Harvard University
Graduate School of Design

Visiting Team Report

M. Arch
Track I (Undergraduate degree outside of architecture + 105 graduate credit hrs)
Track II (Related preprofessional degree + 75 graduate credit hours**)**

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
4 April 2012

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

Table of Contents

I.   Summary of Team Findings

1.   **Team Comments & Visit Summary**

It is the consensus of the team that the national and international reputation of excellence in which the architecture program at Harvard University, Graduate School of Design (GSD) is held, is well deserved. This conclusion exists whether evaluating the **people** of the program, its **physical accommodation**, or its **academic content**.

The **people**, from university leadership through GSD Dean Mohsen Mostafavi, Department Chair Preston Scott Cohen, Program Director Mark Mulligan and the faculty, staff, and students, are an engaged and enthusiastic community of scholars passionately dedicated to the advancement of excellence in architecture and architecture education. Gund Hall houses the GSD and it is an enviable **physical plant** which creatively accommodates the core design studios, support spaces and particularly the architecture library and the workshop/materials laboratories both of which are recognized as setting the standard by which such facilities are judged. The **academic content** of the program is marked by an engaging design studio culture, a technical curricula creatively taught, a wide range of enrichment electives, and international traveling options studios.

Further, the program is neither static nor resting on its laurels, but captures the full potential of its resources to engage in investigation, experimentation, and advancement of an evolving pedagogy. This is done with confidence and an assurance that, as in any exploratory venture, there is the chance for less than totally successful outcomes, nevertheless realizing that such experimentation is essential to long term enhancement of program content and delivery methodologies.

All aspects of the program are robust, and shortcomings cited by the team in meeting NAAB conditions and /or criteria typically are not related to actual absence of related information program-wide, but rather to it not always being assembled and presented in the required course or policy format.

2.   **Conditions Not Met**

    B.2   Accessibility
    B.5   Life Safety
    B.6   Comprehensive Design
    II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

3.   **Causes of Concern**

A. Project Scale of Comprehensive Design: It is the concern of the team that assignments in the Comprehensive Design studio may be too ambitiously large in scope and complexity, thereby leading to the inability (in time, or overwhelming scope) of the students to adequately include content and representation of all required technical components, systems, and information.

4.   **Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2006)**

2004 Condition 5, Studio Culture: *The school is expected to demonstrate a positive and respectful learning environment through the encouragement of the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff. The school should encourage students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers.*

Previous Team Report (2006): The architecture program and the GSD have begun to look at the issues of studio culture and have recently conducted a survey and studio study, the results of which have been distributed to the students and faculty. Yet, while these steps have been taken, which include important suggestions that have had some impact on studio behavior(s), there is still no formal policy or set of procedures developed for implementing the policy. We encourage the school to complete this process that has been started and develop a written studio culture policy.

> **2012 Visiting Team Assessment:** It is the consensus of the team that considerable progress has been made in implementing an effective studio culture and this is confirmed with direct conversation with the student body. The policy is memorialized in several different memos and related sections of the student handbook "Guide to Gund", but does not exist as a comprehensive stand-alone Studio Culture document.

2004 Criterion 13.15, Sustainable Design: Understanding of *the principles of sustainability in making architecture and urban design decisions that conserve natural and built resources, including culturally important buildings and sites, and in the creation of healthful buildings and communities*

Previous Team Report (2006): This condition is still not met. The department has recently refocused the curriculum to ensure an understanding of the science and principles of sustainability (energy conservation) with the goal of inculcating the culture of sustainability throughout the program and especially in the studios. Unfortunately, this program has not yet matured, and evidence of principles of sustainability could not be found in the student work.

> **2012 Visiting Team Assessment:** Since the 2006 visit the program has specifically hired faculty to implement improved academic coverage of all sustainability issues and evidence exists in Energy Technology and Buildings (GSD-6122) and Environmental Technology in Buildings (GSD-6125) that the intentions of 2004 criterion Sustainable Design are now satisfied.

2004 Criterion 13.16, Program Preparation: Ability to *prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria*

Previous Team Report (2006): No evidence of the student's ability to prepare a comprehensive architectural program was found in the material presented.

> **2012 Visiting Team Assessment:** Evidence exists in Architectural Design (GSD 1202), Energy Technology and Building (GSD 6122), and Environmental Technologies in Buildings (GSD 6125) that the intentions of 2004 criterion Program Preparation are now satisfied.

2004 Criterion 13.25, Construction Cost Control: Understanding of *the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating*

Previous Team Report (2006): In the prior team visit, the team could not find evidence to satisfy the then-current criterion of "awareness." This team could not find evidence that would qualify for "understanding" of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating.

The program should provide the students with an overview of all aspects of the subject with appropriate student response that demonstrates a level of "understanding."

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence now exists largely in Issues in the Practice of Architecture (GSD-7212), that the intentions of 2004 criterion Construction Cost Control are now satisfied. However, concerning the specific sub-issue, construction cost estimating, no evidence of this sub-issue was found in any course syllabi.

II.   Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

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

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

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

[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2012 Team Assessment: Building on a 75 year history, the GSD has both pioneered and exemplified excellence in design, education for the design professions, and design related scholarship. It is recognized as a premier design education institution with international reach and remains committed to educating its graduates to assume leadership roles in a rapidly changing twenty-first century world. Recent leadership changes have reinvigorated the GSD's intellectual climate and research capabilities; expanded its physical, financial, information technology, and human resources; and strengthened its external relationships with the parent Harvard University. All of these initiatives have as their underlying objective to support and enhance the mission of the GSD to engage students in critical thinking about the role of architecture in contemporary society while methodically guiding the development of skills in design, visual representation, building science and technique, and professional reasoning and judgment.

This conclusion is drawn from information contained in the APR received prior to the NAAB visit (including an APR supplement received at the time of the visit) and from discussions with leadership, faculty, staff, and students.

In particular, the Master in Architecture program benefits from a variety of advanced history/theory, technology, sustainability and professional practices elective courses where students mix with advanced students from the post-professional programs. Likewise, some Option Studios integrate students from the Master in Architecture with Urbanism and Landscape students. Additionally, PhD, DDes, and MDesS students are frequently involved within the M. Arch. program as Teaching Fellows (doctoral candidates) and Teaching Assistants (masters candidates).

All Departments of the School reside in Gund Hall, which has been continuously renovated and adapted to new requirements in terms of teaching technology, digital production by students, and spaces (e.g. reorganization of some units of the library in order to establish a Material Library now in control of the Library staff). During the summer of 2011 the below-grade floor went through an impressive reorganization and expansion process of the model shop, digital modeling and production, as well as incorporating advanced techniques of digital fabrication.

Regarding the institution, it is apparent from conversation and statements made by the provost, the dean, all levels of faculty/administration, and the students, that the GSD's involvement and recognition on Harvard University campus has increased dramatically since the arrival of the new dean in 2009. The GSD's dean has taken a recognized leadership position on campus; at the same time the School has

dramatically increased its collaboration with other schools on campus, such as the School of Public Health and the School of Engineering in collaborative project initiatives.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

- *Social Equity: The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff— irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.*

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which in each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2012 Team Assessment: The APR and other team room evidence in combination with personnel interviews at all administrative levels support the evaluation that the GSD has in place the policies and tools to insure the establishment and maintenance of an appropriate learning environment infused with a culturally rich mix of social characteristics at faculty, staff, and student levels. This objective is essentially advanced via policies related to studio culture and the Dean's Diversity Initiative (an advisory committee of 9 faculty and 5 alumni created in 2008), the goal of which is to improve the overall learning environment of the GSD, and to place emphasis on increasing underrepresented minorities within the faculty, staff, and student body. However, the team noted that, even though there is ample evidence of a healthy studio culture across the school and its programs, there is no single document that documents its comprehensiveness.

Overall, the Learning Culture evidenced in the Master in Architecture program is outstanding. The healthy financial structure of the program allows it to maintain a high level faculty/students ratio, frequent searches for new faculty to respond to existing courses and/or new courses related to sustainability, technology and fabrication, and a well-organized and efficient staff. Faculty, staff and students are well aware of the intellectual direction of the School as well as of its increasing relationship with the University as a whole.

The dean's leadership was specifically noted in the supportive culture it promotes by a diverse faculty and student body. Governance structures and participation at virtually every level was evident. Students have easy access to the dean and the overall governance of the School through a series of well-defined meetings each semester both with the students' body as a whole and its representative group.

Beyond the general governance it is clear that Gund Hall has allowed faculty and students to create an environment of respect and commitment towards the education of an architect in a holistic nature. Close proximity between students' areas, faculty and administration (including the dean) allows for additional interaction outside of the scheduled meetings and they share this proximity, as well as intermingle within the community they serve.

Social equity and well being of the student body is visible throughout the school and through its governance structure. The Dean of Students occupies an important administrative position and all remarks have emphasized the critical importance of the position in regard to students' health, both physical and mental. The program is aware of the continuing issues related to race/ethnic diversity, both in the faculty and the student body. Various initiatives are in place and being expanded in order to improve the ratio in the long-term planning. Students with disabilities are fully integrated into the school, including recent cases of hearing-impaired individuals who were provided with simultaneous sign interpretation.

I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives: Programs must demonstrate through narrative and artifacts, how they respond to the following perspectives on architecture education. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently within the context of its history, mission, and culture and to further identify as part of its long-range planning activities how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: There is outstanding evidence that the faculty of the GSD demonstrate a continuing and remarkable academic and intellectual production. Books, design awards, critical review of buildings and projects are numerous and cover all ranges of the curriculum: from history to design to technology and professional practice. The dean has set the GSD on a path of increased research capacity and productivity whose value has been recognized by the provost, all levels of governance of the program, its faculty and students.

Under the leadership of the dean the GSD has developed significant outreach toward the institution of Harvard University as a whole, as well as to the campus community. The long-range planning includes increased collaboration with other schools particularly the School of Public Health and the School of Engineering.

B. **Architectural Education and Students**. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to live and work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured and respected; to emerge as leaders in the academic setting and

---

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

the profession; to understand the breadth of professional opportunities; to make thoughtful, deliberate, informed choices and; to develop the habit of lifelong learning.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The Visiting Team finds that students are prepared in a variety of ways to become active members in the global society. Students learn how to become engaged citizens through course work and extracurricular activities. The pedagogical style at the GSD is experimental and innovative, engaging students in ways that respond to their interests and passions. Concurrently, there are many student organizations and student services available to assist students in exploring their interests in extracurricular ways.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: Students are made aware of the regulatory requirements through the efforts of the IDP coordinator Meryl Golden. Through the use of the publication "Guide to Gund", student meetings, website information and links, they are advised early in their duration at the GSD of the professional registration process and required information and time schedules.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The team found ample evidence that students of the GSD are exposed to the profession, and the profession to the school, through a rich mix of 1) lectures, conferences, symposia, and events (www.gds.harvard.edu/#/events/index.html), 2) the engagement of professionally practicing faculty, and 3) the Loeb Fellowship Program which brings nine mid-career professionals to the GSD each year, engaging with students via studios, research labs, or other curricular and extracurricular activities.

The professional exposure of the students is further enhanced by the GSD's urban setting and the opportunities thereby presented for academic engagement with practicing urban planners, landscape architects, engineers, and other design consultants, all contributing toward the students preparation to practice in a multidisciplinary collaborative environment.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence exists from the APR and team room that students work collaboratively in community activities including urban planning where, in response to a multi-layered analysis of social and economic forces, they engage in architectural assignments that foster an awareness of the public good. The GSD actively encourages students to engage local and global communities to understand more directly the needs of communities underserved by architectural or urban design. Option Studios provide still further international service opportunities to assist underserved communities and disaster impacted locales.

The GSD awards several Community Service Fellowships annually to students committed to working with community groups and non-profit organizations on deserving projects and or design services. Additionally, GSD supports Project Link, a university funded, but student initiated and run out-reach opportunity to introduce talented Boston high school students to architecture and related design professions.

I.1.4 Long-Range Planning: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and, where appropriate, the five perspectives. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform its future planning and strategic decision making.

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

2012 Team Assessment: As a whole, the GSD's leadership has a well-defined commitment to a strategic plan emphasizing research and innovation throughout the program and its curricula. Experimentation and innovation are also visible in the teaching methods applied typically in all courses, with a special mention given to the history, technology, and professional practice syllabi.

The Master in Architecture program functions as an independent department within the overall structure of the GSD. Its governance and organizational structure are clear and highly efficient. Under the leadership of the dean and the associate dean for academic affairs, the department demonstrates its necessary autonomy in terms of hiring, curriculum development, and program organization, while at the same time demonstrating a highly developed integration with all the other programs of the GSD: the Master in Urban Planning (MUP), the Master in Architecture II, the Master in Landscape Architecture (MLA), and the Master in Design Studies (MDesS).

This conclusion is drawn from information contained in the APR and the APR supplement provided at the time of the visit, plus discussions with the dean, the associate dean and other administrative leaders.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:
- *How the program is progressing towards its mission.*
- *Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.*
- *Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.*
- *Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:*
    - *Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.*
    - *Individual course evaluations.*
    - *Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.*

    o *Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.*
The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.

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

2012 Team Assessment: The team found considerable evidence in the APR and through presentations and meetings with faculty and staff that self-assessment is a hallmark of the GSD's culture and governance. Of particular note are the assessment programs related to the Student Forum and the Visiting Committee/Self-Assessment initiatives. Faculty discussions are frequent and aimed at improving the curriculum and, in particular, the interaction between design studios and the other portions of the overall curriculum. Statements by both the dean and the associate dean emphasized the role and importance of the senior faculty in improving teaching methods and mentoring the younger faculty. The team also notes the various initiatives that have been launched in recent years in response to self-assessment to support students' interests in study-abroad programs in Paris, Tokyo and Rotterdam.

Team interaction with students confirmed that communication and self-assessment frequently involves the students in a planned and organized manner, with a noteworthy example being discussions related to adjustments in the configuration of the Independent Thesis currently underway with the governance of the school.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

- *Faculty & Staff:*
  o *An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions[2].*
  o *Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.*
  o *Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.*

[X] Human resources (Faculty & Staff) are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence indicates that the program is adequately staffed at all levels and that all levels are satisfied with their support. All required personnel documents are in place including EEO documentation. Work load appears to be balanced and students believe they are well supported. The IDP coordinator is actively engaging students and assisting students in registration in IDP and the administration process. Students are well aware of regulatory requirements for licensing. The criteria for advancement are clear at GSD. However, the team feels that mentoring and support of junior faculty could be improved to assist them in their professional development.

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

[X] Human resources (Students) are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The APR provides adequate information on student admission policies and procedures for both M. Arch degree and the Advanced Placement track (respectively referred to by NAAB as M. Arch Tracks 1 and 2). Students' academic and personal well-being are supported through the Office of Student Services as well as through academic and peer advising. The Office of Student Services provides students' access to Admissions, the Dean of Students, Career Discovery, Career Services, Commencement Planning, Financial Assistance, the Registrar and Academic

---

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

Support Services. Discussion with the students confirmed what was presented in the APR, namely that students are very well supported at the GSD to facilitate adjustment and overall success.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

  [X] Administrative structure is adequate for the program

  2012 Team Assessment: The Harvard University decentralized staff organizational structure results in the GSD having a large staff component to support both direct and indirect program administration, all as conveyed in the staff organization chart. The administrative responsibilities are clearly defined and understood, and the decentralized structure enables the program to have control over the majority of overall administrative issues, and convenient student access to these personnel is a distinct benefit of the program.

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

  [X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

  2012 Team Assessment: The GSD has highly structured systems in place to receive input from all constituents. The dean meets regularly with students and receives feed-back from an elected leadership body of students (The Student Forum). Evidence exists that the faculty has an active voice in all matters. The Academic Affairs Committee of students sets the agenda for meetings with the administration. The department chair and program director are readily accessible in structured and informal meetings. Outside input is received from an alumni council and the GSD visiting committee. All of these procedures are formalized and records are kept.

I.2.3 Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:
- *Space to support and encourage studio-based learning*
- *Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.*
- *Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.*

  [X] Physical resources are adequate for the program

  2012 Team Assessment: The physical plant to support the program is not only adequate, it is exemplary. Periodic modifications and upgrades to Gund Hall have been incorporated since its completion 40 years ago, all with the intent to provide a learning environment of sufficient size and optimum configuration. These improvements include appropriate technological advances in information and computer design technologies all in support of a capacity of approximately 600 students and 100 faculty and staff. In particular, and in addition to maintaining the original studio volume and configuration, are recently renovated and expanded architecture library and materials workshop/fabrication laboratories, whose size, content, and systems' sophistication are without peer. This condition is "met with distinction".

I.2.4 Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.*

[X] Financial resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: It is clear from the physical and staffing resources that Harvard GSD is blessed with adequate funding. The diversity of students, invited speakers, instructors and an extremely rich program of exhibits and lectures are markedly indicative of appropriate resources to fund both basic and enhancement aspects of the program.

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

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

[X] Information resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The Visiting Team was impressed by the amount and extent of information resources available to the students at the GSD. Students not only have access to traditional library resources that cover geographic and topical subjects, but also access to special collections, visual resources and a newly organized materials collection. All the collections are kept and organized by 8 professional librarians, one conservator and 7 library assistants. Students are instructed on basic ways to use the library upon entering the school and further instruction on research skills are regularly provided with particular emphasis for thesis students.

PART I: SECTION 3 –REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports[3]. Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

- *Program student characteristics.*
  - *Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).*
    - *Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.*
    - *Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.*
  - *Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.*
    - *Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.*
  - *Time to graduation.*
    - *Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the "normal time to completion" for each academic year since the previous visit.*
    - *Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.*

- *Program faculty characteristics*
  - *Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.*
    - *Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.*
    - *Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.*
  - *Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.*
    - *Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.*
  - *Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.*
    - *Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.*
  - *Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.*

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

2012 Team Assessment: All information regarding student characteristics is provided in the form of charts in the APR. The student body is diverse and international in makeup. Incoming student qualifications have not changed, only slipping by a few points since the 2006 visit. Time to Graduation for M. Arch I students has not significantly changed either, with about 78% of student graduating on time and approximately 95% graduation within 150% time. The M. Arch I AP track students have slipped slightly with regards to the number of students graduating on time. Regardless, all students in the M. Arch I AP track are still graduating within 150% time.

All required faculty data reports are provided in the APR. However, the mostly narrative format adopted to deliver the information is not the most clear and a more tabular format would better convey the information. Overall, the data for all sections of the faculty demonstrate a solid range of diversity, with a marked increase in the percentage of female faculty, particularly among the tenured group. At this time, only one of the non-tenured senior faculty, and none of the junior faculty is African-American, a fact that shows no change/progress since the 2006 visit. It is noted that the department of architecture remains a

---

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

very diverse faculty in terms of international background with a very strong presence of faculty from Europe and Asia both as part of the regular faculty and the visiting faculty.

Long-range planning for the School anticipates a significant faculty increase of about 14 FTE over the next five years and at the time of the report the Department is evaluating candidates for five positions, including two tenured/senior positions.

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

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

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The reports as required were provided in the APR.

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials: The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty are adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history and context of the institution.

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The APR along with a variety of faculty exhibits (printed and on-line) presented the team with an ample array of material to attest to the programs' compliance with the identified criteria. The Department of Architecture benefits from an exceptional faculty whose academic, professional and teaching credentials are outstanding and set a national and international standard for other schools. Plans to increase the overall faculty of the GSD by 14FTE indicate that the GSD's commitment to excellence, innovation and cutting edge research in design, history and technology is not only being maintained, but reinforced.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW
The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

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

2012 Team Assessment: All policy documents were provided as required in the team room. See Section 1.1.2 for comments on the content within the studio culture document.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:

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

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Public speaking, presentation, and writing skills are fostered throughout the program with particular emphasis in Design Studios (GSD-1101, 1102, 1201, 1202), history courses (GSD-4121, 4122, 4223), and Building Technology (GSD-6230).

The team found ample evidence of the ability of students to speak and listen effectively. The ability to describe both space and drawings is outstanding overall, preparing the students for the presentation of their own projects and practice. The four design studios are primary vectors for developing this ability and the team was able to attend pin-up presentations where those skills were clearly at work both in first year and in the advanced studios. The team commends the innovative use of the "case study" approach to the architecture curriculum through this dynamic interaction between students, classes, and faculty.

Additionally, the team found high-level of achievement in the writing and presentation of the pre-thesis reports delivered by each student before entering the thesis semester.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The visiting team found extensive evidence that demonstrates the students' high-level of achievement in Design Thinking Skills. The sequence of four core design studios (GSD-1101, 1102, 1201, 1202) provides the evidence of the student's capacity to analyze a problem, diagram one or various solutions, and develop the appropriate diagrams to explain the chosen solution. This criterion is "met with distinction".

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Visual communication skills are to be commended at the GSD. Starting with the core design studios including: GSD-1101, 1102, 1201, 1202, and including visual study courses, GSD-2121, 2122 and specialized digital media courses GSD-2223 and 2224, students become fluent with model building, manual presentations and digital and photographic techniques.

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.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: While there is strong evidence of teaching the required material, and examples of the student ability to make excellent technical documents is evident in design studio (GSD-1201), and materials and technology courses (GSD-6123 and 6230), there is no evidence of student assignments to actually *write* an outline specification.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The team found ample evidence of Investigative Skills throughout the second year core design studios (GSD-1201, and 1202) and sequence of *Buildings, Texts, and Contexts I-II-III* (GSD-4121, 4122, 4123). Outstanding evidence can also be found in the Pre-thesis reports produced as part of the Independent Thesis requirements (GSD-9301).

Core studios demonstrated students' ability in each stage of a sequence of project assignments, including historical, environmental, and technical information to the study of building precedents. The team notes that the fourth core design studio (GSD-4123) also showed strong evidence of students' investigative skills in relation to the city and the urban environment in general, including in the form of writing down urban codes to interpret and potentially redevelop urban neighborhoods. This criterion is "met with distinction".

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The team found strong evidence that the first two core design studios (GSD-1201 and 1202), supplemented with a well-integrated introduction of technology and history-theory courses (GSD-6121 and 6122), enable the students to develop well-established fundamental design skills. They are illustrated by a variety of diagrams, study and final models, and complete plans, sections and elevations at an appropriate scale.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The Visiting Team found evidence of precedent investigation documented in the second, third and fourth core design studios (GSD-1102, 1201 and 1202) . Physical evidence of precedent analysis was found in student produced booklets in the team room, specifically for the third semester studio, GSD-1201.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The team found strong evidence that the required design studio course work and history-theory courses provide the students with a full understanding of ordering systems in architecture and in the environment in general. The four core studios (GSD-1101, 1102, 1201, 1202) and the sequence of *Buildings, Texts, Contexts* provide rich evidentiary examples of design diagrams, projects, and papers.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The Visiting Team found evidence of an understanding of historical traditions and culture as it relates to the Western history, in required history courses (GSD-4121, 4122 and 4223). Evidence of an understanding of Non-Western historical traditions was found in elective studios and seminars, of which each student is required to take at least one.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Cultural Diversity is primarily being taught in the Buildings, Texts and Contexts sequence (GSD 4121, 4122 and 4223). In these courses historic buildings are discussed in terms of their political, cultural and economical context. Evidence of an understanding of Non-Western historical traditions was found in elective studios and seminars, of which each student is required to take at least one. There was additional evidence of both Western and Non-Western cultural understanding represented in the studio work exhibited in the team room.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The team noted that the research-oriented development of the school under the current dean and administration is strongly impacting the program at all levels and within all departments. The Master in Architecture program generates outstanding and innovative examples and teaching strategies that have established applied research as the center of the curriculum. The fourth semester design studio (GSD-1202) with its emphasis on the environment at large and the urban environment in particular, and the Independent Thesis (GSD-9301) provide solid evidence of a full understanding of Applied Research.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The students in the Master in Architecture program are exposed to an outstanding sequence of required studios and courses to help them develop their critical thinking skills as well as the skills in both 2-D and 3-D representation. Evidence of the very high standards of teaching and curriculum organization/integration are everywhere to be found in written, drawn, printed, and model evidence available to the team. The team stresses the innovative character, content, and delivery of both the History-Theory sequence and the Materials- Technology sequence.

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge:

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

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of the students' ability to fulfill the predesign criterion. However, the team generally had to look beyond the identified design studio and materials/technology courses (GSD-1202, 6122, 6125) in order to find most of the evidence. The third core studio, Comprehensive Design (GSD-1202) shows effective group research in all the requirements under this condition. In addition, the written pre-thesis reports and the content of the Independent Thesis (GSD-9301) adequately demonstrate the development of the required ability.

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

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: Architectural Design (GSD-1201) is listed as the source for fulfilling this SPC. There is evidence of one lecture that addresses accessibility in this course but a review of student graphic work does not convey their ability to apply the principles of accessibility in their project work. Main entries fail to provide ADA required avenues of ingress/egress, maneuvering space is insufficient to accommodate physical disabilities, door swings inhibit egress flow, accessible toilets are not indicated, and no references could be found for addressing sensory and cognitive disabilities.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Energy, Technology, and Building (GSD- 6122) and Environmental Technologies in Buildings (GSD-6125), comprehensively address the full range of sustainable issues. Through case studies in both written and graphic format, students demonstrate their understanding of sustainable issues as well as their ability to apply this knowledge in the design of buildings.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Site design is addressed in all design studio courses and most comprehensively in Architectural Design (GSD-1201 and 1202). Student site models are included for most projects and indicate an ability to employ topographical understanding as well as appropriately accommodating pedestrian and vehicle access. Urban site issues are studied and explored in detail in GSD-1202. This criterion is "met with distinction".

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

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: Students have not demonstrated the ability to apply basic egress systems to buildings. Projects show required exit stairs that a) are depicted as unenclosed, b) without doors, c) exiting internal to the building, d) ending without egress and large assembly areas as provided with only one means of egress. These issues were evident in a review of documents from Architectural Design (GSD-1201) and other studio work.

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.5. Life Safety**
A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture	**B.7 Environmental Systems**
	B.9. Structural Systems

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: While evidence exists that the majority of the above sub-criteria are met individually, evidence does not exist in the comprehensive studio Architectural Design (GSD-1201) that there is any consistency within the projects in general, or from student to student, that all of the issues are integrated within the work. Particular emphasis is made for the absence of information in the comprehensive studio projects of B.2 Accessibility, B.3 Sustainability, B.5 Life Safety, and B.9 Structural Systems.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Financial Considerations are met by the content of Issues in the Practice of Architecture (GSD-7212), via a uniquely engaging and interactive teaching format.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Energy, Technology and Buildings (GSD-6122) and Environmental Technologies in Buildings (GSD-6125) both address the issues comprising environmental systems. Student work products in these classes indicate an understanding both in written documents and graphic examples.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Students gain an understanding of structural systems through Analysis and Design of Building Structures (GSD-6227and 6229). The students' understanding of the principles is evidenced by both written and graphic class work. Analyses and study of existing buildings are also used as tools in the education process.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The subject matter is covered in Energy Technology in Buildings (GSD-6122), Materials, Constructions, and Processes (GSD-6123), Environmental Technologies in Buildings (GSD-6125), and Building Technology (GSD-6230). Students use case studies of built systems to understand the principles and they demonstrate their knowledge in graphic representations of various building envelope systems ranging from masonry to curtain wall and more geometrically complex cladding assemblies.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence exists broadly in Environmental Technologies in Building (GSD-6125) that building service systems are presented and discussed in lecture format. However, the evidence is weak and the team was unable to identify specific studio course work that consistently addressed the issues of plumbing, vertical transportation, security and fire protection systems.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The subject matter is covered in Materials and Construction (GSD-6121), Energy Technology in Buildings (GSD-6122), Materials, Constructions, and Processes (GSD-6123), Environmental Technologies in Buildings (GSD-6125), and Building Technology (GSD-6230). Students demonstrate their understanding through graphic and written course assignments. A materials library and an extensive work shop with testing equipment allow students to personally explore the properties of materials.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The program at Harvard GSD is focused on design and critical thinking. As a result of this focus the SPC in realm B have likely received less emphasis. The SPC's are substantially covered in non studio courses such as technology and structures, and while it is recognized that the students have received instruction in the SPC areas, it is less evident that they apply the knowledge in their studio design projects.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:

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

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of collaboration in Architectural Design (GSD-1202), Materials and Constructions: an Introduction (GSD-6121), and Building Technologies (GSD-6230). In each of these courses respectively, teams of students are asked to analyze an urban site; asked to design and build an inhabitable structure; and asked to analyze and present case studies. This criterion is "met with distinction".

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Human behavior as it relates to the built environment is addressed in Architectural Design (GSD-1202), and human behavior as it relates to environmental issues is addressed in the Environmental Technologies in Buildings course (GSD-6125).

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence exists in Issues in the Practice of Architecture (GSD-7212), that students are exposed to the issues of architect-client-owner relationships and their public-community setting.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence exists in Issues in the Practice of Architecture (GSD-7212) that the overall subject of project management is addressed. This course creatively engages the students through lecture, case studies, and role playing to bring to life real word experiences in understanding the material.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence exists in Issues in the Practice of Architecture (GSD-7212) that all facets of practice management as identified in the SPC are creatively and comprehensively addressed.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Direct evidence exists in Issues in the Practice of Architecture GSD-7212, that the issue is formally addressed and there is evidence among students at all levels of the curriculum that leadership is a major element of the program and the program's culture at large. It is clear that the faculty as a whole functions as an exceptional ensemble of leadership role models within the school, the University, the city of Boston and the global environment. The team notes that the outstanding series of Option Studios dealing with national and international community issues such as those led in Senegal, in post-Tsunami Japan, or innovative studio such as Rio-2030 foster leadership skills in a broader context. This criterion is "met with distinction".

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence exists in Issues in the Practice of Architecture (GSD-7212) that students are exposed to the full range of legal responsibilities in the practice of architecture creatively covered in an innovative learning environment.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence exists in Issues in the Practice of Architecture (GSD-7212) that students gain an understanding of matters related to ethics and professional judgment inherent in the practice of architecture.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence exists in Issues in the practice of Architecture (GSD-7212) that students gain a working understanding of the community and social responsibilities inherent in the practice of architecture.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: All nine criteria in Realm C are met, and the team deems noteworthy that criteria met by the professional practice course, Issues in the Practice of Architecture (GSD-7212), are so effectively covered. This single course, so often a problematic course/issue in other programs, deserves recognition for its engaging and interactive format, and its syllabus and methodology could well serve as a "best practices" model for other programs. In support of this contention, an expansion of the subject, offered in an elective course by the same faculty, is regularly over-subscribed .

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Harvard University is accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), whose most recent accreditation visit occurred in 2009 and whose next visit is scheduled for 2017. Confirmation of Harvard's regional accreditation is found on line at the NEASC website:
http://cihe.neasc.org/about_our_institutions/roster_of_institutions/#Massachusetts

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: GSD meets the NAAB criteria for the M. Arch degree. The electives available to the students are particularly varied and robust offering an extremely rich educational environment. The 3½ year Master in Architecture benefits from a students' cohort with very diverse academic backgrounds. The admission process for advanced standing in the Master in Architecture (AP) is appropriately rigorous in evaluating the transfer of credits.

Regarding the nomenclature of degrees as recommended by the NAAB for recognition as M. Arch., the Graduate School of Design is aware of the fact that the existing M. Arch. II (post-professional) is in potential conflict with the NAAB nomenclature recommendation.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development
The program must describe the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications (e.g., changes or additions) are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Further, the NAAB expects that programs are evaluating curricula with a view toward the advancement of the discipline and toward ensuring that students are exposed to current issues in practice. Therefore, the program must demonstrate that licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The M. Arch I curriculum is reviewed and changes adopted through a series of meetings that occur between different groups within the GSD. According to the APR, a comprehensive review of the different curriculum platforms is undertaken every three years. The platforms include: studios, buildings text/context courses and technology based courses. Discussions with faculty have revealed a desire to constantly improve curriculum to better relate to the evolving architectural and practice context. There are also several opportunities for students to provide input on teaching and the curriculum through meetings with the administration and course evaluations.

PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The GSD evaluates all applications within the school. Due to their large quantity of applicants, a large faculty committee, with staff assistance evaluates each application. As exhibited by a review of application forms and files, it is evident that careful consideration is given to the evaluation of the applicants' pre-professional education. Applicants are advised of their shortcomings and advised which additional courses will be required at the GSD. The high admission standards for the AP program have the effect of limiting the total number of students so admitted.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees
In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, *Appendix 5.*

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: The team found that the intention of the NAAB language is fulfilled in the various referenced documents, but "…the exact language…" was not met in that there were examples where the copy was incomplete and/or paraphrased and/or referenced the *2004* NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Despite this, there is compelling evidence that students are fully aware of the critical professional implications of accredited versus non-accredited architecture programs.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:
> *The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*
> *The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This condition is met by information on the GSD web site or thru links to NAAB web site. The NAAB C & P are also available in hard copy upon request via the faculty resource room.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:
> *www.ARCHCareers.org*
> *The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects*
> *Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture*
> *The Emerging Professional's Companion*
> *www.NCARB.org*
> *www.aia.org*
> *www.aias.org*
> *www.acsa-arch.org*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This condition is met by appropriate and related GSD web site links.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:
> *All Annual Reports, including the narrative*
> *All NAAB responses to the Annual Report*
> *The final decision letter from the NAAB*
> *The most recent APR*
> *The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda*

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The required items are available in the GSD faculty resource library and as per NAAB recommendation online.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This condition is met by the GSD web site via links to NCARB information.

III.   Appendices:

1.   Program Information

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

A.   History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)

Reference Harvard University, *APR,* pp. 6-9

B.   History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)

Reference Harvard University, APR, pp. 9-10

C.   Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference Harvard University, APR, pp. 18-20

D.   Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference Harvard University, APR, pp. 20-22

2. **Conditions Met with Distinction:**

I.2.3 Physical Resources

A.2 Design Thinking Skills

A.5 Investigative Skills

B.4 Site Design

C.1 Collaboration

C.6 Leadership

3. **The Visiting Team**

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
Judsen R. Marquardt, FAIA
LMN Architects
801 Second Avenue, Suite 501
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 682-3460
(206) 343-9388 fax
jmarquardt@lmnarchitects.com

Representing the ACSA
Jean-Francois Lejeune
Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
School of Architecture
University of Miami
Coral Gables, FL 33146-5010
(305) 284-5258
flejeune@miami.edu

Representing the AIAS
Melissa R. Petrie
900 N. Benton Avenue
Springfield, MO 65802
(816) 830-8160
mpetrie13@comcast.net

Representing the NCARB
James R. Carlson, AIA, NCARB
106 East Killingly Road
Foster, RI 02825
(401) 626-1654
jrcalc1@yahoo.com

IV.   Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Judsen R. Marquardt, FAIA **Team Chair**	**Representing the AIA**

Jean-Francois Lejeune **Team member**	**Representing the ACSA**

Melissa R. Petrie **Team member**	**Representing the AIAS**

James R. Carlson, AIA, NCARB **Team member**	**Representing the NCARB**