

# ***2023 Visiting Team Report***

Kennesaw State University  
Department of Architecture

B.Arch.

Continuing Accreditation Visit  
March 22-24, 2023

The logo for the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) is displayed in white on a black background. It consists of the letters 'NAAB' in a bold, sans-serif font. The 'N' and 'A' are connected, and the 'B' is slightly larger than the other letters.

National  
Architectural  
Accrediting  
Board, Inc.

## Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Visit	3
II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	4
III. Program Changes	5
IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation	7
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	32
1. Conditions Met with Distinction	
2. Team SPC Matrix	
3. The Visiting Team	
VI. Report Signatures	37

## I. Summary of Visit

### a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The NAAB Visiting Team would like to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of Interim Department Chair, Chris Welty, and the team of KSU faculty, staff, and students who organized the collection of digital evidence. Much work went into documenting, assembling, and coordinating the digital collection of evidence reviewed by the team. Furthermore, the team appreciates the virtual hospitality, participation, and contributions of the administrators, including Provost Pulinkala, Dean Payne, and Associate Deans Bedette and Loreto, during the virtual team visit. The visiting team wants to express appreciation to the faculty and staff who collected syllabi, course schedules, other course materials, and student work samples for the NAAB team to review. The team also recognizes the additional efforts of faculty to organize Zoom meetings during the visit so that team members could drop in on scheduled studios and classes.

During the visit, the team interacted with upper-level administrators committed to the success of the Department of Architecture within the College of Architecture and Construction Management, described in at least one meeting as a “gem of the university.” The visiting team, however, still found a university and college in transition. Since the last NAAB site visit in 2014, when the B.Arch. program was part of the Southern Polytechnic State University, in Marietta, GA, the university merged with Kennesaw State University, in Kennesaw, GA. The merged institution, Kennesaw State University (KSU), has gone through several transitions, taking the Architecture department with it. One transition has been the move from a teaching institution to an R2 institution in 2019, placing more emphasis on faculty scholarship and research. Another transition has been the election by the architecture department to move to a STEM CIP Code. In order to do this, Calculus I (MATH 1190) is now required as part of the B.Arch. curriculum at the Marietta campus, with the Kennesaw site as the liberal arts campus. Another transition was the change from a school of architecture and construction management to a college of architecture and construction management. The transitional state of the context within which the Architecture department has functioned has also included numerous changes in administration and leadership, with current openings for dean and department head, recently appointed or hired associate deans, a recently appointed provost, and a number of university presidents since 2014. The visiting team notes that the dean and department head search committees have recently begun on-campus interviews to fill the positions.

Despite these transitions in the university structure, university administration, and the college, the architecture faculty, staff, and students have been the glue holding the B.Arch. program together. The NAAB team, having interacted with over 100 students and over 50 faculty and staff during the visit, found a diverse student body in the Architecture department who feel safe, welcomed, inspired, engaged, valued, and well prepared for the architectural profession. Students spoke fondly of the staff, faculty, and departmental leadership, particularly Interim Chair, Chris Welty, or simply “Welty” to the students. Student leaders spoke of the impacts that COVID had on their education, including several years of hybrid or online learning, and how this year has been “powerful” in ways that exceed their pre-COVID experiences. Faculty and administrators spoke of how KSU was one of only four Georgia public universities to grow its enrollment during COVID, and that growth is clear in the B.Arch. program, which has grown by roughly 82% since 2018. During this period of growth, KSU has still managed to develop a model for assessment and curricular development that is to be commended for its bottom-up, top-down, cyclical approach to improving architectural education in the program.

The combined growth in enrollment and move to an R2 institution have made clear impacts on the B.Arch. program’s faculty. The visiting team observed that the 82% increase in enrollment has been accompanied by a roughly only 3.5% increase in budget to the Architecture department overall since 2018. New architecture faculty hires have been limited, primarily in the realm of limited-term faculty with two-year contracts. Part-time faculty fill some of the gaps. Full-time faculty are teaching larger studios and lecture classes, working with larger cohorts of thesis students, and are expected to produce scholarship

or research in addition to their pre-existing teaching workloads. The faculty described how their salaries have remained stagnant, not keeping up with cost-of-living increases or market-rate adjustments in the booming Atlanta architecture and construction industry. It is clear to the visiting team that funds from the state's funding formula are scarce while expectations of faculty and staff are high. It is a testament to the strength, resourcefulness, and resilience of KSU's architecture faculty, staff, and department head that the program has withstood COVID, tremendous enrollment growth, institutional restructuring, limited budget growth, and a shift in Carnegie classification since the last NAAB visit.

The B.Arch. program has been supported by the recent restructuring of the college administration, an initiative by Dean Payne. A recently added position of Associate Dean of Student Success and Accreditation, currently held by Kathryn Bedette, provides an environment where students can thrive and succeed in high impact practices as part of the university's QEP. Students have access to the newly created Albion Student Success Headquarters, a recently renovated space for student success through programming and resources. Another recently added and filled position, that of Associate Dean of Faculty/Staff Affairs and Research, offers support to faculty in grant writing assistance, securing grant funding, and establishing or solidifying their scholarly agendas. Giovanni Loreto filled this position in 2022 and is still developing new initiatives for research in the college.

The teaching and learning culture that has persisted at KSU is to be commended. During the visit, students remarked on how well they have been prepared for the profession, as evidenced by their experiences in internships with architecture and design firms. Staff reinforced this by pointing out how faculty and alumni leverage their experience and connections to position KSU students in the profession, pointing out that KSU has a reputation for developing students who are well prepared technically while still retaining their creativity and critical thinking skills. Students also commented on how the department promotes students' mental health and a work-life balance while encouraging peer-to-peer check-ins. Students have also demonstrated their agency in their education, as evidenced in the MAC student organization for mentorship, a grass-roots student-initiated club at KSU, as well as other student organizations such as Alpha Rho Chi, AIAS, and NOMAS. Student leaders spoke of the wealth of opportunities for leadership development, professional development, and career preparation supported by the program and its faculty. Architecture faculty have obviously created a nurturing environment for an increasingly diverse—majority minority—student body, and the formidable strength in this close-knit family community is palpable in conversations with students, staff, and faculty alike.

b. Conditions with a Team Recommendation to the Board as Not Achieved (*list number and title*)

- SC.6 - Building Integration
- 5.4 - Human Resources and Human Resource Development

## II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

### 2009 Condition Not Met

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

**Previous Team Report (2014):** While evidence of “ability” was found for technical drawings and physical models in Arch. 4224, 4014, 3012; there was a lack of evidence in meeting the “ability” to write outline specifications. The SPC is, therefore, not met.”

**2020 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by Kennesaw State University, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the 2-Year Interim Progress Report. No further information is required at this time.

**2023 Team Analysis:** KSU addressed these deficiencies through Interim Progress Reports in 2016 and 2019, and the NAAB responded that no further action was required.

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

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| A.2. Design Thinking Skills                   | B.2. Accessibility         |
| A.4. Technical Documentation                  | B.3. Sustainability        |
| A.5. Investigative Skills                     | B.4. Site Design           |
| A.8. Ordering Systems                         | B.8. Environmental Systems |
| A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture | B.9. Structural Systems    |
|   | B.5. Life Safety"          |

**Previous Team Report (2014):** The evidence of comprehensive design demonstrating the integration of the SPCs listed did not consistently rise to the level of "ability." Further, projects presented in the team room reflected varied comprehension from section to section. Therefore, this SPC is not met.

**2020 IPR Board Review:** After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by Kennesaw State University, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the 2-Year Interim Progress Report. No further information is required at this time.

**2023 Team Analysis:** KSU addressed these deficiencies through Interim Progress Reports in 2016 and 2019, and the NAAB responded that no further action was required.

The 2023 Visiting Team found that 2020 Condition SC.6 - Building Integration was not met. While this condition is different from the previous conditions' Comprehensive Design, the similarities suggest that the integration of complex architectural elements and systems is an area still in need of improvement at KSU. The Visiting Team also found that 5.4 - Human Resources and Human Resource Development was not met for a reason similar to the previous team's "Causes of Concern - D. Growth and resulting faculty workload." The continuing challenge of faculty workload suggests that KSU has not resolved this issue over the past nine years.

### 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.

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

The program describes that the 2020 NAAB Conditions resulted in a transition process starting with a series of focusing meetings of faculty and coordinators. During this phase, the program started looking at core curriculum and other initiatives and special events. Student participation opportunities include a lecture series, symposiums, and a new Architecture Leadership Series formalized and embedded in the courses throughout the curriculum.

An Architecture Assessment Coordinator was appointed to coordinate the program and assessment cycles. A copy of their report for fall of 2022 is included in the online documents provided to the team. In addition, a NAAB Procedures Coordinator was created to oversee evidence collection and compliance.

The following program changes were noted in the APR:

Initiatives and Special Events - the APR noted the reestablished study abroad program through a proposal for an elective course ARCH 4490 Architectural Morphologies and Mapping in Italy. In addition, a course description for ARCH 4490 was provided during the site visit. The study abroad course was approved by the university for Summer 2023 and registration for the course began March 10, 2023.

Vertical Charrette - organized by the four student organizations and discussed at the site visit meeting with student leaders, the vertical charrette offered in the fall was a campus scavenger hunt involving students from all years.

Ismaili Council MOU - commemorating the fifth anniversary of The Global Centre for Pluralism.

Coordinator Roles and Assessment Process Defined - responsibilities include ensuring consistency in applying the curriculum goals and performance, maintaining currency of the curriculum, and assessment. Their role includes moderating faculty discussions, developing teaching components in collaboration with faculty, and reviewing Faculty Course Assessment Reports (FCARs).

Assessment Plan Developed - developed comprehensive program assessment plan to ensure courses are assessed twice within an accreditation cycle with time for reflection and improvements in between assessments. A 6-year Assessment Schedule was provided to the team via KSU's online documents. The irregularity of FCAR collection in the past was noted.

Strategic Planning - began a strategic planning cycle in 2019 (located in Sec. 5.2.4 of the APR, pp. 72-79), which includes the program's expansion of the understanding of environmental sustainability to include generative and resilient design. The strategic plan adopted three categories; students, faculty, and community, to understand and develop a framework for advancement and assessment.

## 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).

Described

### 2023 Team Analysis:

The required descriptions contained in the three bullet points of the Context and Mission as required in section IV.1 of the VTR, for the Kennesaw State University Bachelor of Architecture degree program, are comprehensively and effectively described on pp. 8-12 of the APR response and further identified as follows:

1. KSU's Bachelor of Architecture program's institutional context, geographical setting, and how the program's mission and culture its architectural pedagogy is described on p.8 of the APR. The urban setting in Atlanta, Georgia, allows it to realize a robust relationship with the local design and construction industry resulting in a pedagogy that incorporates both theory and practice. Both KSU's mission statement and that of the College of Architecture articulate the value placed on students' success as they pursue success in their careers.
2. The Department of Architecture's B.Arch. program's position as the largest architecture program in the state of Georgia complements the other professional degree programs in the university. Additionally, the context within the university provides a multitude of options for elective studies or minors that complement the degree in architecture. Consistent with the university's goals, the architecture program strives to increase its regional relevance through its strengths in environmental leadership, diverse community engagement, and interdisciplinary systems thinking. B.Arch. students can access the university's more than 60 international studies programs.
3. Occasions to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective opportunities are provided with the ability to attend academic conferences, outside workshops, participation in student professional organizations, field trips across the US, study abroad programs, and program, campus, and community sponsored programs, and ongoing interactions with regional and local professionals and firms.

## 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)

**Described**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

**Design:** The program describes its commitment to the value of design through its curriculum, including ten semesters of design studio in a pedagogical environment that balances theory and practice (APR pp. 13-20). Each studio builds on the previous ones, culminating in a thesis studio. **ARCH 5015: Focus Studio** challenges students in their penultimate studio to develop research and theory to underpin their independent thesis design in their final semester studio, **ARCH 5017: Thesis Studio**. The program further exhibits its value of design in its establishment of multiple student design competitions and prizes internal to the program as well as a lecture series that draws renowned designers from practice.

**Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility:** The program describes its commitment to the value of environmental stewardship through its pedagogical focus on sustainability, primarily in the third year of the program (APR pp. 20-22). The program's value of professional responsibility vis-a-vis health, safety, and welfare is addressed through professional practice courses such as **ARCH 4224: Professional Practice I Codes and Technical Documents**. Furthermore, the program addresses its commitment to professional ethics in **ARCH 3313 ARCH 4226 - Professional Practice III Practice and Ethics**. Beyond the curriculum, KSU organizes an annual event around sustainability, EQUINOX. The visiting team confirmed this shared value through meetings with faculty and students during the visit.

**Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion:** The program describes its commitment to the value of equity, diversity, and inclusion in the APR (pp. 23-25). It exhibits this value most clearly in the course materials for the **ARCH 4014: Urban Lab** studio and the Equitable, Ecological, Creative Placemaking Initiative. The visiting team confirmed the program's commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion through numerous interactions with faculty, staff, and students during the VTV. Student leaders commented on how the program and faculty demonstrate their commitment to diversity through engagement with student organizations.

**Knowledge and Innovation:** The program describes its commitment to the value of knowledge and innovation through its approach to balancing theory and practice in applied learning (APR pp. 25-26). The university has just recently gained an R2 Carnegie designation, and there are opportunities for enhanced research and contributions to the body of knowledge in the future. The visiting team met with the new Associate Dean of Faculty/Staff Affairs and Research for the College of Architecture and Construction Management, who confirmed the knowledge and innovation commitment of the Department of Architecture. Students are exposed to research in several courses leading to and including their thesis studios: **ARCH 4117: Thesis Prep.**, **ARCH 5016: Thesis Research**, and **ARCH 5017: Studio X Thesis**. Faculty spoke of NCUR projects in which they have collaborated with students.

**Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement:** The program describes its commitment to these shared values in its APR (pp. 26-27) by describing courses with opportunities for student collaboration and leadership. Meetings with students confirmed these opportunities, particularly mentioning several design competitions, sponsored teamwork from the Precast Concrete Institute, student-led initiatives like a scavenger hunt, and the vertical studio offered during the summer. Students reflected on their **ARCH 4014: Urban Lab** studio as the best example of community engagement provided to them by the department.



**Lifelong Learning:** The program describes its commitment to the value of lifelong learning (APR 27-29) through its coursework on cultures, history, and theory, as well as professional practice courses. The visiting team observed the strong relationships between academic and practice settings while meeting with students, faculty, and staff during the visit. Some faculty who are still active in professional practice model lifelong learning for their students. Visiting critics and lecturers reinforce this value for lifelong learning.

### **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)*

**Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

The curriculum, structure, and other available opportunities and experiences in the Kennesaw State University Bachelor of Architecture degree program are comprehensively and clearly described on pp. 29-32 of the APR response.

The process and requirements for licensure, along with career opportunities, are introduced to students in a lecture in the fall student orientation session, reinforced throughout the five-year curriculum (reference APR Figure 3.1: NAAB Program Criteria mapped within the core curriculum by coordinators), culminating in the fifth year **ARCH 4226: ProPractice - Ethics** in a module on the practice of architecture that includes lessons on the “Path to Licensure.” This is further reinforced and made available to students on a website section, “Your Career in Architecture.” Although licensure and practice are extensively addressed during a student’s time with the B.Arch. program, alternative career opportunities in education, construction management, graphic arts, curation, industrial design, design of gaming assets, set design, etc., are also presented to students.

Assessment of PC.1 is addressed in the program assessment plan that is typical of all courses where Student Learning Outcomes are mapped to NAAB criteria. Student achievement, learning outcomes, and effectiveness of course materials in meeting Student Learning Outcomes are gauged in the Program and Student Criteria Matrix, Faculty Course Assessment Report (FCAR), and the Course Sequence Coordinator’s FCAR Summary.

This was further verified during the interactions with students, faculty, and staff during the virtual site visit.

**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)*

**Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

Design at the Kennesaw State University Bachelor of Architecture degree program is described on pp. 32- 37 of the APR response.

Beginning in **ARCH 1001: Studio I**, students develop the ability to see the environment and respond to factors—including scalar alterations and adjustments, modularity, relationships between solid and voids, points, lines, and planes—as space-defining elements. The course lays the foundation of space-making according to methodological procedure. **ARCH 1002: Studio II** integrates the understanding of and nurtures the design methods that consist of observations, documentation through multiple drawing techniques, analysis through diagramming and study models, and developing design iterations based on the analysis. **ARCH 2003: Studio III** concentrates on shaping, organizing, and designing architectural spaces using spatial and compositional strategies derived from the site, climate, program, precedent, and architectural case studies. **ARCH 2004: Studio IV** introduces building codes and places emphasis on materials. **ARCH 3011: Studio V** contextualizes design thinking in a complex world as it relates to systematic and multiscale processes. **ARCH 3012: Studio VI** integrates technology, and **ARCH 4013: Studio VII** utilizes advanced technology for key performance benchmarks. Real-time data validates early design hypotheses, and the observational and measurable outputs enable iterative design. **ARCH 4014: Studio VIII** and **ARCH 5015: Focus Studio** are research-based and cover form, space, materiality, and context. These courses also highlight the interplay of micro and macro scales (buildings to cities; building details to urban settings): Moving between architecture as a singular object and architecture as part of the environment, both culturally and environmentally.

Assessment of PC.2 is addressed in the program assessment plan that is typical of all courses where Student Learning Outcomes are mapped to NAAB criteria. Student achievement, learning outcomes, and effectiveness of course materials in meeting Student Learning Outcomes are gauged in the Program and Student Criteria Matrix, Faculty Course Assessment Report (FCAR), and the Course Sequence Coordinator's FCAR Summary.

**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)

**Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

The APR demonstrates how this program criterion is met on pp. 37-38. From building systems analysis and architecture studios exploring climatic issues affecting sites through graphic documentation to lectures exploring the connection between building forms and environmental design, individual research, and development of working energy models, the coursework below provides a broad range of considerations for the built and natural environments. Review of syllabi, lectures, analyses, and student work illustrate the program's holistic approach between the built and natural environments through **ARCH 3011: Architecture Studio V** and **ARCH 3012: Architecture Studio VI**. Synthesizing and integration of these systems are indicated in both **ARCH 4013: Architecture Studio VII: Integrative Design** and **ARCH 4014: Architecture Studio VIII; Urban Lab**.

The program notes that applied learning methods emphasize hands-on exploration designed to provide students with the knowledge, skills, and experiences necessary to be productive, contributing leaders in the architectural profession and civic community. Lectures, readings, and assigned projects, including the development of wall sections in **ARCH 2311: Environmental Tech 1**, **ARCH 3313: Environmental Technology II**, and **ARCH 3314: Environmental Technology III**, provide information on conditioning, lighting, thermal comfort, sustainability, and climate, etc., and are evaluated through quizzes and final exam. FCARs by each faculty member for each course and section for PC.3 were included online.

The team confirmed evidence with faculty during interviews where several different research projects regarding resilient and sustainable principles were noted.

All design studio faculty invite internal and external reviewers to student presentations and exhibits while several studios are sponsored by local architecture firms where practitioners from sponsor firms are invited to serve as jurors and provide additional feedback and assessment of student work and achievement of learning outcomes.

**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)

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The APR demonstrates how this program criterion is met on pp. 39-40. Students receive a broad range of historical and cultural history and theory through a series of lectures, research, and writings from early civilization to 21st C. architecture and urban design in the following required courses: **ARCH 2111: Architecture Culture I-IV** covering Early Civilization to the 21st century. In addition, **ARCH 4116: Urban Theory** covers urban design and planning theory. Students learn to analyze formal, spatial, and programmatic elements based on a time-period and cultural, social, and political forces of the time with buildings seen as design solutions to complex socio-cultural problems in course assignments, including readings, online discussion forums, topical presentations, and research papers.

The team confirmed evidence of the curriculum extending the scope of non-Eurocentric points of view and discussions of Imperialism and Colonialism through discussions with faculty and students. The program has initiated a Pluralism and Diversity Program with the Aga Khan Program to expose students to the international impact of architecture in the Built Environment - Landscape Architecture, with Thomas Woltz as a keynote speaker. In addition, they now have lectures on Native American (North and South America), African, Islamic, Indian, Chinese, and Japanese cultures and architecture.

Students are evaluated through class participation, summaries of weekly readings, quizzes, research papers, drawings, and final exams. FCARs by each faculty member for each course and section for PC.4 were included online for the visiting team to review.

**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)

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

Research and Innovation at the Kennesaw State University Bachelor of Architecture degree program are described on pp. 40- 42 of the APR response.

In **ARCH 4013: Architecture Studio VII: Integrative Design**, energy modeling platforms are utilized for empirical research and to systematically test building configurations. **ARCH 4014: Architecture Studio VIII; Urban Lab** requires a research methodology in support of students' design narrative. Syllabi denotes research as in-depth site analysis and requirements, comparative studies, and survey of future plans. **ARCH 4116: Urban Theory** analyzes the elements of urban form, comparing the ways cities have changed in the past and how designers may help change the future. **ARCH 4117: Thesis Prep**, in preparation for thesis, aims to develop and rehearse a focused argument for one's approach to a selected topic. The course overview describes it as a "fifteen-week intensive research, thinking, writing and documenting course." **ARCH 5015: Focus Studio** is noted to foster generative design research through a series of investigations. Project descriptions include case study requirements. **ARCH 5016: Thesis**

*Research* involves the identification and exploration of literature, theories, examples, and data that are relevant to the thesis research topic. **ARCH 5017: Studio X (Thesis)** culminates the research into well-developed solutions, rich in details that celebrate innovation, imagination, and creative solutions for human existence. The visiting team notes that research is adequately incorporated within program curricula and easily accessible to undergraduate students. In addition, there are opportunities to conduct research outside of the studio/classroom with the support of faculty and grants.

Assessment of PC.5 is addressed in the program assessment plan that is typical of all courses where Student Learning Outcomes are mapped to NAAB criteria. Student achievement, learning outcomes, and effectiveness of course materials in meeting Student Learning Outcomes are gauged in the Program and Student Criteria Matrix, Faculty Course Assessment Report (FCAR), and the Course Sequence Coordinator's FCAR Summary.

**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)

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

Evidence of how the program ensures that students understand approaches to project 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 in the three presented classes or the Architecture Leadership Development Series was not well represented in the APR. The approach and response in the APR from KSU are more about personal development as opposed to the development of leadership in the context of multi-disciplinary teams and coordination; therefore, the visiting team asked for additional evidence and discussion during the visit.

During the site visit, the team found adequate evidence of multiple examples of adequate leadership and coordination opportunities during discussions with students, student leaders, and faculty. Students commonly shared leadership and collaboration opportunities in their involvements in **ARCH 4014: Architecture Studio VIII Urban Lab**, the Architecture Leadership Development Series, outside workshops, class projects, competitions, and robust student organizations. Collaborative engagements were also observed in the thesis studio between students and other campus departments.

**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)

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The Learning and Teaching Culture at the Kennesaw State University Bachelor of Architecture degree program are described on pp. 43- 44 of the APR response.

The school's Studio Culture Policy promotes the five values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation for teaching environments and faculty interaction with students. Further, the department's bylaws promote "an environment supportive of a multidisciplinary approach to learning, creativity, scholarship, application and engagement." Full-time faculty are engaged in course sequence coordination and committee roles that ensure a collegial and broadly engaged work environment. The college reports open lines of communication and a collaborative environment between administration, faculty, and staff.

The Visiting Team identifies key themes and stand-out statements related to Learning and Teaching Culture:

- Students report feeling a “part of the process” in regard to program governance. There is a strong network of student leaders, and the Registered Student Organizations (RSOs) work together. Students believe faculty want them to feel empowered. The Department is responsive to student feedback.
- The staff and faculty are committed to student success and dedicate their time and resources. The Mentoring Architecture Construction (MAC) organization is a particularly compelling example of staff, faculty, and students working together to mentor students.
- Staff, faculty, and students reflect on an increasingly diverse school and celebrate accessibility. They feel the community is inclusive, supportive, and tight-knit. When asked about what their program-pride points were, the resounding answer was: People!
- The school is committed to promoting healthy habits via workshops, peer-to-peer wellness checks, and instruction on methods for regulating stress. Students are encouraged to prioritize wellness and are accommodated if and when needs arise.
- Multi-year communication and education. Upperclassmen are invited to sit on juries. Faculty discuss projects with students from other studios. Culture of engagement and constructive feedback
- Overall positive regard for the program, people, and process.

**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)

**Met**

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

The team found evidence that the program meets this criterion in lecture notes from ARCH 1000: Introduction to Architecture on “Values” and “Diversity and Equity.” The team found additional evidence of the program’s addressing designing for people with diverse needs and abilities in lectures from **ARCH 4224: Building Codes and Technical Documents**. Students are challenged to design at an urban scale for social diversity equity and inclusion in **ARCH 4114: Architecture Studio VIII - Urban Lab**. Students are exposed to diverse cultures in a series of history courses titled “Architecture Culture I” through “Architecture Culture IV.” The team also noted the assessment policies and procedures through a meeting with the Assessment Coordinator and documentation provided to the team via the D2L online system. Assessment of PC.8 is addressed in the program assessment plan that is typical of all courses where Student Learning Outcomes are mapped to NAAB criteria. Student achievement, learning outcomes, and effectiveness of course materials in meeting Student Learning Outcomes are gauged in the Program and Student Criteria Matrix, Faculty Course Assessment Report (FCAR), and the Course Sequence Coordinator’s FCAR Summary.

#### 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)

**Met**

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

A narrative for the program's response to Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment was found on pp. 47-49 of the APR response.

**ARCH 2211: STRUCTURES I** cultivates an appreciation for how projects are designed for people via thoughtful approaches to selecting materials and sizes. **ARCH 3011: Studio V** and **ARCH 3012: Studio VI** demonstrate awareness of how various environmental, structural, and service systems are integrated into building design. Projects must demonstrate numerous perspectives, including interfacing with various social groups, programmatic elements, and translating from organization profiling into space-making. **ARCH 3211: STRUCTURES II** and **ARCH 3212: STRUCTURES III** develop student understanding of structural loads. ARCH 3133 and ARCH 3314 address human comfort through passive systems, lighting, electrical, and acoustics. Each of these components is revisited in **ARCH 4013: Studio VII**. The course utilizes energy models, daylighting simulation, and viewsheds from within buildings to access the human experience. **ARCH 4116: Urban Theory** analyzes the elements of urban form as products of social norms including street networks, public spaces, urban fabric blocks, plots and building typologies. **ARCH 4224: Pro Practice I Codes and Technical Documents** is focused on codes and technical documentation, covering IBC, NFPA, ADA and The Fair Housing Accessibility Guidelines.

**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)

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The APR addresses this student criteria on pp. 49-50. Through the three Professional Practice courses offered: **ARCH 4224: Pro Practice I Codes and Technical Documents**, **ARCH 4225: Pro Practice II Cost Control**, and **ARCH 4226: Pro Practice III Practice and Ethics**, the students are exposed to current building codes and regulatory requirements, including IBC, NFPA, and ADA. In addition, they cover cost control and budgeting and review best practices through a review of several AIA documents and contracts.

Course syllabi, quizzes, assignments, and a sample of mock construction documents were provided online as evidence of material. In addition, conversations with faculty and students during the site visit elaborated on additional processes, including a Professional Development Series highlighting interviews with practitioners and weekly events sponsored by the student organizations, including guest speakers.

Students are evaluated through class participation, quizzes, execution of mock construction drawings, and final exams. FCARs by each faculty member for each course and section for SC.2 were included online. Mock construction documents show evidence of students' understanding of building codes regarding egress, life safety, and accessibility. Site visits to alternative building construction methods (mass timber buildings), and lectures from professionals, including a fire engineer and the ADA architect for Georgia, illustrate additional measures supporting this criterion.

**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)

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program provides students an understanding of the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to sites and projects in the United States. The evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations is addressed in **ARCH 3011: Studio V**,



**ARCH 3012:** *Studio VI*, **ARCH 3313:** *Environmental Technology II*, **ARCH 4013:** *Studio VII*, **ARCH 4224:** *Pro Practice I Codes and Technical Documents*, and **ARCH 4226:** *Pro Practice III Ethics*.

The architect's responsibilities and liabilities in the interpretation and application of codes and ordinances are communicated on issues such as site analysis concerns, site constraints associated with local zoning codes and ordinances, accessibility, and egress for mid-size projects, along with construction types, allowable areas, and heights. During the visit, the team also observed a structures course in which the instructor discussed wind zones and structural regulations in response to lateral loads from wind on buildings.

Assessment of SC.3 is addressed in the program assessment plan that is typical of all courses where Student Learning Outcomes are mapped to NAAB criteria. Student achievement, learning outcomes, and effectiveness of course materials in meeting Student Learning Outcomes are gauged in the Program and Student Criteria Matrix, Faculty Course Assessment Report (FCAR), and the Course Sequence Coordinator's FCAR Summary.

**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)

**Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

A narrative for the program's response to Technical Knowledge was found on pp. 51- 53 of the APR response.

**ARCH 1241:** *Design Communication I* addresses principles of drawing conventions and related techniques. **ARCH 2211:** *Architecture Structures I* develops knowledge and skills in the understanding of statics, strength of materials, and the behavior of structural elements. **ARCH 2242:** *Design Communications II* utilizes component-based 3D computer modeling platforms and graphic post-processing programs. **ARCH 2311:** *Environmental Technology I* employs tectonic explorations to develop understanding of construction materials and appropriate use. In **ARCH 3211:** *Structures II* and **ARCH 3212:** *Structures III*, students deepen their understanding of concrete and lateral loads, steel, and wood. **ARCH 3313:** *Environmental Technology II* prepares students for the design and discussion of system integration and passive strategies with consideration for impact, cost and result. **ARCH 3314:** *Environmental Technology III* requires design analyses to develop understanding in technical areas: Lighting, electrical and acoustics. In **ARCH 4224:** *Pro Practice I Codes and Technical Documents*, students produce a set of CDs with Revit (or comparable). In **ARCH 4225:** *Pro Practice II Cost Control*, students create and employ digital and physical models to study the effects of project variations on costs evaluating design decisions for cost effective application of project resources. Ladybug (Grasshopper) and equivalents mentioned.

**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)

**Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

A narrative for the program's response to SC.5 was found on pp. 53-54 of the APR. The team carefully analyzed the APR, its supporting materials, and related student work examples. Course syllabi and project descriptions outlined clear objectives aligned with NAAB guidelines. The visiting team reviewed student work samples primarily from two courses, one in the third-year sequence and one in the fourth-year sequence. The third-year studio, **ARCH 3012:** *Architecture Studio VI*, focuses on ecological



knowledge and responsibility, sustainability, and the integration of research into the design studio. **ARCH 3012** prepares students for **ARCH 4013: Architecture Studio VII - Integrative Design**, which challenges students to build on **ARCH 3012** to develop designs to a DD level while integrating systems related to SC.6. The visiting team confirmed their findings through discussions with the interim department head during the visit.

The visiting team determined that while ARCH 3012 was successful in introducing many of the aspects of SC.5 Design Synthesis, students appear to have needed the additional year of experience and education before fully demonstrating their ability to meet SC.5. The visiting team found the most compelling student evidence for this criterion being met in the student work samples from **ARCH 4013: Architecture Studio VII**. Projects from these **ARCH 4013** studio sections are typically large-scale, complex multi-story structures.

Students in **ARCH 4013** presented their work digitally in PDF form with a combination of drawings, diagrams, computer models, renderings, analytical software analyses of options, narrative descriptions, and photographs of process work, study models, or in some cases, full-scale mock-ups of components. Massing model studies, blocking and stacking diagrams, and space plans demonstrate the students' abilities to respond to user requirements. Life safety systems, illustrated through diagrams and drawings, illustrate the students' abilities to synthesize regulatory requirements. Site diagrams and site plans generated in these projects illustrate the students' abilities to synthesize and respond to site conditions in their designs. Accessible design synthesis is demonstrated in the floor plan and site plan drawings in the student work. Finally, the students' considerations of their measurable impacts on the environment are addressed in digital analyses using a variety of analytical software available to them through the department.

Assessment of SC.5 is addressed in the program assessment plan that is typical of all courses where Student Learning Outcomes are mapped to NAAB criteria. Student achievement, learning outcomes, and effectiveness of course materials in meeting Student Learning Outcomes are gauged in the Program and Student Criteria Matrix, Faculty Course Assessment Report (FCAR), and the Course Sequence Coordinator's FCAR Summary.

**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)

**Not Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

A narrative for the program's response to SC.6 was found on pp. 54 of the APR. The team carefully analyzed the APR, its supporting materials, and related student work examples. Course syllabi and project descriptions outlined clear objectives aligned with NAAB guidelines. However, the team found that the program does not meet this criterion consistently across studio projects and the student outcomes from **ARCH 3012: Architecture Studio VI** and **ARCH 4013: Architecture Studio VII**, the APR noted courses supporting this student criteria. Various aspects of the criteria were addressed separately for the most part, without showing the kind of integration that is expected. While some projects showed some level of ability (in **ARCH 4013**), too many projects fell short (more than 75% of those reviewed).

Building envelope systems and assemblies were explored with enlarged wall sections. However, it wasn't clear how the development of these systems applied to the building as a whole or how it informed the design. Additionally, the wall sections often lacked enough detail to demonstrate an understanding of the use and constructability of the materials being noted.

Structural systems were explored consistently in **ARCH 3012**. However, student work didn't demonstrate an understanding of the nature of proposed systems, their relationship to spatial elements and interface

with other systems including ventilation, conditioning, and life safety. Development of structural systems appears to have improved between **ARCH 3012** and **ARCH 4013**. However, the represented structural systems most often were not consistently developed in the projects beyond a level of acknowledgement.

Similar to the observations associated with structural systems, mechanical systems most often were not represented beyond the level of acknowledgement in projects. The integration and coordination of mechanical systems into the overall building designs were not consistently addressed in the provided student work.

Studies for measurable outcomes of building performance were found in **ARCH 4013** on several projects with the use of Cove.tool Analysis - analyzing light, radiation, and baseline energy.

The team acknowledged there were a few projects which met the criteria for SC.6. However, there was a lack of consistency across student projects and recurring evidence of integrated systems was not adequately demonstrated.

Recognition of the shortcomings in the integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance have been recognized by the program. The Summary FCAR Assessment for SC.6 made available by KSU noted the large section size for a studio of this intensity, and an inability to provide necessary feedback to students during course meeting time. In addition, instructor inexperience underscored inconsistency in the development of student work between sections. Recommendations for additional preparatory coursework relative to mechanical and structural system design were noted. Several proposed procedural changes were suggested. The assessment coordinator and interim department head described a “drive-by” structural systems check process that arose from FCAR reviews.

#### **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)

**Met**

##### **2023 Team Analysis:**

Kennesaw State University is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) noted in a letter dated January 14, 2020 on pp. 56-58 of the APR and with current links on p. 55 of the APR.

The next reaffirmation of accreditation takes place in 2029 and the next fifth-year Review in 2025.

##### **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.

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

4.2.1 Professional Studies. The APR p. 59 provides a link on their website to documentation of professional courses required for students in the B.Arch. program. In addition, the APR p. 60 outlines the 95 credit hours and courses. The optional entry track is noted as the Accelerated Track and outlined in the APR p. 60 and noted in the link to their website.

4.2.2 General Studies. The APR pp. 61-62 provides links to documentation of the minimum number of credits for general education required by the institution and the minimum number of credits for general education required by their institutional regional accreditor. All KSU students are required to have 42 General Education credit hours. From our interviews during the NAAB visit, it was noted the change to a STEM criteria resulted in a change to the curriculum of 44 General Education credit hours or an additional 2 credit hours; Math 1190 - 1 extra hour over non-STEM math and Lab Science - 1 extra hour from a lab (over non-STEM). The extra two credit hours for STEM majors are recorded in the major requirements but are from General Education. They can be seen in the catalog under "Lower Division Major Requirements (Area F) (18 Credit Hours)." At the bottom of this section, the two hours are noted by the statement: "Two Credit Hours from General Education Core Curriculum Area D."

The link on p. 61 for the B.Arch. Curriculum Chart in the APR was not updated and is linking to the previous version. The chart, as posted online since September 2022 can be found under "More Information," "Program Resources" from: <https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/architecture/programs/bachelor-architecture.php>

The updated chart adds 2 credit hours for an elective course into the semester (the elective was previously shown, but not added into the total by the previous Chair to allow flexibility in offering either a 2 or 3 credit hour elective).

4.2.3 Optional Studies. The APR pp. 62-63 describes optional studies opportunities available to students within and outside of the program. Active links to minors include Construction Management, Psychology, and Environmental Studies. Based on interviews with faculty it was noted there are additional opportunities for free electives resulting in minors within the College of Engineering and Biology. In addition, the APR provides a link to the Double Owl Pathways program allowing B.Arch. students the opportunity to receive graduate courses while still an undergraduate. Students may pursue a Double Owl with the Master of Art & Design Museum Studies concentration to gain expertise in this area.

4.2.4 Bachelor of Architecture. The program requires completion of 150 credit hours sufficient to meet the requirement as noted on the APR pp. 59, 64, and on their webpage linked in their APR.

4.2.5 Not Applicable

4.2.6 Not Applicable.

**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.

- 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.

- 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.
- 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.

**Met**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The APR (pp. 65-67) describes the program's process for evaluating preparatory education. The visiting team found evidence that the program meets this criterion based on the team's review of advising documentation, admissions documentation, and confirmation of procedures from administrators and staff during the visit. Kennesaw State University's Registrar performs an initial review of a student's prior academic coursework to determine if any credits will transfer. Any credits that count towards a student's degree requirements will automatically be counted as free electives. For these electives to be considered for lecture credit or studio credit, the Architecture department requires a detailed review of the applicant's previous course materials and, for studios, a portfolio of work which is then reviewed by multiple faculty members. The program made available to the visiting team a collection of one transfer student's materials. For this single student, no fewer than seven evaluations were conducted by Architecture faculty. Each faculty member who reviews the candidate offers an evaluation of the materials along with a recommendation for advanced placement, if applicable. The visiting team confirmed these procedures through a review of documentation made available to the team during the visit and through meetings with advising faculty, departmental staff, and administrators.

## 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.

**Described**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The program's APR describes its structure and governance (pp. 67-70), with links as listed below. The visiting team confirmed structure and governance during meetings with faculty, staff, and administrators during the site visit.

5.1.1. Administrative Structure: <https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/org-chart.php>

The dean serves as the chief administrative officer of the college and has the responsibilities and authority specified by the Board of Regents and delegated by the Provost, Dr. Ivan Pulinkala. The dean serves at the pleasure of the provost. The dean may appoint the assistant/associate dean as needed to carry out duties assigned by the dean. In the college of Architecture and Construction Management the dean's office employs an Associate Dean for Student Success and Accreditation (AD-SSA) Professor Kathryn Bedette, and an Associate Dean for Faculty/Staff Affairs and Research (AD-FAR) Associate

Professor Giovanni Loreto. The AD-SSA leads a team of four professional academic advisors supervised by a Director of Advising. In mid-July 2022 Professor Christopher Welty was appointed as the new Interim Department Chair. A national search for a permanent chair is underway. After the submission of the VTR, Dean Payne announced departure from position. A national search for a new dean is also underway.

5.1.2. Governance: <https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/committee-assignments.php>

Three key councils within the CACM are the College Faculty Council (CFC), College Staff Council (CSC), and the Student Advisory Council (SAC). These councils provide a voice for the collective. The CFC serves as a reporting body to the Dean. The CSC is to provide oversight and guidance to the needs and requirements of the staff. The SAC provides the students with a representative body at the college level to highlight issues, concerns, and celebrations among the students. This council includes student membership from both departments, undergraduate and graduate levels; college senator; and an at-large member from a non-traditional group. Architecture faculty are represented in the department, college, and university-level committees. The KSU faculty handbook regulates the representation of the different departments in the shared governance of the university. The ARCH faculty members participate in faculty and administrator search committees at the department, college, and university-levels. The faculty members also participate in the university and college curriculum committee and internal funding research committees. The Department of Architecture maintains the mission, vision, and values established by the ARCH chair, faculty and advisory board, which are periodically reviewed to align and contribute to the college and university-wide mission and goals.

## **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.

### **Demonstrated**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

The program's APR describes its planning and assessment in its APR (pp. 70-80). The visiting team confirmed structure and governance during meetings with faculty, staff, and administrators during the site visit, particularly in a meeting with the assessment coordinator who shared a PowerPoint presentation to the visiting team. The program demonstrates that it has a planning process for continuous improvement in sub-conditions 5.2.1 through 5.2.5 as follows:

5.2.1 The Strategic Plan adopted by the program in 2022 includes a process which redefined the department Vision and Mission, identified intersections between the vision and mission, and established goals, strategies, objectives, and tactics. The new plan resulted in goals that have tactics that are trackable and measurable, resulting in two Vision Points and four Mission Points of focus identified on pp. 70- 71 of the APR. Additionally, the department has developed a rigorous assessment program that reviews all academic classes at least twice during the 8-year NAAB accreditation cycle.

5.2.2 Key performance indicators used by the unit and the institution.



The CACM Strategic Plan established eight objectives outlined on p. 71 of the APR with goals, initiatives, and actions. The objectives in both plans focus heavily on engagement, student success, diversity, and leadership.

Key performance indicators and data sets were established to gauge progress on the eight objectives: These are comprehensively outlined on pp. 71- 72 of the APR.

CACM Annual reporting on the progress of meeting goals and routine analysis of the indicators is ongoing.

#### 5.2.3 How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated multiyear objectives.

The program is making ongoing progress in its mission and multi-year objectives in the areas of local and global engagement, sponsored studios addressing local client needs, engagement with local economic development organizations, improving retention through pursuit of STEM designation, and engagement with national organizations.

#### 5.2.4 Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program as it strives to continuously improve learning outcomes and opportunities.

Utilizing a modified version of the *Strategic Planning in Higher Education framework*, the KSU Architecture program adopted a strategic plan in 2021 that involved an extensive and diverse input from student, faculty, staff, and community stakeholder groups. This strategic planning process included participation in a SWOT analysis with these groups to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats with the outcome of the analysis being extensively integrated into the plan.

#### 5.2.5 Ongoing outside input from others, including practitioners.

Utilizing the opportunities afforded by being in a large metropolitan area, the program has developed opportunities for feedback and input from a myriad of outside sources, including world class design and construction firms, and other associated groups. These opportunities with these firms include involving their personnel as adjunct faculty, guest speakers, topic experts, and jurors. The engagements with these firms also afford the program financial support for design studios, design-build projects, design competitions, and academic scholarships. Firm and industry leaders also are given the opportunity to provide formal and informal input on curriculum and course improvements.

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. Self-assessments have been integrated into the operating culture of the KSU Architecture program and are addressed in the program assessment plan that is typical of all courses and programs mapping Student Learning Outcomes to NAAB criteria. Student achievement, learning outcomes, and effectiveness of course materials in meeting Student Learning Outcomes are gauged in the Program and Student Criteria Matrix, Faculty Course Assessment Report (FCAR), and the Course Sequence Coordinator's FCAR Summary. Additionally, a faculty review cycle plays an important role in advising and encouraging the department to make adjustments that promote student and faculty success utilizing an Annual Review Document (ARD) and Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA). This assessment protocol promotes faculty success through a process of goal setting and accountability, and provides opportunities for adjustment within the department and program. The quality of the assessment program was validated in a meeting during the site visit with the assessment coordinator.

### 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.

**Demonstrated**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The course assessment maps Student Learning Outcomes to NAAB criteria. Each faculty writes an assessment report for each course at the end of each semester. Through documentation of student achievement, the goal of the report is to reflect upon the effectiveness of course material in meeting the Student Learning Outcomes and criteria allocated in the Program and Student Criteria Matrix. A standard form is used for all courses - (Faculty Course Assessment Report (FCAR)). The report discusses modifications faculty have incorporated since the last course offering, reflects on effectiveness and notes suggestions for improvement.

The program's curriculum assessment assures threads of teaching and learning (organized by the Architecture Curriculum Committee), the Curriculum Matrix, and the Mission and Vision, (among other goals assigned by the department, college, and/or university at large), are distributed purposefully throughout the curriculum.

5.3.1 The relationship between course assessment and curricular development consists of a plan for regular assessment of the whole curriculum. The Architecture Assessment Schedule conceives of the curriculum as six studio course series and six non-studio course series paired and assigned one semester each to assess, strategize, then implement, establishing a three-semester review process or typically one year. Review of all curricula with two cycles per class is approximately six years.

5.3.2 The roles and responsibilities of academic coordinators, Coordinator Council, Architecture Curriculum Committee, architecture assessment coordinator, and department chair are found in the APR pp. 85-86 and were further described during the site visit by the architecture assessment coordinator.

The evidence and process for curricula development is documented in the APR pp. 80-86 and was further elaborated on during conversations with the Assessment Coordinator and department chair. Clear flow diagrams of the process and schedule were presented during the site visit and made available to the team. In addition, the following link in their APR: <https://cia.kennesaw.edu/assessment/assessment-of-learning.php> provides further evidence regarding the assessment process.

**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.

**Not Demonstrated**

**2023 Team Analysis:**

The Kennesaw State University Bachelor of Architecture degree program's Human Resources and Human Resource Development are described on pp. 86- 92 of the APR response.

5.4.1 Given the recent conversion to an R2 university, the faculty have been encouraged to negotiate workloads that allow them to provide the best experiences for the students. Baseline workload metric for tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty are 60-20-20 (teaching - research, scholarship, creative activity - service). Baseline workload metric for lecturers and senior lecturers are 90-0-10 (teaching – research, scholarship, creative activity – service). The Visiting Team observes that the combined growth in enrollment and move to R2 Institution have made clear impacts on the B.Arch. program's faculty, despite negotiating ability. The increase in enrollment results in increased studio sizes, increase in lecturer workload, and thesis advising up to 6 per faculty. Faculty workload is not alleviated by graduate assistance. In addition, full-time faculty are expected to produce scholarships or research in addition to their pre-existing teaching workloads. Concern about increased enrollment—as it relates to instruction cohorts and workload—was confirmed during the visit. Condition is not demonstrated.

5.4.2 Professor of Architecture Christopher Welty coordinates the internship course and serves as the program appointed Architect Licensing Advisor. He is a registered architect and an active member of the AIA and has served the AIA Georgia Board as Treasurer and AIA Atlanta as President. He attends the annual NCARB Architect Licensing Advisor Summits and reports back to faculty and students. Students are introduced to the requirements for licensure (including AREs, AXP, and NCARB Record (which they're encouraged to establish during upper division of program)) at the beginning of the program with **ARCH 1000: Intro to Architecture** and at the end of the program with **ARCH 4226: Pro Practice III Ethics**. Associate Dean and Professor Kathryn Bedette serves as a volunteer Architect Licensing Advisor and hosts educational sessions: "What is Architecture Licensure?," "All Things NCARB;" and "The Details on Licensure Requirements: AXP and ARE."

5.4.3 Full-time Architecture faculty holding a PhD are active researchers and routinely publish and present. The department allocates funds to support faculty in attending conferences/ workshops/symposia. Additionally, the college hosts conferences and events open to faculty, students, and professionals. The school is supportive of achievements and opportunities for faculty, including educational leaves for visiting professorships, limited-term positions, etc. Staff have been invited to submit to the Dean's Research Grant, routinely seek conferences, seminars, and workshops to attend, and pursue continuing education. The staff reports that professional development contributes to the passion and commitment they exhibit for their job and the university. Many staff members—like academic advisors, facilities managers, etc.—have attended conferences, utilized the university's reduced tuition, and pursued certificates.

5.4.4 – KSU utilizes degree-targeted academic advising. The College of Architecture and Construction Management has four professional advising positions (including a Transfer Specialist), in addition to a Director of Advising. Department staff and faculty members are available to help with career development (as required by KSU faculty handbook). In addition, the department has 14 positions that work directly with students related to career development. The Career and Internship Advisor provides individual and group advising, and works closely with faculty to administer the program and make industry connections for recruitment activity. **ARCH 3398: Internship** is an elective internship course providing opportunities for students to connect with industry professionals and gain valuable work experience. Other student support services listed include: Student Health and Well-being (HEAL, Health Services, CARE, Institutional

Equity, Student Disability, ACT), Academic Support (Mentoring Architecture Construction (MAC), Learning Assistant Programs, Albion Student Success, SMART Center, UITS).

### **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.

**Demonstrated**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

**5.5.1** The program demonstrates (APR pp. 92-93) its commitment to diversity and inclusion through upgrades in its facilities to make them accessible and through accommodations offered to those with physical and learning differences. The team confirmed this through discussions with faculty, staff, and students.

**5.5.2** The program demonstrates its plan for maintaining and increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff through a DEI strategic initiative from the DEI committee through an action plan. The Department of Architecture is assessed annually by the Division of Diverse and Inclusive Excellence. The APR compares the diversity of its full-time faculty to that of its students. While the diversity of KSU Architecture faculty does not mirror that of its students, there are documented initiatives in place to address this discrepancy. (APR pp. 93-94) The team confirmed this through discussions with faculty, staff, and students.

**5.5.3** The program demonstrates (APR pp. 94-95) its success in maintaining and increasing the diversity of its students, which appears to have happened organically alongside other DEI initiatives in the Department of Architecture, which admits to not having any affirmative action policies in admissions. The student demographics reflect a diverse student body. The team confirmed this through discussions with faculty, staff, and students.

**5.5.4** The program demonstrates its policies that are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) at the university, college, and department levels (APR pp. 95-99). At the university level, there are six Presidential Commissions: Disability Strategies and Resources; Gender and Work Life Issues; Racial and Ethnic Diversity; LGBTQ+ Initiatives; Sustainability; and Veterans Affairs, as well as the Division of Diverse and Inclusive Excellence. The College of Architecture and Construction Management DEI Committee has worked alongside DDIE to establish the E3 Action Plan with funding to address three diversity and inclusion initiatives. The Department of Architecture has

adopted an annual “DEI Temperature Check” for assessment. The team confirmed this through discussions with faculty, staff, and students.

- **5.5.5** The program has described (APR p. 99) its policies and procedures to support students with different physical and/or mental abilities. There is a Student Disability Services office and a unit for Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment to support faculty who serve students with different abilities. Faculty and staff are supported through several mental health and physical health initiatives, as verified in meetings with departmental leadership.

The APR (pp. 92-94) documents the program’s response to this criterion. The visiting team confirmed the B.Arch. program’s commitment to social equity, diversity, and inclusion through numerous interactions with faculty, staff, and students during the VTV. One student leader remarked about how, over time, student organizations have become more diverse in their membership and leadership positions.

### **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.

**Demonstrated**

### **2023 Team Analysis:**

The Architecture program is housed in three buildings (Architecture Building, Design I Building, and Design II Building) that house the facilities and physical resources required to fulfill the requirements in criteria 5.6.1 through 5.6.4. In a meeting with the visiting team, lab staff commented on the large investments made since the previous NAAB visit in purchasing laser cutters and 3D printers, including a 3D printer that extrudes clay. The visiting team engaged with one thesis student who was using this new equipment to develop prototypes for his thesis.

Evidence of physical resources to support the pedagogical approach and student/faculty achievement has been comprehensively provided on pp. 99-104 of the APR and further verified in the program video. The visiting team confirmed these resources in discussions with faculty, staff, and students.

Rapid recent increases in enrollment present ongoing challenges in providing the required physical resources in the available space for the program. To the credit of the program administration, faculty, staff, and students, they have proven to be agile and adaptive in making the available studio, classroom, lecture spaces, labs, shops and other spaces fill the needs for executing the learning formats and pedagogy in use by the program.

### **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.

**Demonstrated**

### 2023 Team Analysis:

The Kennesaw State University Bachelor of Architecture degree program's Financial Resources are described on pp. 104- 108 of the APR response.

The program operates with a zero-based budgeting model and reports that the fiscal health of the college is stable. Enrollment has increased by 82% (2018 to 2022), according to table in APR pp. 106. Budget for OS&E, Travel, and Student Assistants decreased by 22% (2018 to 2022) and salaries increased by 4.7% (2018 to 2022). Faculty comment that salaries are not competitive with the market. "Arch Total" (total budget) increased by 3.5% (2018 to 2022). The program is managing an increase in enrollment by hiring part-time faculty and secured limited-term faculty (which the State defines as two years). The provost acknowledges that resources do not match enrollment increase and need to catch up. Provost, chairs, faculty, and staff mentioned the two-year lag by state.

The program utilizes course fees and Learning Culture Fees to better improve the hands-on education component of studios, lectures, studio culture, and student organization events without incurring additional fiscal burden to the department. Course fees and Learning Culture Fees increased by over 90% (2018 to 2022). The balance of the department's foundation/development accounts have remained below \$100,000. Other funding resources have been made available through Student Success Grants, one-time funding requests, and summer Sprint enrollment initiatives. The faculty, whether by nature or necessity, are resourceful in securing additional funding.

The visiting team determines that despite the lack of growth in resources proportional to enrollment growth, the program is effective in managing and supplementing their budgets and, furthermore, are supporting student learning and achievement.

### 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.

#### Demonstrated

### 2023 Team Analysis:

The visiting team found evidence in the APR (pp. 108-112), through a video of KSU's facilities, and through discussions with faculty and students during the visit. The Kennesaw State University Library System consists of three primary campus locations: Sturgis Library, the Repository (Kennesaw campus), and the Johnson Library (Marietta campus). All KSU students have access to these libraries plus an online library website. The KSU library is also part of the Galileo Interconnected Library (GIL), a statewide consortium of public libraries and university libraries with over 10 million volumes in 384 databases.

In addition to these resources, the KSU Library participates in other library cooperatives such as LYRASIS, Atlanta Regional Council for Higher Education (ARCHE), and the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP). These interconnected library networks provide faculty and students access to more volumes than they would otherwise have and faster access to volumes from other libraries in the state, region, and country. The KSU Library also administers the Digital Commons, which provides open access to peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, and conference proceedings in 73 disciplines from more than 482 colleges and universities.

The KSU Library holds over 8,000 volumes in architecture and related disciplines, and the GIL network provides access to over 127,7000 volumes in the same subject areas. Architecture faculty and students at KSU have access to dedicated library staff liaisons who are discipline-specific and offer support in training, orientation, one-on-one consultations, and assistance with research needs. Architecture faculty and students can also request specific acquisitions from the library via an online request form. There are 56 full-time library personnel (28 faculty and 28 staff) to assist the KSU campus community.

The visiting team confirmed these findings through a meeting with library leadership, including the Dean of Libraries, and staff dedicated to liaising with the Architecture department, including a research librarian who collaborates with faculty and students on the research courses leading the student theses.

## 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.

**Met**

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

Statement on NAAB-Accredited degrees is included on the program website. The exact language is found at the following link: <https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/architecture/about/accreditation.php>. The text that must follow the statement is also included: Name of University ("Kennesaw State University"), academic unit ("Department of Architecture"), degree program ("Bachelor of Architecture"), total number of credits required ("150 credits"), and year of next accreditation visit ("2023"). The visiting team confirms links provided on APR p. 113 are working and meet the criterion.

### 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)

**Met**

#### 2023 Team Analysis:

- a) Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition are found at the following link under "NAAB Conditions and Procedures": <https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/architecture/about/accreditation.php>
- b) Conditions for Accreditation, 2014 Edition are found at the following link under "NAAB Conditions and Procedures": <https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/architecture/about/accreditation.php>



- c) Procedures for Accreditation, 2020 Edition are found at the following link under “NAAB Conditions and Procedures”: <https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/architecture/about/accreditation.php>
- d) Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition (Amended) are found at the following link under “NAAB Conditions and Procedures”:  
<https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/architecture/about/accreditation.php>

All NAAB Conditions and Procedures documents are made publicly available and are included on the program website. Visiting Team confirms links provided on APR p. 113 are working and meet criterion.

### **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.

**Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

Access to opportunities for students and graduates to develop career and employment plans includes workshops, sessions, and individual appointments, in addition to the following links provided in the APR p.113. In addition, the visiting team noted during interviews with faculty and student team leaders, several opportunities for students to engage with professionals from the greater Atlanta region through monthly lunch and learns organized by the student organizations and jury reviews. Internships with local practitioners while students are still earning their degree provided experience in advance of graduation increasing their value in the job market.

Department of Career Planning and Development: <https://careers.kennesaw.edu/>

To schedule a Career Advising Appointment: <https://careers.kennesaw.edu/contact/index.php>

Events Calendar: <https://careers.kennesaw.edu/students/events.php>

Student Resources, including Handshake: <https://careers.kennesaw.edu/students/index.php>

### **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

**Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

a - f ) IPRs and narratives of Program Annual Reports submitted since last year, NAAB responses, most recent decision letter from NAAB, APR from last visit, and final edition of most recent VTR are all found here: <https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/architecture/about/accreditation.php>.



g) "Plan to Correct" is not applicable.

h) NCARB ARE pass rates are found under "Data":  
<https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/architecture/about/accreditation.php>. The program includes national averages, as well as scores for KSU and SPSU.

i) Statements on learning and teaching culture are located under "Studio Culture" here:  
<https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/architecture/about/policies.php>. The College Course Policies which provide policies on the course environment, grading, and collaboration with the college Advising Team is included in APR p. 114  
([https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/docs/shared\\_governance/cacm\\_course\\_policies\\_3nov2020.pdf](https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/docs/shared_governance/cacm_course_policies_3nov2020.pdf))

j) Statements on diversity, equity, and inclusion in the Architecture Department are provided here under "Values": <https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/architecture/about/policies.php>. Additional statement from KSU Division of Diverse and Inclusive Excellence can be found here: <https://diversity.kennesaw.edu/>. "KSU Thrives as a Diverse Community" can be found here <https://www.kennesaw.edu/about/index.php>.

The visiting team applauds KSU for devoting web pages to this criterion.

### **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

**Met**

### **2023 Team Analysis:**

The visiting team found evidence of this criterion being met in documentation and links provided in the APR (pp. 115-117) and from accessing the webpages from the following links:

- a) Application forms and instructions  
[https://gafutures.xap.com/applications/usg/USG\\_Common\\_2021/apply.html?application\\_id=2300](https://gafutures.xap.com/applications/usg/USG_Common_2021/apply.html?application_id=2300)
- 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  
Freshman and Transfer Freshman: <https://admissions.kennesaw.edu/admissionsrequirements/freshmen.php>  
Transfers: <https://admissions.kennesaw.edu/admissions-requirements/transfer.php>
- c) Forms and a description of the process for evaluating the content of a non-accredited degrees  
Transfers: <https://admissions.kennesaw.edu/admissions-requirements/transfer.php>
- d) Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships  
The Financial Aid webpage instructs students on the application process for federal/state aid, additional documentation that may be necessary, and how to request a re-evaluation of aid eligibility: <https://financialaid.kennesaw.edu/student-resources/how-to-apply.php>. *Information*

regarding scholarships is located: <https://financialaid.kennesaw.edu/financial-aidtypes/scholarships/index-2.php>.

The Department of Architecture Scholarship Committee promotes disciplinary scholarships and makes decisions on KSU Foundation Scholarships for architecture students. Applications are through Scholarship Universe and information is available at:

<https://cacm.kennesaw.edu/architecture/students/scholarships.php>.

e) Explanation of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures

While the B.Arch. program does not set specific diversity goals relating to admission, the program and department are committed to an equitable and fair admission process as stated in the following commitment provided on the application landing page, paragraph 18:

[https://gafutures.xap.com/applications/usg/USG\\_Common\\_2021/apply.html?application\\_id=2300](https://gafutures.xap.com/applications/usg/USG_Common_2021/apply.html?application_id=2300)

The visiting team confirmed these policies and procedures by reviewing documentation KSU provided on its D2L online system consisting of sample applications, transfer applications, faculty review, and assessment forms to determine advanced placement in the program, measured against NAAB's 2020 Conditions and Procedures. Additionally, the visiting team met with the five-person advising team for the College of Architecture and Construction Management, which described their practices for academic advising of architecture students. The visiting team also notes that, while specific diversity goals are not set in relation to admissions, the B.Arch. program has a majority minority student population, a diverse group of students that has arrived in the KSU B.Arch. program organically.

#### **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.

**Met**

#### **2023 Team Analysis:**

The program has demonstrated that students have access to current resources and advice for making decisions about financial aid. This is addressed on pp.117-118 of the APR with information on the following links:

<https://financialaid.kennesaw.edu/> - General financial aid information.

<https://kennesawstate.financialaidtv.com/>. - Office of Scholarships and Financial Aid.

<https://financialaid.kennesaw.edu/contact-us/index.php> - Financial Aid Counseling resources.

In addition to links provided to students regarding financial aid, each student is assigned a financial aid counselor.

The estimated cost of attendance and participation in the KSU Architecture program is provided to students on the following Financial Aid website: <https://financialaid.kennesaw.edu/student-resources/cost-of-attendance.php>

## V. Appendices

### Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

#### PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture

The Visiting Team was particularly impressed by the learning and teaching culture in KSU's B.Arch. program, the "glue" that has held the program together during recent years of transition and the COVID pandemic. The team identified the following key themes and stand-out statements related to Learning and Teaching Culture:

- Students report feeling a "part of the process" in regard to program governance. There is a strong network of student leaders and the RSOs work together. Students believe faculty want them to feel empowered. The department is responsive to student feedback.
- The staff and faculty are committed to student success and dedicate their time and resources. The Mentoring Architecture Construction (MAC) organization is a particularly compelling example of staff, faculty, and students working together to mentor students.
- Staff, faculty, and students reflect on an increasingly diverse school and celebrate accessibility. They feel the community is inclusive, supportive, and tight-knit. When asked about what their program-pride points are, the resounding answer was: People!
- The school is committed to promoting healthy habits via workshops, peer-to-peer wellness checks, and instruction on methods for regulating stress. Students are encouraged to prioritize wellness and are accommodated if, and when, needs arise.
- Multi-year communication and education. Upperclassmen are invited to sit on juries. Faculty discuss projects with students from other studios. There is a culture of engagement and constructive feedback.
- Overall positive regard for the program, people, and process.

#### 5.2 Planning and Assessment

The visiting team was particularly impressed by how KSU has integrated the assessment process into its curriculum planning and development. While the assessment coordinator position in KSU's Architecture department was recently created, KSU has hit the ground running by having a pre-established assessment process utilizing FCAR documentation. Furthermore, the visiting team recognized the administrative and operational structures and planning processes that combine a top-down and bottom-up methodology for evaluation and improvement.

Self-assessments have been integrated into the operating culture of the KSU Architecture department and are addressed in the program assessment plan that is typical of all courses and programs mapping Student Learning Outcomes to NAAB criteria. Student achievement, learning outcomes, and effectiveness of course materials in meeting Student Learning Outcomes are gauged in the Program and Student Criteria Matrix, Faculty Course Assessment Report (FCAR), and the Course Sequence Coordinator's FCAR Summary. Additionally, a faculty review cycle plays an important role in advising and encouraging the department to make adjustments that promote student and faculty success utilizing an Annual Review Document (ARD) and Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA). This assessment protocol promotes faculty success through a process of goal setting and accountability and provides opportunities for adjustment within the department and program. The quality of the assessment program was validated in a meeting during the site visit with the assessment coordinator.

The visiting team confirmed the thoughtful and thorough process of planning and assessment that has been implemented by KSU's Architecture department through multiple meetings during the Virtual Site Visit.

### **5.3 Curricular Development**

The visiting Team noted a thorough and systematic approach to the Planning, Assessment and Curricular Development for the program which seamlessly intertwines these Resources (5.2 Planning and Assessment and 5.3 Curricular Development). The model outlined clearly by the assessment coordinator and department chair and included in the APR, is an evolution of an earlier assessment program. It provides a top-down, bottom-up, cyclical approach assuring the ability for the program to assess, strategize, and implement changes and improvements to the curriculum course by course. The assessment schedule ensures all courses are assessed twice within an accreditation cycle with time for reflection and improvements in between assessments with careful consideration of the effectiveness of course material relative to Program and Student Criteria. The highly developed process supports KSUs vision, mission, and strategic plan to continuously improve the quality of all aspects of the institution through their “Assessment of Learning” process and provides the means to adapt curriculum and enhance architectural education over time as the profession responds to new challenges, adopts new technologies and recognizes the role architects and designers play in the ever-evolving nature of our built environment.

**Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix**



### Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

#### **Team Chair, Practitioner Perspective**

Travis Hicks, M.Arch., AIA, NCIDQ, LEED AP  
Associate Professor of Interior Architecture  
UNC Greensboro  
Greensboro, NC  
336.447.5468  
[tlhicks@uncg.edu](mailto:tlhicks@uncg.edu)

#### **Educator Perspective**

Kathleen Lechleiter, AIA  
Principal Twopoint Studio, LLC  
Baltimore, MD  
[kathleen@twopointstudio.com](mailto:kathleen@twopointstudio.com)

#### **Regulator Perspective**

Gregory Erny, FAIA, NCARB  
architects + LLC  
Reno, NV  
[ernygregory@gmail.com](mailto:ernygregory@gmail.com)

#### **Student Perspective**

Robyn Payne, Associate AIA  
Perkins&Will  
Boston, MA  
[robyn.payne@perkinswill.com](mailto:robyn.payne@perkinswill.com)



## VI. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,



---

Travis L. Hicks, AIA  
Team Chair



---

Kathleen Lechleiter, AIA  
Team Member



---

Gregory Erny, FAIA, NCARB  
Team Member



---

Robyn Payne, Associate AIA  
Team Member