom. ARCH 204B - Thesis Studio expects

students to develop a conceptually sophisticated and technically advanced design proposal with articulated architectural consideration. Assessments across all criteria in this course is based on (1) originality, (2) intellectual ambition and clarity, (3) refined articulation (precision and communication of ideas), (4) skillful production of projects, (5) progress over the semester, (6) attendance, and (7) timely completion of exercises. Students are encouraged to self-evaluate their work, although final evaluation of work is made by the instructor. Assessment guidelines include questions such as: How clearly are you articulating your conceptual intentions, positioning of thesis, translation of thesis, representation, appropriateness, quality of representation, oral presentation skills, breadth, participation in discussion, response to criticism, and self-directed work/independence. 70% of students are expected to achieve a B+ or higher. In AY 22-23, student performance was above the targeted benchmark at 90%. In the program's internal assessment, the overall student performance, structure, content, and design pedagogy work well. Students were tasked to submit early descriptions and images of their projects, enabling them to think about their projects earlier than usual. Large physical models were helpful in the design of the thesis projects and will remain.

PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration—How the program ensures that students understand approaches to leadership in multidisciplinary teams, diverse stakeholder constituents, and dynamic physical and social contexts, and learn how to apply effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems. ([p.9](#))

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis

The program ensures students understand approaches to leadership in multidisciplinary teams, diverse stakeholder constituents, and dynamic physical and social context, and learn how to apply effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems in ARCH 207D - Cultures of Practice and ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio. ARCH 207D is intended to cover the transition from education to practice and covers key topics such as teamwork in design, relationships with related disciplines, leadership in teams, client communication, and the economics of good design. Leadership and collaboration tips are covered in the 'Project Experience' series of classes including Class #25 on the design team, MEP and trade partners, and consultants in their roles; Class #26 on architect as design team leader, the client relationship, communication, and presentation; Class #27 on the role of the general contractor and project delivery methods; and Class #28 on the design approvals process. Students are graded on class participation, leading class discussions, participation in mock-interviews, and role-playing exercises simulating typical collaboration scenarios. 95% of students are expected to participate and receive a pass from peer evaluations on role-play and collaboration, and 97% met the benchmark. Course-wide, nearly 100% of students are expected to complete each assignment in a satisfactory way. In AY 22-23, 100% of students met the benchmark.

Even still, the program anticipates taking more steps that better tie collaboration exercises in with other aspects of the course. ARCH 203 pairs students in teams to implement an integrated building design for the duration of the semester. This course simulates aspects of professional practice where the student team leads the design and incorporates consultant feedback on structures, codes and life safety, daylighting, and facade and mechanical systems. Specialist consultants are brought in weekly and are at the service of the students, with the students leading the communication as to their design intents and effectively integrated feedback through a series of design iterations. The first half of the course focuses on a design schematic, with the second half dedicated to the development of this design as it integrates with a range of building systems. The entirety of this effort leads to the production of an integrated drawing set. Students are evaluated through a combination of regular assignments, culminating in a final project, final review, and final drawing set. The course benchmark is that 90% of students are expected to receive a B+ or higher. In AY 22-23, 95% of students met or exceeded the benchmark. In future course iterations, changes include providing more examples and clarifying the intentions of the integrated building section drawing, as well as improving the environmental systems documentation.

PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture—How the program fosters and ensures a positive and respectful environment that encourages optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation among its faculty, students, administration, and staff. (p.9)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis

The program provides student opportunities for teaching, governance, and socializing, as well as a curriculum that allows for flexibility. They have a strong reputation in fostering graduate students who aspire to teach through Graduate Student Instructor positions. The program has also identified resources under 5.4 Human Resources to demonstrate a positive and respectful environment is present, including professional development of the faculty and support services available to students in the program. Graduate Student Affairs Officers (GSAOs) provide M.Arch. students with support in navigating the department, college, and university at large. The Graduate Architecture Student Union (GASU) also meets regularly with the chair, dean, and GSAOs to communicate positive and negative feedback gathered from the graduate student population, as well as distributes 'Pulse' surveys each semester. Students are involved in important department processes, such as faculty searches, and their opinions weigh heavily in course content through the rigorous course evaluation process.

As confirmed throughout the visit in discussions with students and faculty, there is a tangible and healthy studio culture present in the program. For example, all-nighters are neither expected nor encouraged and a mutual respect between the faculty and students is understood. There is a written studio culture policy, though its presence is not well known to the students. The team feels the positive and respectful environment is embedded within the program pedagogy.

Assessment of this program criteria is primarily through an indirect method by way of the Graduate Student Exit Survey, which is administered annually by the CED and addresses topics such as overall academic experience, faculty advising and mentoring, environment fostering free and open discussion, and belonging, among others. The expected benchmark is to have 80% of question responses be positive, with either 'yes,' 'strongly agree,' 'agree,' or 'somewhat agree' responses. In the 2022 survey, which had a 95% participation rate, the vast majority of question responses met the benchmark. Even still, the program has planned improvements for over half of the assessment points included in the survey.

PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion—How the program furthers and deepens students' understanding of diverse cultural and social contexts and helps them translate that understanding into built environments that equitably support and include people of different backgrounds, resources, and abilities. (p.9)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis

Social equity and inclusion is introduced in the program during the fall semester of first year in ARCH 270 - History of Modern Architecture, and then assessed in ARCH 230 - Advanced Architectural Design and Criticism during the spring semester of first year. During the second year, the assessment point occurs during fall studio in ARCH 201 - Architecture & Urbanism Design Studio and reinforced through its companion colloquium ARCH 207B - Architecture Research Colloquium. The design studio emphasizes social equity and inclusion issues by conducting an intensive study of a site in Oakland and focuses on programs and sites that promote inclusivity within typically underserved communities. The assessment in ARCH 230 is made by letter grade following weekly readings and discussions followed by written assignments. Students are expected to exhibit comprehension of the topics discussed, ability to formulate independent and critical approaches to topics, and to articulate the topics through verbal discussion,

completing written assignments, and completing the final project. The benchmark for this course is 70% of students achieving B+ or higher.

In previous years, improvement has been shown by increasing the percentage of students surpassing the benchmark by adding more discussion that promoted self-reflection. Student reactions to the coursework and additional content on various topics will be added for AY 23-24, showing a commitment to continuous improvement. The assessment in ARCH 201 did not show any proposed process or improvements between AY 21-22 and AY 22-23. As a result, the benchmark was not met in AY 22-23. The planned improvements for AY 23-24 included adding readings to the course. The assessment in ARCH 207B shows 100% of the students have met the benchmark.

Regardless, course improvements are made to improve student support in completing the companion studio ARCH 201 between academic years. Noteworthy is the integration with representatives from the Othering and Belonging Institute into the discussions and learning for students. In ARCH 270, it was noted that international students achieved the benchmark at a lower rate than domestic students. The coursework was adjusted to include more global studies and an emphasis on how some specific U.S. policies have affected social justice in housing issues. In AY 22-23, 100% of the students gained a clear understanding of the social equity and inclusion issues presented and discussed. Inclusion of current case studies are to be added in AY 23-24, demonstrating a commitment to continuous improvement and using relevant real-world examples of social justice in action in the built environment.

3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes (*Guidelines, p. 10*)

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

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment—How the program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities. (*p.10*)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

Several seminars and labs include integration of health, safety, and welfare design principles. Students are taught about issues related to natural light, passive ventilation, structural systems, mechanical systems, indoor air quality, site planning, life safety systems, egress, fall protection systems, and fire protection measures.

The primary assessment point that synthesizes coursework and lab studies is ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio, which asks students to apply knowledge of building systems to a design project through drawings and oral presentations. Each course integrates principles of health, safety and welfare into its syllabus, and is referenced for student awareness. Competencies are developed and applied in the studio projects in ARCH 203 and include lecturers who convey how to integrate the complexity of designing building systems within the overall project designs holistically.

The courses that integrate health, safety and welfare include: ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio, ARCH 207C - Professional Practice (companion to ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio), ARCH 240 - Advanced Study of Energy and Environment, and ARCH 250 - Introduction to Structures. Additionally, ARCH 207B - Architecture Research Colloquium introduces students to health, safety and welfare goals with lectures on planning principles, natural ventilation, daylighting, life safety, accessibility, structural systems, and mechanical systems. In ARCH 203, the benchmark is 80-90% students achieving B+ or higher, and 90% of the students achieved the benchmark in AY 21-22 and AY 22-23.

SC.2 Professional Practice—How the program ensures that students understand professional ethics, the regulatory requirements, the fundamental business processes relevant to architecture practice in the United States, and the forces influencing change in these subjects. (p.10)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

The program ensures students understand professional ethics, regulatory requirements, fundamental business processes relative to architectural practice in the United States, and the forces influencing these topics in ARCH 207D - Cultures of Practice. The course's four thematic modules are well aligned with SC.2: "The Professional Challenge," "The Business of Architecture," "The Project Experience," and "Preparing for Professional Success." Lectures included in the "Professional Challenge" series are particularly relevant, covering topics such as architects' ethical responsibilities, the way firms are organized and how power and opportunities are distributed, the legal structures connecting architects to clients and contractors, various types of architectural drawing packages, as well as other types of documents and exhibits that represent the business of practice. One assignment of note is the "Firm Report" project, where students research an existing architectural firm and develop a report concerning specific characteristics of that firm. Previously taught by a non-licensed faculty member who has since retired, the course is now taught by a seasoned practitioner and licensed architect. Several changes were implemented starting in Spring 2023 including a greater emphasis on regulatory systems, such as California state law, as well as an enhanced focus on the subject of contracts and business processes. The course benchmark is that nearly 100% of students are expected to achieve a grade of B- or better on each assignment. 100% of students have met this benchmark in the most recent years. To improve student performance even further, the instructor recommends that future iterations of the course more effectively address the needs and interests of students across divergent interests, such as large firm vs. sole proprietor.

SC.3 Regulatory Context—How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project. (p.10)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

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 primarily through ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio.

ARCH 203 tasks students with designing an integrated building project for real sites with specific regulatory contexts. Building and zoning codes guide project development with the involvement of specialist consultants who raise, discuss, and consult on issues relating to planning and building codes. The studio distributes a course handbook with information on relevant codes for reference throughout the semester. ARCH 201 - Architecture + Urbanism Studio also serves as an introduction to regulatory context by exposing students to code and regulatory frameworks related to housing. Its companion course ARCH 207B - Architecture Research Colloquium introduces students to land use planning and regulations as part of the required reading. In ARCH 203, life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations are assessed through evaluation of certain pages within the integrated drawing sets. Each of the six sheets related to this criteria is scored and weighted and averaged into a composite score. The benchmark is that 85% of students receive 87/100 or better, and 51% met the benchmark.

The program notes that the relatively low success rate will be addressed by requesting that students explicitly note relevant code references in their drawing set. In many cases, the information appears to be

present, but is not called out. The instructors also envision an update to the handbook to reflect the most recent building codes.

SC.4 Technical Knowledge—How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects. (p.10)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

The program ensures that students understand the established emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of the building, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects through ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio. ARCH 203 focuses on the integration of technical knowledge within the design process. Students are to create a preliminary concept design for the building and develop technical systems for structural design, facade design, environmental design, and mechanical design. A specialist consultant engages weekly with the class to discuss and assess issues related to the building's systems and technologies, enabling students to gain professional insight and understanding the critical role technical knowledge plays in practice. Supplemental exposure to technical knowledge is presented in ARCH 240 - Advanced Study of Energy and Environment, ARCH 250 - Introduction to Structures, and ARCH 260 - Introduction to Construction. In each of these courses, students build knowledge in systems, technologies, and assemblies and integrally apply their understanding of technical knowledge to the design and construction process.

The program assesses student understanding of established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction through the completion of a final comprehensive drawing set. Students are evaluated on their ability to decipher systems at multiple scales and from various phases from initial design to construction details. Sheets of the final drawing set are scored against SC-4 criteria and averaged. The assessment benchmark is 85% with 87% meeting the benchmark.

SC.5 Design Synthesis—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions. (p. 12)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

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, accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions in ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio. ARCH 203 meets this criterion by synthesizing considerations of site, zoning regulations, building codes, community context, climate, program, and accessibility into the design process. Design decisions are facilitated with weekly guidance by specialist consultants in areas of structures, facade, fire and life safety, mechanical systems, and environmental daylighting design. Students work in pairs throughout the semester and are evaluated on design synthesis in the Final Drawing Set. Confirmed by the team on the visit through student and faculty discussions, the synergies of collaboration and support within teams provided tangible benefits to the overall process and helped maintain accountability. The design synthesis criteria are found within several sheets of the Final Drawing Set. Each of these sheets are scored and weighted for this criterion and averaged into a composite score. The benchmark is that 85% of students are expected to receive an aggregate score of 87/100 or better,

and 92% of students met the benchmark in AY 22-23. Changes include expanding the program analysis portion of the design process, allowing for a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between program requirements and other conditions for building design. A mid-semester review of the working drawing set will also be introduced in order to accelerate student understanding of design synthesis.

SC.6 Building Integration—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance. (p. 12)

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

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 in ARCH 203 - Integrated Design Studio.

While ARCH 203 is the primary assessment point for this criterion, there are also a number of classes that contribute to and feed into the integrated studio, including ARCH 207C - Professional Practice Colloquium, ARCH 240 - Advanced Study of Energy and Environment, ARCH 250 - Introduction to Structures, and ARCH 260 - Introduction to Construction. ARCH 203 assesses students on their ability to make design decisions regarding the integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structure, environmental control systems, and life safety in a building project. Students work in pairs throughout the semester on the design of an architectural project and are evaluated on building integration in the Final Drawing Set submitted at the conclusion of the semester. The student team works closely with consultants specializing in fire & life safety, mechanical design, structural design, environmental design, and facade design. Students are tasked with understanding the requirements of the program, the needs of the users, and opportunities and constraints of an appropriate site strategy. They are expected to identify these systems and requirements within their projects at multiple scales, from overall design concept to a construction detail and are evaluated on the degree to which the building design integrates these various components into a coherent, singular design proposal. Students are paired in teams for the duration of the semester and act in a similar manner to the profession to ensure integration of building systems while retaining design intents. The building integration criteria can be found in the majority of sheets in the Final Drawing Set. Each of these sheets is scored and weighted for the building integration criteria and averaged into a composite score.

The benchmark is that 85% of students are expected to receive 87/100 or better, and 94% met the benchmark in AY 22-23. Planned changes include streamlining the drawing set format so that there is less friction and redundancy between the technical drawings and presentation drawings, allowing for clearer representation of technical knowledge. The deadline for the Final Drawing Set will also be moved to earlier in the semester so that the technical knowledge can be a more fundamental portion of the final reviews, allowing for greater discussion of building integration rather than just a jury to review the design and representation quality.

4—Curricular Framework (Guidelines, p. 13)

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

4.1 Institutional Accreditation (Guidelines, p. 13)

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

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

On page 94 of the APR, UC Berkeley provides a link to the letter from the WASC Senior College and University Commission that notes a ten-year accreditation of the University of California, Berkeley, from 2014 through 2024. This reflects the accreditation at the time of the writing of the APR. The next Accreditation Visit was scheduled for Fall 2024, with a mid-cycle review in Spring 2020.

4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum (Guidelines, p. 13)

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

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

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

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

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

The department of architecture at UC Berkeley offers a NAAB accredited Master of Architecture degree. This is explained in the Master of Architecture Handbook, a pdf available on the College of Environmental Design UC Berkeley website (<https://ced.berkeley.edu/arch/degrees-admissions/master-of-architecture>) as well as in the APR, page 94. The degree has two tracks: Option 3 accommodates students with a B.A. or B.S. degree consisting of 120 non-professional units, while Option 2 accommodates students with 120 non-professional or professional units. Option 3 requires 72 units with 13 elective units. Option 2 requires 48 units with 5 elective units. Both options describe the professional, general, and elective requirements and both meet the requirements of 168 semester credit hours and 30 graduate semester credit hours.

4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education (Guidelines, p. 16)

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

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

understands the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program before accepting an offer of admission.

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

4.3.1 The admissions process includes evaluation of student undergraduate transcripts, looking to verify that sufficient coursework has been completed at accredited institutions. Prior studio experience and evidence of satisfactory completion of courses through portfolio review demonstrate whether students are admitted to Option 3, Option 3 with advanced standing, or Option 2. Option 2 admittees can waive fundamental architecture studio courses ARCH 200A - Introduction to Architecture Studio I and ARCH 200B - Introduction to Architecture Studio II as well as ARCH 200C - Representational Practices in Architectural Design I, ARCH 200D - Representational Practices in Architectural Design II, and ARCH 207A - CED Lectures Colloquium. Students admitted in Option 2 may also submit waiver requests if they have equivalent coursework on their transcript from other institutions for ARCH 230 - Architectural Design Theory & Criticism, ARCH 240 - Advanced Study of Energy & Environment, ARCH 250 - Introduction to Structures, ARCH 260 - Introduction to Construction, and ARCH 270 - History of Modern Architecture. Faculty instructors for these courses review the waiver requests to determine whether or not previous coursework satisfies the coursework in this program. This information is provided transparently on the program's website: <https://ced.berkeley.edu/arch/degrees-admissions/master-of-architecture>.

4.3.2 All preparatory education experience for admission to Option 3 are considered general studies. Standardized equivalents to coursework waivers for Option 2 students are established that include weighted studio completion and portfolio review that demonstrates strong design skills, comprehensive understanding of architectural drawing conventions, and advanced knowledge of the discipline.

4.3.3 Transparency for the requirements and expectations are clearly posted and explained on the program's website. It includes an explanation of the admissions criteria, multi-phased ranking system, and composition of the review committee.

5—Resources

5.1 Structure and Governance *(Guidelines, p. 18)*

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

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

The department of architecture is housed within the College of Environmental Design. This College is the smallest college at the University of California at Berkeley, and one of fifteen schools and colleges that comprise the university. Other schools and colleges include the Haas School of Business, Chemistry, the College of Computing, Data Science, & Society, the Graduate School of Education, the College of Engineering, the School of Information, the Graduate School of Journalism, the School of Law, the College of Letters & Science, the Rausser College of Natural Resources, the School of Optometry, the School of Public Health, the Richard and Rhonda Goldman School of Public Policy and the School of Social Welfare. The deans have regular meetings and open communication with the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, who reports to the Provost. Services such as information technology support and

human resources activities is provided by a shared services team (ERSO) that is part of the College of Engineering (APR, page 106).

The College of Environmental Design consists of the department of architecture, the department of landscape architecture, the department of city & regional planning, and the Institute of Urban & Regional Planning. The departments are led by a chair, while the institute has a program director. These chairs and director are joined by an Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs, an Associate Dean of Undergraduate Affairs, a Summer Programs Director, a Turner Center Director (Affordable housing), and an Associate Director of the Master of Design program. In addition to these academic roles, the college has an Administrative & Finance Assistant Dean and other administrative personnel, including a Community Initiatives Director, a Communications Director, a Development & Alumni Relations Assistant Dean, and an Archives Curator.

The department of architecture is served by a department manager, two graduate student affairs officers, a program assistant, and an events and special projects coordinator. The department manager is responsible for operations and financial concerns. One graduate student affairs officer focuses on fellowships, events, and advising for the MS and PhD programs, while the other focuses on advising, admissions, outreach, and retention for the M.Arch. program (APR, page 107).

The majority of the governing affairs for the department is the responsibility of the chair, who is appointed for a three- to five-year term by the dean. In the last decade, chairs have served a range of years, with shorter service a result of unexpected departures of a dean. The chair reports directly to the dean of the college.

Faculty have a cabinet with the purpose of advising the chair. This cabinet consists of the BA director, M.Arch. director, MAAD director, MS/PhD History, Theory, and Society committee chair, MS/PhD Building Science, Technology, and Sustainability committee chair, and the faculty equity advisor (APR, page 108). There are also standing committees and appointments as well as ad hoc committees. Faculty participate in college committees, rotating assignments. The role of staff is also recognized in the continuing operations of the department, and they have weekly meetings with the chair. Students participate through the Graduate Architecture Student Union (GASU), meeting with the chair at least once a semester, as well as surveys, faculty search feedback, and graduate student instruction opportunities. Faculty searches and course evaluations are other ways in which students are involved in governing.

Based on the program response in the APR and the team visit, it's evident that faculty, staff, and students alike have ample opportunities to provide a constant feedback loop on curricular and programmatic continuous improvement. Faculty committees and other advisory mechanisms are systematically integrated into the governance structure. Student coursework evaluations and governing bodies also provide a continuous feedback loop from the student experience.

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

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

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

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

Team Findings:

Not Met

2024 Team Analysis:

5.2.1 While the mission and vision statements of the department of architecture align with the university and college strategic objectives, these statements have not been updated after the revision of the university strategic plan in 2019 and the college updated plan in the spring of 2023 (APR, page 112). The department meets all NAAB conditions through four strategic priorities. The strategic objectives of the university, college, and department are in concert and connections to the NAAB conditions are present; however, multi-year strategic objectives of the department are not clearly identified.

5.2.2 On pages 113-114, the APR provides information on key performance indicators related to tenure and promotion, curriculum review, and student surveys. Additional information on key performance indicators for the department were provided and included minutes on faculty retreats. Administration and faculty at the site visit indicated that key performance indicators had not yet been set as the strategic plan for the department has not yet been written. This is planned for after the NAAB visit.

5.2.3 The ten-year university review of the program occurred in spring 2023. The development of a strategic plan and revisiting the mission and vision statements are stated to be underway in the APR. The site visit confirmed that this work is upcoming. The mission of maintaining a humanistic dimension in architecture education is being addressed by the offering of a Bachelor of Arts degree that is related to design. A faculty hire in history/theory, with expertise in the American South, is planned. Improving design excellence is addressed with faculty hires for design studios. Building technology courses were improved through revisions, and funding supports graduate student events.

5.2.4 UC Berkeley enjoys a solid academic tradition, a faculty with strengths in scholarship and research, and a talented student body that is supported with an effective staff and administration. There are also challenges, including faculty reductions of over 30% that increased workloads and been exacerbated by an increase in M.Arch. students. Funding has fallen from 83% to 72% in the last ten years, alleviated by supplemental tuition and increased enrollment. New standards for lecturer and graduate teaching assistant pay results in funding that must be met by the department. Space and infrastructure are also challenges in comfort and pin-up area needs. Opportunities include a strategic hiring plan and opportunities for interdisciplinarity in capstone projects. Increasing recruitment of the quality and diversity of students is another opportunity, as well as increasing alumni connections.

5.2.5 UC Berkeley benefits from a number of talented professionals in the region that are able to serve as lecturers and reviewers. The lecturers introduce a breadth of perspectives that enrich the program. UC Berkeley has a number of endowed chairs. Reviews include external visitors from other architecture programs and practice. Consultants are used in integrated studios, helping with everything from structures to daylighting. Professional connections are also being explored with area practitioners.

5.3 Curricular Development *(Guidelines, p. 19)*

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

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

5.3.1 The curriculum is shaped by faculty expertise, a general review and response to new needs and concerns in the profession, and a response to NAAB program and student criteria. Curricular assessment

and development is addressed in four distinct yet critical ways: (1) student course evaluations (based on 12 specific questions addressing the effectiveness of instructors and course content), (2) M.Arch. student Pulse surveys (including a graduation exit survey measuring student satisfaction with their experience in the program), (3) 100% participation of all faculty in studio and thesis review, and (4) annual fall faculty engagement to address curricular needs (APR pages 119-120). Curricular changes are introduced by the M.Arch. Committee, which consists of the M.Arch. director, a minimum of four faculty members, and a GSAO staff member. Responses to student feedback and NAAB criteria instigate changes that are introduced every eight to ten years as part of an academic review process for every department. The three-day review includes faculty from peer institutions, providing the department with a solid outside perspective.

5.3.2 The faculty are responsible for the curriculum, coming to agreement through the guidance of the department chair, the faculty cabinet, and the program committees (APR page 121). Program committees work independently to set agendas and confer with the department chair. The full faculty comes to consensus on the curriculum. Faculty freedoms and expertise are respected and incorporated, but studios and courses are coordinated to ensure learning outcomes are met.

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development *(Guidelines, p. 19)*

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

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

5.4.1 Each faculty member instructs no more than 4 courses in an academic year, balanced as a studio plus a non-studio lecture or seminar in either History, Theory and Society (HTS) or Building Science, Technology and Sustainability (BSTS). Contact hours are thus also limited based on this balance, allowing faculty ample time for pursuing research and creative work in order to meet university merit, promotion, and tenure requirements. Non-ladder faculty are often working in the field and balance teaching with architectural practice.

5.4.2 Continuing Lecturer Keith Plymale has served as the architect licensing advisor since 2017. Evidence that the duties defined in the NCARB Position Description are being carried out include his meetings with students and attendance at the NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit. A 352-page report of activities conducted by this position from 2017-2023 are included in the (APR, page 123).

5.4.3 Professional development opportunities are available and advertised to faculty and staff at the department (Department of Architecture), college (College of Environmental Design), and university levels. Teaching resources, professional research opportunities, networking, and career development

resources are readily available. Berkeley Culture & People (the University's centralized human resources department) provides ample resources related to Career Growth, Career Development Workshops, Conferences, and other External Resources. The Culture & People webpage also shows evidence of resources such as 1:1 career coaching, skills development, anti-racism self-assessment tools, and Individual Development Plans at: <https://hr.berkeley.edu>. Work-life balance and benefits are also clearly articulated. Faculty are offered hybrid schedules and employee wellness and assistance programs.

5.4.4 The graduate student affairs officers (GSAOs) provide M.Arch. students with support in navigating administrative student support issues related to admissions, registration, enrollment, financial aid, student employment, international student issues. CED has a dedicated career counselor at the UC Berkeley Career Center. The department has a paid summer internship program offering wages between minimum wage (\$16/hr) up to \$25/hr at Bay Area architecture firms (also credited as course ARCH 108). The University's Psychological Services at the University Health Services (UHS) Tang Center support students' mental health and well-being. CED previously had a licensed, on-site psychologist from Counseling and Psychological Services to support student mental health and well-being; however, budget cuts caused this position to be cut and the Department has requested reinstatement of this critical position.

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (*Guidelines, p. 20*)

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

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

5.5.1 The program provides fellowships for accepted underrepresented minority students. However, less than 10% of the applicants are underrepresented minorities, only half of those are accepted, and only one in six of these acceptances enroll at UC Berkeley. The Arcus Social Justice Corp Fellowships provide funding for graduate students who engage in social justice after graduation. Financial assistance and tech waivers are also available. Two faculty serve as equity advisors.

5.5.2 Diversity among the faculty has increased since the last accreditation, with position advertisements noting this position and asking for each candidate's statement on "Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Belonging, and Justice" (APR, page 126). While faculty diversity is increasing, this percentage lags behind the undergraduate students at Berkeley yet is greater than the diversity of the graduate students.

5.5.3 The department recognizes that the underrepresented minority population is steady and low. Steps are being taken to admit more graduate students from this pool through targeted and priority admissions, with an approach of reaching more minority applicants and communicating a pathway for current undergraduates (APR, page 127). More outreach is also planned.

5.5.4 The UC Berkeley Office of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Belonging oversees EEO policies, as well as Affirmative Action, harassment and discrimination, and other related issues. The Office of Graduate Diversity is a resource for the admissions process. The university-wide approach to EEOC measures is carried out in the department through the “Making It Happen” initiative, which included efforts such as increasing minority representation, provide mental health, and supporting social justice movements.

5.5.5 UC Berkeley has a non-discrimination policy and a website for Disability Services. The approach to disabilities in the department and college support the university standard by working with the Disabled Students’ Program. UC Berkeley also has a newly endowed professorship, the Lifchez Professor of Practice in Social Justice, which focuses on design education addressing accessibility and justice.

5.6 Physical Resources *(Guidelines, p. 21)*

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

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

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.

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

The Department of Architecture is housed in Bauer Wurster Hall, along with other CED departments and others. A wide variety of teaching and public gathering space is accommodated, including a cafe, lobby for pin-ups and reviews, lecture hall, gallery, classrooms, departmental offices, faculty offices, studios, small seminar rooms, library, fabrication shop, computer lab, outdoor courtyard, and archives. Larger lecture halls for large seminars are offered in other campus buildings nearby.

5.6.1 Bauer Wurster Hall houses undergraduate and graduate design studios on floors five through nine. Maintenance and facility challenges result in uncomfortable HVAC conditions (APR page 136).

5.6.2 Traditional classrooms, learning labs, a lecture hall, and review spaces serve the program. The Fabrication Lab has significant capacity for design build projects and model making. It is supplemented by the materials store so students do not need to travel offsite to acquire model materials, and a digital fabrication space consisting of 6 laser cutters, 18 3D printers, a CNC machine, and a Zund machine. There is also outdoor space for casting materials and a paint shop. The on-site library is part of the campus library system and is well-used by students from within and outside of CED.

5.6.3 Faculty members each have dedicated office space. Visiting and continuing lecturers may have an office, depending on availability. Part-time lecturers and graduate student instructors are offered shared

space in smaller offices. Space constraints within the building have not fully supported faculty research, and an offsite facility is being procured in nearby Richmond, California for these needs. .

5.6.4 Resources to support learning formats and pedagogies are grouped into three major categories: 1) Information and Infrastructural Technologies (IIT), which covers computing resources; 2) Fabrication Services, which includes the Fabrication Shop, Digital Fabrication Lab, and Materials Store; and 3) Facilities, which includes classroom and building management and AV/IT resources.

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

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

For the last three academic years, the program has demonstrated more annual income than expenses, with income over expenses ranging from \$1.1 million to \$2.2 million. Annual operating expenses ranged from \$7.6 million to \$7.9 million, while income ranged from \$9.0 million to \$9.9 million. Income derives from campus support, student tuition, and “other income” which includes the Architecture Annual Fund, Summer Sessions, Academic Research and Support, and Gifts & Endowments. Expenses include salary and benefit compensation for faculty and staff, student aid, fee remissions, supplies and expenses, and other expenses.

Due to ongoing budgetary challenges in the UC system, the Department of Architecture and the College of Environmental Design have had to innovate and adapt to increased capacity and capital facility needs with decreasing funding. This is a constant stressor on the program. There are continual unfunded mandates, passing along costs to the college and department. While these items are not insignificant, the department has become accustomed to the demands and works to make the budget meet the needs of the program.

5.8 Information Resources *(Guidelines, p. 22)*

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

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

The most prominent resource that provides convenient and equitable access to architecture literature and information is the Environmental Design Library, one of the premier design libraries in North America. Librarian David Eifler confirmed access to a variety of physical resources and access to over 25 digital databases, providing unlimited exposure to a cross-section of project types and ideologies. The 14,000 square foot library serves as a study and learning space for students, faculty, and staff. Librarian Eifler’s goal is to continually create programming that brings together the College of Environmental Design to further push learning and cross-pollination between educational disciplines.

The Environmental Design Archive, established in 1953, is an underutilized resource that provides a bounty of historical knowledge and context on local vernacular. It is committed to raising awareness to the

architectural, landscape, and design heritage of Northern California and beyond through collecting, preserving, and providing access to primary records of the built and design environment. The collection is open to all members of the University of California community, as well as scholars, architects, landscape architects, preservationists, and the general public. Curator Betsy Frederick-Rothwel explained how students, faculty, and visitors interact with the two on-site archive rooms. She noted that the archive has an overflow space in the Richmond campus. Historically and culturally significant vernacular architectural works are preserved and showcased. Reliance on the Environmental Design Archive is not as widely utilized, although still presents a significant wealth of informational resources.

6—Public Information

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

6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees *(Guidelines, p. 23)*

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

The CED website includes a webpage that has the NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*, Appendix 2. The webpage titled "Accreditation and Licensure" includes the requisite statement verbatim, as viewed on 2/21/2024: <https://ced.berkeley.edu/arch/about/accreditation>. The webpage also states there are two options for the M.Arch program, including Option 3 (72 Graduate Credits), and Option 2 (120 Credits + 48 Graduate Credits). Catalogs and promotional media were not included in the APR.

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures *(Guidelines, p. 23)*

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

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

The CED website includes a webpage titled "Accreditation and Licensure" that includes NAAB Conditions and Procedures, and related documents, as viewed on 2/21/2024: <https://ced.berkeley.edu/arch/about/accreditation>. The webpage clearly states 2024 as the next accreditation visit, and includes links to several previous reports as well as NAAB required conditions and procedures. Links include: *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*; *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*; *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, 2014 Edition*; and *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2015 Edition*.

6.3 Access to Career Development Information *(Guidelines, p. 23)*

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

The program has demonstrated access to career development and placement services through the Careers and Work Opportunities section of its CED website. Resources found here include job and internship opportunities, architecture news and community, licensure and career development information, UC Berkeley's recruiting platform (Handshake), career counseling, and access to a biweekly newsletter (CareerMail). There is also an annual CED career fair, as well as various other professional development workshops offered by the Career Center.

The CED website includes a broad array of professional organizations and job boards as well. It includes fields beyond the practice of architecture, and also includes city and regional planning, government, landscape architecture and environmental planning, and sustainable environmental design. Evidence of these career paths can be found at: <https://ced.berkeley.edu/resources/careers-and-work-opportunities>. The webpage also includes external links and contact information for a career counselor.

6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents *(Guidelines, p. 23)*

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

- a) All Interim Progress Reports and narratives of Program Annual Reports submitted since the last team visit
- b) All NAAB responses to any Plan to Correct and any NAAB responses to the Program Annual Reports since the last team visit
- c) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB
- d) The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit
- e) The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda
- f) The program's optional response to the Visiting Team Report
- g) Plan to Correct (if applicable)
- h) NCARB ARE pass rates
- i) Statements and/or policies on learning and teaching culture
- j) Statements and/or policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

The CED website includes a webpage titled "Accreditation and Licensure" that includes Accreditation Reports, NAAB Conditions and Procedures, and related documents, as viewed on 2/21/2024: <https://ced.berkeley.edu/arch/about/accreditation>. Links include the most recent accreditation VTR from 2016 as well as subsequent interim reports are also available (2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021), including the 2021 Plan to Correct, and the 2022 NAAB Decision Letter. The webpage also includes NCARB ARE 5.0 Pass Rates (an external link to NCARB). An overall statement on the learning and teaching culture is included on the "About the Department of Architecture" webpage here: <https://ced.berkeley.edu/arch/about>. There is also a statement on diversity on this page: <https://ced.berkeley.edu/arch/about/diversity>, which includes a vision statement and specific departmental goals and pledges.

6.5 Admissions and Advising *(Guidelines, p. 24)*

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

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

Application to the program is found on <https://ced.berkeley.edu/admissions/graduate-admissions>. The instructions are clear. The timeline is provided. Applications include completion of the UC Berkeley application, an application fee, a statement of purpose, a personal history statement, three letters of recommendation, a GRE score, a TOEFL score, transcripts, a GPA, a resume, a portfolio, and a writing sample.

Admissions requirements are clearly stated on the website, along with the materials necessary for application. The evaluation processes and policies are explained through notation of deadlines and the description of admissions criteria, ranking of applications, and the composition of the review committee and their scoring categories. The website notes that there are two paths for obtaining the M.Arch., with one serving students with non-architecture undergraduate degrees and the other serving those who have completed an undergraduate degree in architecture. The latter is considered to be an M.Arch. with advanced standing.

The instructions for applying on to the M.Arch. program for students with non-accredited degrees are noted on the website. With the standardized application that includes a portfolio, it is clear to applicants that the review of admissions materials are scored by the review committee following their rubric. Information about financial aid is found on <https://ced.berkeley.edu/admissions/fees-financial-aid>. The website provides a link to <https://financialaid.berkeley.edu/>, which provides information on scholarships. The websites seem to be easily navigable.

Goals for diversity are noted on <https://ced.berkeley.edu/arch/about/diversity>. A diverse student body is supported to obtain a broad range of voices.

6.6 Student Financial Information *(Guidelines, p. 24)*

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

Team Findings:

Met

2024 Team Analysis:

The CED Financial Aid website page includes information on fellowships, student employment, prizes and awards, and FAFSA resources. The Resources section of the CED website includes a list of awards, scholarships, and fellowships available to students. The Tuition and Fees page includes information such

as professional degree supplemental tuition, additional materials costs, and CED materials fees. The M.Arch. admissions page includes a subsection with the above information as well. This information, in conjunction with the Cost of Attendance page of the UC Berkeley website, gives students an initial estimate of all costs associated with the program. Students do note that estimates of studio-related fees (model building supplies, etc.) are generally not provided. Faculty and staff recognize this difficulty and aim to revisit implementation of a course cost estimator into the syllabi and/or CED website. In addition, the program may aim to allocate donations for offsetting materials costs as much as resources allow.

For Program COF

V. Appendices

Appendix 1. Team PC/SC Matrix

For Program COF

Appendix 2. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator Representative

Karen Cordes Spence, Ph.D., AIA, LEED AP
Director, School of Architecture and Professor
Mississippi State University
Mississippi State, MS
kspence@caad.msstate.edu

Team Member, Practitioner Representative

Elias Agia, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Project Architect
Re:Vision Architecture
Philadelphia, PA
elias.agia@comcast.net

Team Member, Regulator Representative

Nicholas Vann, AIA, NCARB
Director of Equity and Belonging
Washington State Governor's Office of Equity
Olympia, WA
nicholas.vann@gmail.com

Team Member, Student Representative

Stephanie Aranda, Associate AIA
Recent B.Arch Graduate, Drexel University
Architectural Designer
GNA Architecture
San Antonio, TX
sna53@drexel.edu

For Program COF

VI. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Cordes Spence, Ph.D., AIA, LEED AP
Team Chair

Elias Agia, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Team Member

Nicholas Vann, AIA, NCARB
Team Member

Stephanie Aranda, Associate AIA
Team Member

For Program COF