August 8, 2017

Dr. James P. Clements
President
201 Sikes Hall
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29634

Dear Dr. Clements,

At their July 2017 meeting, the directors of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) reviewed the Visiting Team Report (VTR) for Clemson University.

On behalf of the Board, it gives me great pleasure to inform you that the Master of Architecture degree program was granted eight-year term of accreditation. The term is effective January 1, 2017 and the program is scheduled for its next visit for continuing accreditation in 2025.

Please be reminded that continuing accreditation is predicated on two reporting requirements:

a) Annual Statistical Reports. These reports capture statistical information on the institution and the program. The next statistical report is due on or before November 30, 2017.

b) Interim Progress Reports. Programs that receive an eight-year term of accreditation must submit an Interim Progress Report (IPR) two years after a visit and again five years after the visit. Clemson’s first interim progress report is due November 30, 2018. There is more information on the IPR process in Section 10 of the NAAB 2015 Procedures for Accreditation.

Finally, public dissemination of both the Architecture Program Report and the VTR is a Condition of accreditation. These documents must be made public electronically in their entirety. Please see Condition II.4.4 of the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and Section 5 of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2015 Edition.

On behalf of the NAAB and the visiting team, thank you for your support of accreditation in architectural education.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Judith Kinnard, FAIA
President

cc: Kate Schwennsen, FAIA, Director
    Bruce E. Blackmer, FAIA, Team Chair
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Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architecture education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.
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I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgements and Observations

The NAAB team extends its deepest appreciation to the many people at Clemson University who made the team feel so welcome and assisted it during its visit. Special thanks go to Program Director Kate Schwennsen for orchestrating a productive agenda and marshalling resources for a truly exceptional team room. Considering all of the complexities of this program, the organization of the student work was extraordinary.

The School of Architecture (SoA) has a reputation of leadership within the university, and within the profession throughout South Carolina and beyond. Transformative progress on many fronts can be seen since the last NAAB review. New facilities, dramatic improvements in program clarity, and robust, integrated, remote program delivery at diverse locations all give the program vitality that is attractive to students, faculty, and the profession. Bringing order and cohesion to a complex and diverse array of offerings and initiatives over the past several years has been successfully achieved in ways that leverage and unify core program elements while still offering a wide variety of options to students. Two of the Master of Architecture pathways provide deep exploration of architecture as it relates to health and make up a celebrated research component of the school. Clemson is now recognized as an R1 research university.

The provost characterized the SoA as Clemson’s “most renowned program.” The dean noted how the merger of architecture, the arts, and the humanities into the College of Architecture, Arts, and Humanities (College of AAH) in 1995 set the stage for advancing the importance of the “architect as humanist.” The recent evolution of this combination of schools has broken the “silos” that is often inherent in professional programs, and brings the strength of design thinking to the entire university.

The school’s student body is unique in its unity within a diverse mix of student demographics. The team was impressed with the students’ engagement in its discussions with them regarding their education at Clemson. Students were brought together to write a studio culture policy. Many students said that they had a good work-school-life balance, and many were proud to be involved in, and to have become leaders in, student groups outside of architecture. Student-faculty relationships are strong, with teachers and the school leadership being characterized by students as “accommodating and inspiring.”

Faculty demonstrate a mutual respect for one another. Faculty outside the SoA commented on the striking improvement in interdisciplinary collaboration and the welcoming attitude toward it that has been experienced over the past 6 years. Opportunities for the further advancement of this collaboration are within the strategic vision of the program and the College of AAH. With a high percentage of faculty holding PhDs, the school is well positioned for success in research.

b. Conditions Not Achieved

B.9 Building Service Systems

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2009 Criterion B.11, Building Service Systems Integration (for Tracks 1, 2 & 3): 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

Previous Team Report (2011): For all tracks, Arch 874 Technical Resolution included curriculum regarding electrical system design, and Arch 892 Comprehensive Studio demonstrated understanding of vertical circulation systems. Numerous studios demonstrated understanding of
plumbing systems as they apply to sustainable systems for water conservation. That said, very little evidence was present demonstrating understanding of plumbing and electrical design, and no evidence was present indicating understanding of security or fire protection systems.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: SPC B.9 Building Service Systems in the current NAAB Conditions for Accreditation has replaced SPC B.11 from the 2009 visit. Student work in this criterion still does not reflect the prescribed level of achievement, and it remains Not Met.

2009 Criterion C.4, Project Management: Understanding of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods

Previous Team Report (2011): While evidence was found in Arch 881 Professional Practice Survey taught in Charleston, it was not found in the curriculum for the same class or in other courses taught at Clemson.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: This SPC is now Met.
III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

PART ONE (I): SECTION 1 – IDENTITY AND SELF-ASSESSMENT

1.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission, and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program’s pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. This includes the program’s benefits to the institutional setting, and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university’s academic plan. This also includes how the program as a unit develops multidisciplinary relationships and leverages opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.

2017 Analysis/Review: Clemson University, located in northwest South Carolina, is a land-grant and state-assisted university that opened in 1893. Its strategic priorities include Research (advanced materials, cyberinfrastructure and big data science, energy, transportation, and advanced manufacturing, human resilience, health innovation, and sustainable environments), Engagement (student, community, and public-private partnerships), Academic Core (interdisciplinary curricula, general education, and enhanced advising), and Living (being an outstanding place to live and work). These are to be enabled by Revenue Growth (manages enrollment, legislative, and development priorities while enhancing entrepreneurial activities and operational efficiencies), Building Futures (new and renovated multi-function facilities), College Reorganization, and Accountability and Leadership (manages resources and focus on impact). In October 2014, U.S. News & World Report ranked Clemson as a Top 20 Public University. The university has over 17,000 undergraduate students and over 4,500 graduate students, who are enrolled in more than 80 majors, more than 75 minors, and more than 110 graduate degree programs.

In the early 1970s, the school was departmentalized and awarded college status. At that time, the predecessors of the current School of Architecture and the departments of Art, Construction Science and Management, Planning, Development, and Preservation, and Landscape Architecture were created. In 1995, the university was restructured; the College of Architecture merged with the College of Liberal Arts, and the new College of AAH was formed with schools that included the School of the Arts, the School of Design and Building, and the School of the Humanities. The School of Design and Building includes the School of Architecture, the Department of Planning, Development, and Preservation, the Department of Landscape Architecture, and the Department of Construction Science and Management.

Information provided in the APR, discussions with the provost and the dean, and interactions with alumni and supporters gave the team an indication of the strengths of the program within the university and the communities that it touches. The SoA’s vision is to be a source of transformational architectural leadership to shape the environment of the 21st century. This leadership includes developing the “fluid campus” concept as part of the university’s goal to be globally connected. This concept provides off-campus opportunities for students to study at the Clemson University Charles E. Daniels Center for Building Research and Urban Studies in Genoa, Italy, the Barcelona Architecture Center (BAC) in Spain, and the Clemson Architecture Center in Charleston (CAC C). The success of the program’s fluid campus demonstrates the university’s goal to be globally connected. The provost views it as a precursor for curricular exploration in the Asian sphere.

1.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages 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.
• The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy that also includes a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition to the matters identified above, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.

• The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include, but are not limited to, participation in field trips, professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

2017 Analysis/Review: Insights into the learning culture of the program are presented in the APR (pp 5-6) and were supplemented by additional information provided through team interviews and meetings with students and faculty.

Adequate and focused policies that address the learning and studio culture were made available to the team. The school updated its studio culture policy in August 2016 at a faculty retreat and based it on feedback from students and faculty.

Both students and faculty acknowledge the significance of the issues addressed by the school’s “Learning and Studio Culture Statements,” and they strive to adhere to the expectations described in these policy documents as they relate to work-school-life balance, general health and well-being, and professional conduct. There is a genuine atmosphere of trust and an informal understanding involving mutual effort, camaraderie, and support between students, between students and faculty, and between students and staff.

1.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources.

• The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students as compared with the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution during the next two accreditation cycles.

• The program must document that institutional-, college-, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

2017 Analysis/Review: It is apparent that all levels of the university, including the SoA, have recognized the need to diversify and have begun implementing methods to do so with regard to the student body, faculty, staff, and guest speakers in lecture series. The university’s statement on inclusion reads as follows: “Clemson University aspires to create a diverse community that welcomes people of different races, cultures, ages, genders, sexual orientation, religions, socioeconomic levels, political perspectives, abilities, opinions, values and experiences…” In 2016, Clemson established the Chief Diversity Office, and in February 2016, the first chief diversity officer was named. The SoA has a plan to increase gender and racial diversity by 15% among students and faculty by 2020 to more accurately reflect the diversity of the state’s citizenry. It hopes to double its underrepresented groups in the next 10 years. The SoA has achieved a higher level of diversity within its student body than has the rest of the university and hopes to be a campus leader regarding diversity.

Multiple departments of the School of Design and Building created a video entitled “Imagine and Create the Future,” which highlights the achievements of school alumni and students of color, and was distributed to middle schools. The SoA has established a Student Council for Diverse Design Thinking, which is dedicated to dialogue between diverse groups, organizations, and individuals within the allied design disciplines. The SoA has also supported the creation of a new National Organization of Minority Architecture Students (NOMAS) chapter and a Women in Architecture Students (WIAS) organization to promote diversity, and is expanding its pre-collegiate summer offerings throughout the state. The school has stepped up efforts to attract non-traditional students, minority students, students beyond the usual geographic catch basin, and first-generation college applicants. From 2012 to 2015, the percentage of the student body that was white decreased from 82% to 74%. Since 2015, there has been an increase in the number of African American and Latino students, and the percentage of non-resident international
students has risen from 16% to 27%. However, in the team’s meeting with the faculty, faculty members expressed concern that the program has difficulty retaining first-generation students and that programs aimed at helping these students to remain in the program were not producing the intended results.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Collaboration and Leadership. The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders.

B. Design. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multi-dimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed at addressing increasingly complex problems, engaging a diverse constituency, and providing value and an improved future.

C. Professional Opportunity. The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and career paths for architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings, and in local and global communities.

D. Stewardship of the Environment. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and the natural resources that are significantly compromised by the act of building and by constructed human settlements.

E. Community and Social Responsibility. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens that are able to understand what it means to be a professional member of society and to act on that understanding. The social responsibility of architects lies, in part, in the belief that architects can create better places, and that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program’s response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to positively influence the development of, conservation of, or changes to the built and natural environment.

2017 Analysis/Review:

A. Collaboration and Leadership. As described in the APR (p. 12), students are engaged in team unity, communication and decision making, conflict resolution, and cultural awareness and empathy through a variety of studio and elective projects. The team’s meetings with students disclosed that the studio experiences include working individually, in teams (2-3 individuals), and/or in larger groups throughout the years of the program.

Clemson’s student organizations include NOMAS, WIAS, the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS), and the Graduate Architecture Student Partnership (GASP). It was noted in the APR that these organizations relay the voice of the students to the faculty and administration, and their feedback is relayed back down to the students. In the team’s meetings with the program director and the student body, it was noted that the leaders of the student organizations have seats at the table for faculty meetings. Representatives of these organizations are encouraged to take on national leadership roles as well, as is evident by the fact that a 2015 graduate of the preprofessional BA program was seated as the 2015/2016 AIAS national vice-president.

B. Design. As described in the APR, design is at the core of the school’s professional degree programs, and they are “designed for students to learn the combinations of methods, skills, and cognitive processes that architectural design requires.” Clemson’s architecture students have excelled in design competitions, and have won several awards or honorable mentions each year. A strong design sensibility was apparent in the projects exhibited in the team room and elsewhere around the school.
C. Professional Opportunity. The South Carolina Board of Architectural Examiners provides funds for the student enrollment fee for IDP/AXP. The SoA has an Architect Licensing Advisor. The architecture courses taught at the Clemson, Charleston, Barcelona, and Genoa locations are taught primarily by practicing faculty. Local professionals come to speak in the Professional Practice courses and provide internships. The M. Arch pathways exploring architecture for health received the 2014 NCARB Award for Innovative Architecture Curricula that Integrates Education and Practice. Field trips, off-campus study, a new faculty brown-bag lunch-talk series, and the lecture series provide students with exposure to practice. Each year, there are internships in local firms within the Clemson area and beyond that involve several architecture students.

D. Stewardship of the Environment. The APR describes the environmental focus of studio projects (p. 16). Student work in the team room indicated that this focus is a key component of all studio projects. SoA students have received several awards for projects submitted to design competitions, including the U.S. Department of Energy Solar Decathlon, where they submitted the Indigo Pine house project. Over 100 students have participated in this project over the last 3 years. The project continues, and the house is located at the South Carolina Botanical Garden. The Lee III expansion to the architecture facilities is a LEED Gold and Net Zero Energy building. The design and structure of the building make it a “building that teaches.” Students are encouraged to design structures that are eligible for LEED Certification. The fluid campus experience exposes students to various geographies, climates, and built environments.

E. Community and Social Responsibility. Students are exposed to a variety of local social situations in certain studios. As stated in the APR, the aim is to train active, engaged citizens who are responsive to the needs of a changing world. With this training, graduates will be able to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges through design and conservation. The fluid campus experience involves several studios and courses in multiple locations. For example, the projects in Charleston provide opportunities for community engagement. These include design proposals for renovating a YMCA, a project to repurpose an existing warehouse, and urban design proposals for reconstituting the former separated low-income African American neighborhoods. The CAC C’s Architect2Architect Seminar series engages students and practitioners in conversations about architecture and the community.

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement with a ratified planning document and/or planning process. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources, to identify patterns and trends so as to inform its future planning and strategic decision making. The program must define how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college, and university.

2017 Analysis/Review: Long-range planning in the SoA is directly linked with strategic planning processes, objectives, and schedules at both the college and university levels, according to information found in the APR (pp. 13-14). The university’s most recent strategic planning process, 2020 Clemson Forward, began in fall 2014 after the arrival of the new president and provost, and resulted in the establishment of university-wide committees and the reorganization of the College of AAH. This followed the previous strategic plan, the 2020 Roadmap, which provided a plan for the lean years of budget reallocations during FY12-FY15. This plan largely achieved its vision when the university was ranked as a Top 20 Public University by U.S. News & World Report in October 2014.

The College of AAH began developing its strategic plan in spring 2016. A strategic planning task force, along with the leadership of the three “virtual” schools of the college, created drafts of their objectives. These drafts were overlaid and blended to become the College of AAH 5-year Strategic Plan for 2016-2021, and the plan was presented in draft form to the Board of Trustees in July 2016.

The SoA’s version of the 2020 Clemson Forward plan began in January 2016. It was built on the previous 2020 Roadmap with data and goals from both the Architecture 2020 Plan Progress Report and the College of AAH plan. The School of Architecture 2020 Clemson Forward Strategic Plan 2016-2020 was approved in August 2016. The changes in the plan that resulted from the last NAAB team visit included coordinating the courses on the program’s four campuses (Clemson, Charleston, Genoa, and Barcelona) in order to reduce the administrative complexity. In addition, “bookend” semesters were created, which enable students to take courses that are not impacted by travel semesters.
The SoA’s long-range planning process identifies objectives, tracks 10-year national trends, and compares the Clemson program to peer programs. School leadership and faculty stay abreast of national trends through participation in organizations, conferences, research, practice, visiting critiques, and program self-assessment.

I.1.6 Assessment:

A. Program Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:
   - How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated objectives.
   - Progress against its defined multi-year objectives.
   - Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.
   - Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

   The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success.

B. Curricular Assessment and Development: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments, and must identify 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.

2017 Analysis/Review: The SoA has a well-established system of self-assessment, which is documented in the APR (pp. 14-15). As determined through team interviews with the faculty and students, a genuine spirit of collegiality also provides for an effective informal consultation process. The school’s standing committees and faculty meetings provide venues for the formal assessment of areas of responsibility. The program uses course evaluations and formal and informal surveys to assess the program’s performance and plan for its future development.

As reported in the APR (p. 15) and confirmed in the team discussions with the school’s faculty and the program director, the official mechanism for establishing and reviewing the curriculum is the school’s Curriculum and Assessment Committee, which consists of three members representing the three teaching streams (Design, Technology, and Humanities) who serve 3-year staggered terms, and the directors of the undergraduate and graduate programs. Decisions made by this committee are reported to, and debated by, the school’s faculty before they are considered by the college’s Curriculum Committee.

Faculty retreats are organized annually to discuss the vision for the school, reassess the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum, and establish future directions. As reported in the APR (p. 14), the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE) also reviews individual college programs on a regular basis.

Students regularly assess teaching through university-administered course evaluations. As confirmed in meetings with the students and the program director, students have an opportunity to provide direct feedback. The program director meets with the student representatives on a regular basis to discuss operational details, student concerns, and the overall direction of the school.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

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

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

[X] Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of compliance with this condition is presented in the APR (pp. 18-38). Verification of this evidence and supplemental information was provided through team interviews and meetings with faculty and students. There are currently 26 full-time faculty positions on the Clemson campus: 11 tenured, 8 tenure track, 5 lecturers, 1 Professor of Practice, and 1 Research Assistant Professor (APR, p. 18). There are also 3 part-time lecturers. As reported in the APR (p. 18), the CAC C has 1 tenured faculty member, 1 full-time senior lecturer, and 4 part-time lecturers. In Genoa, there is 1 full-time lecturer and 4 part-time lecturers. The Barcelona Architecture Center provides its own staff and faculty, most of whom are practicing Barcelona architects.

Approximately one-third of all faculty members (15) on the Clemson campus hold doctoral degrees. There are approximately 20 US registered architects among the full-time faculty. Most faculty members teach one studio and one course per term, and are expected to devote about one-quarter of their time to scholarship, research, and/or creative activity, with additional time devoted to service to the university, the profession, or the community. Faculty with advanced degrees who supervise post-professional (research) students do not receive teaching-load credit for that supervision.

As reported in the APR (p. 20), faculty members can apply for small grants from various internal sources to initiate and advance their research interests. Faculty can also apply for conference travel grants to enable them to present their work. The school has several named professorships and endowed chairs, as well as the ‘Creativity Professorship’ program, which also contributes to faculty development.

The school has an Architect Licensing Advisor. Each fall, he and representatives from the South Carolina Architectural Licensing Board and/or NCARB meet with students to discuss professional licensing and the Architectural Experience Program (AXP).

The SoA has five administrative staff members on the Clemson campus who provide support to faculty and students. There are two additional non-administrative, full-time staff members with specialized responsibilities. The programs in Charleston, Genoa, and Barcelona also have support staff who provide students with academic and personal advising.

I.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including labs, shops, and
equipment.

- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- Information 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, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

[X] Described

2017 Team Assessment: In the APR (pp. 39-57), the team found descriptions of the program's physical resources and the floor plans for all of the facilities on the Clemson campus, at the CAC C in Charleston, at the BAC in Barcelona, and at the Clemson University Charles E. Daniels Center for Building Research and Urban Studies in Genoa. The APR also explained how the facilities support the program's pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Since the last NAAB team visit, three of the four campuses have moved into new or recently renovated facilities. The Clemson campus program moved into the award-winning, Thomas Phifer-designed Lee III expansion, which was completed and opened in January 2012 to house the M.Arch program. This LEED Gold facility's unique structure, open concept, daylighting system, and green roof are not only functional, but they also provide physical examples of systems that are applied in the architecture studies. During the course of the Lee III construction, the existing Lee I and Lee II facilities underwent significant renovation. The Clemson campus also has recently obtained access to a 15,000 sq ft warehouse facility on the campus bus route within 5 miles of campus. It is to be utilized for storage and pre-fabrication research installation purposes. In August 2016, the CAC C moved into the newly renovated Cigar Factory, a historic textile mill. The BAC moved into its newly renovated facilities in Fall 2014. The Clemson University Charles E. Daniels Center for Building Research and Urban Studies is owned by the Clemson Architectural Foundation (CAF) and is maintained through university funding.

The SoA is part of the campus-wide electronic infrastructure and maintains a staff of three dedicated technicians to offer support to students and faculty. Students are expected to provide their own laptops. Laser cutters and 3D printers are available in the architecture facilities for student use free of charge. There are no plotting capabilities in the architecture facilities, but plotting services are available in the main library, which is approximately 0.25 mile from the SoA. Students share three plotters that serve the entire university, with printing costs absorbed by the students. One in-house color printer serves the entire Lee complex. The CAC C has three private plotters.

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment: The APR (pp. 16-17) describes the architecture program's financial resources and its ability to meet budgets. Team meetings with the program director confirmed that funding is adequate, faculty requests for travel are commonly funded, and students receive financial support. The program is seen by the university as one of its most recognized, and, as a result, it receives strong financial support. Outside resources are also available as reflected in the recent $4 million grant for the M.Arch pathways exploring architecture for health. The architecture program maintained a stable budget during a period of cuts by the university, with architectural salaries being increased during that period. The program has seen significant budget increases in recent years.

I.2.4 Information Resources: The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

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

[X] Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment: In the APR (pp. 39-57) and in the Architecture Information Access Policy, evidence was provided indicating that all students, faculty, and staff have access to adequate information resources, including physical resources, digital resources, and information resource personnel. The Gunnin Library in Lee II is a branch of the Clemson University Library system. In addition to receiving funding through this system, the library receives an annual $25,000 external funding gift through the South Carolina Board of Architectural Examiners, which is strictly for library materials and resources in direct support of architecture, sustainable building design, and the urban built environment. The information resource funding is formally requested and reviewed annually.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

- Administrative Structure: The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and the school, college, and institution.

- Governance: The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[X] Described

2017 Team Assessment: The APR (pp. 66-71) presents a description and diagrammatic representation of the administrative structure of the SoA and its programs. As one of 10 units within the College of AH, the school has a single director/chair who appoints other faculty to partial administrative duties, including the associate chair, director of graduate studies, director of undergraduate programs, directors of certificate programs, centers, and institutes, and directors and resident professors in off-campus centers. The director/chair carries a 75% administration and 25% teaching work distribution. The director/chair reports directly to the college dean.

The APR (pp. 72-73) presents a brief overview of the governance structures. The standing committees are Faculty and Student Advisory, Teaching Streams, Curriculum and Assessment, Honors and Awards, Faculty Search and Screening, Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment, Post-Tenure Review, Graduate Admissions, and Sabbatical. These committees are complemented by other ad hoc committees and an array of student organizations: the AIAS, which represents mainly undergraduate students; GASP, which represents graduate students; WIAS; and NOMAS.
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: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

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

A.1 Professional Communication Skills: Ability to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8620 History and Theory III, Arch 8640 History and Theory IV, and Arch 8880 Architectural Programming.

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

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for the core studios: Arch 8410 Architecture Studio I, Arch 8420 Architecture Studio II, Arch 8510 Design Studio III, and Arch 8520 Design Studio IV. Additional evidence was provided in Arch 8920 Comprehensive Studio (Studio VI).

A.3 Investigative Skills: Ability to gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Student ability was developed in different ways in research papers, digital design fabrication projects, and analytical building technologies studies. Evidence was found in studio projects prepared for Arch 8210 Research Methods, Arch 8410 Architecture Studio I, Arch 8420 Architecture Studio II, Arch 8610 History and Theory II, Arch 8580 Thesis Research, and Arch 8590 Thesis Manuscript.
A.4 Architectural Design Skills: Ability to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8510 Design Studio III and Arch 8960 A+H Studio: Selected Projects and for the entire studio sequence.

A.5 Ordering Systems: Ability to apply the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8700 Structures I, Arch 8710 Structures II, and Arch 8860 Health Facilities Design and Planning.

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

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8860 Health Facilities Design and Planning and Arch 8960 A+H Studio: Selected Projects.

A.7 History and Culture: Understanding of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, and regional settings in terms of their political, economic, social, and technological factors.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8610 History and Theory II, Arch 8620 History and Theory III, Arch 8640 History and Theory IV, and Arch 6850 History and Theory of A+H.

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

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level related to cultural diversity was found in student work prepared for Arch 8510 Design Studio III, Arch 8570 Design Studio V, and Arch 6850 History and Theory of A+H. Evidence of an understanding of issues associated with social equity was found in Arch 8620 History and Theory III, Arch 8640 History and Theory IV, and Arch 6850 History and Theory of A+H.
Realm A. General Team Commentary: All criteria in this realm are met. There was ample evidence in exhibited student projects and writings that students possessed the necessary design thinking, investigative, and communication skills and abilities. Students exhibited the ability to explore their design ideas effectively, from writing, sketching, and diagramming, to digital modeling and physical model-making. Conceptual ideas were developed through thematic research and precedent analyses that were pertinent to the pedagogic objectives of each studio. Projects were successfully presented through diagrams, normative drawings, axonometric views, rendered interior and exterior perspectives, and carefully crafted scale models produced using a variety of digital fabrication equipment available in the school. Student projects related to community-based initiatives in Charleston demonstrated a deep understanding of cultural diversity and social equity, according to team discussions with students. The proliferation of group and team projects across the studios and courses that were presented in the team room suggested that a large part of the studies at the M. Arch level is devoted to collaborative practice.

Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. Additionally, the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately.

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

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8920 Comprehensive Studio (Studio VI) and Arch 8570 Design Studio V.

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

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in studio projects in Arch 8520 Design Studio IV, Arch 8570 Design Studio V, and Arch 8970 A+H Studio: Hospitals.

B.3 Codes and Regulations: Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student
work prepared for Arch 8820 Professional Practice II, Arch 8920 Comprehensive Studio (Studio VI), and Arch 8970 A+H Studio. Hospitals.

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

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8720 Production and Assemblies, and Arch 8740 Technical Resolution.

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

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8700 Structures I, Arch 8710 Structures II, and Arch 8720 Production and Assemblies.

B.6 Environmental Systems: Understanding of the principles of environmental systems’ design, how systems can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This must include active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8520 Design Studio IV and Arch 8730 Environmental Systems.

B.7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies: Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8730 Environmental Systems and Arch 8740 Technical Resolution. Additional examples of student achievement were found in many studio projects in Arch 8920 Comprehensive Studio (Studio VI).

B.8 Building Materials and Assemblies: Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components, and assemblies based on their inherent performance, including environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: This criterion is Met with Distinction Evidence of this was found in student work prepared for Arch 8710 Structures II and Arch 8720 Production and Assemblies.

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

[X] Not Met
2017 Team Assessment: Communication, vertical transportation, and security systems were not consistently found in studios or coursework. The team requested additional evidence, which was provided by the school. The team was still unable to locate the appropriate material.

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

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8820 Professional Practice II.

**Realm B. General Team Commentary:** With the exception of the elements of B.9, students demonstrated a sound comprehension of the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials. Applications of these were evidenced in their architectural solutions. The team noted examples of exceptional student work in Realm B, particularly regarding technical, structural, and building envelope systems in both coursework and studio work.

**Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions:** Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.
- Responding to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.
- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.

C.1 **Research:** Understanding of the theoretical and applied research methodologies and practices used during the design process.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8210 Research Methods.

C.2 **Evaluation and Decision Making:** Ability to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8210 Research Methods.

C.3 **Integrative Design:** Ability to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

[X] Met
2017 Team Assessment: This criterion is Met with Distinction. Evidence of this was found in student work prepared for Arch 8920 Comprehensive Studio (Studio VI). High-pass work demonstrated an ability to produce integrated design in a comprehensive and broad way. Low-pass work addressed virtually all of the elements of integrated design and demonstrated students’ ability to work them into a building design. Students clearly demonstrated an ability to comprehensively integrate the myriad elements of architecture into their design solutions.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The school is especially strong in Realm C. There was ample evidence in exhibited student projects from the comprehensive design studios that students possessed the necessary abilities and skills to synthesize a broad range of contextual, design, and technical considerations into an integrated design solution. As is the case with design studios in the program, student projects in the comprehensive studios are done in teams. The quality of the projects is high, which is in large part due to collaborative teamwork.

Realm D: Professional Practice: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction.
- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.
- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture: Understanding of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect, and other key stakeholders, such as user groups and the community, in the design of the built environment, and understanding the responsibilities of the architect to reconcile the needs of those stakeholders.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8810 Professional Practice I.

D.2 Project Management: Understanding of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams; identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements; and recommending project delivery methods.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8810 Professional Practice I.

D.3 Business Practices: Understanding of the basic principles of business practices within the firm, including financial management and business planning, marketing, business organization, and entrepreneurialism.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8810 Professional Practice I.
D.4 Legal Responsibilities: Understanding of the architect’s responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8820 Professional Practice II.

D.5 Professional Ethics: Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice, and understanding the role of the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 8810 Professional Practice I.

Realm D. General Team Commentary: Realm D connects directly to the practice of architecture. Evidence showed that the elements of the realm are taught in the Professional Practice I and II courses. The instructional content exposes students to a range of professional scenarios and literature.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation:

In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. 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 Higher Learning Commission (formerly the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

2. Institutions located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program’s country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Clemson University is a part of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). It currently enjoys an accredited status with no stipulations. The most recent SACSCOC visit reaffirmed the institution’s accreditation in 2013 for a 10-year period that ends in 2023. Information regarding the institution’s accreditation can be found on the Clemson University website.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following 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.
The B. Arch, M. Arch, and/or D. Arch are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch, M. Arch, or D. Arch for a non-accredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Every accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Clemson University has four pathways to the M. Arch degree. In all of the pathways, students are limited to a maximum of 15 credit hours per semester and a minimum of 9 as full-time students. Pathway A is intended for students without a 6-8 semester portfolio. These students may come from any undergraduate background. Pathway A has a total requirement of 90 credit hours and typically takes 3 years to complete. Pathway B is intended for students with a preprofessional Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science in Architecture degree, and has a total of 60 credit hours. Being accepted into Pathway B requires an applicant to submit a competitive portfolio of design studio work, which is evaluated by a selection committee. After 1 year, students in Pathway A parallel students in Pathway B for the remaining curriculum.

Pathways C and D are similar to Pathways A and B, but they have reduced electives and added requirements focusing on health. Students in Pathways C and D are required to have a 1-credit summer internship.

Pathway A and Pathway B have bookend semesters before and after 2 fluid campus semesters. The bookend semesters address core requirements for all four pathways, with the 2 fluid campus semesters offering a wide variety of opportunities within a consistent framework of educational delivery and outcomes. Most NAAB Student Performance Criteria are addressed in the bookend semesters, with a lower proportion being addressed during the fluid campus semesters at diverse locations.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB Student Performance Criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.
- In the event that a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate that it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The APR (pp. 97-98) describes student admission procedures. More detailed explanations of the assessment process were provided in the team's meetings with the school's director, director of graduate studies, director of undergraduate programs, and faculty. A template is used for scoring applicants and their portfolios, and for evaluating their strengths and weaknesses. From that assessment, a determination is made as to whether the school offers the applicant advanced placement in Pathway B or admission into Pathway A, or rejects the application. Given that some Student Performance Criteria are addressed only in the first year of Pathway A and Pathway C, advanced placement in Pathway B and Pathway D relies on preparatory education for addressing those criteria. As documented during the team visit, applicants who are considered for advanced placement are asked for additional evidence (such
as course descriptions and coursework) to indicate that certain Student Performance Criteria have been met.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the general public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online.

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 1, in catalogs and promotional media.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of the statement on NAAB-accredited degrees is found at http://www.clemson.edu/caah/departments/architecture/about/accreditation.html

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty, and the public:

The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The Conditions for Accreditation in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004, depending on the date of the last visit)

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The Conditions for Accreditation in effect at the time of the last visit (2009), the Conditions for Accreditation currently in effect (2014), and the Procedures for Accreditation (2015) are available at http://www.clemson.edu/caah/departments/architecture/about/accreditation.html

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Clemson University provides career development information on the following website links:

http://www.clemson.edu/caah/departments/architecture/about/accreditation.html
The Emerging Professional’s Companion http://epcompanion.org/
National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) http://www.ncarb.org
American Institute of Architects (AIA) http://www.aia.org
American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS) http://aias.org
Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) http://www.acsa-arch.org
National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) http://naab.org/home
Michelin Career Center, Clemson University http://career.clemson.edu

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 electronically available to the public:
- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- All NAAB Responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB.
- The most recent APR.\(^1\)
- The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Links to all Interim Progress Reports, NAAB Responses to Interim Progress Reports, the most recent NAAB decision letter, the most recent APR, and the final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report (VTR) are provided in the Clemson School of Architecture Accreditation Reports and Documents section of the School of Architecture page of the Clemson University website: [http://www.clemson.edu](http://www.clemson.edu)

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates:

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their websites to the results.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Links to the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards' pass rates for the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) by institution are provided on the School of Architecture page of the Clemson University website [http://www.clemson.edu](http://www.clemson.edu). A link to the site is also located in the School of Architecture Graduate Program Handbook, p. 2 - link for School of Architecture, and p. 3 - link for Accrediting Information.

II.4.6 Admissions and Advising:

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions.
- Admissions requirements, admissions decision procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing.
- Forms and process for the evaluation of preprofessional degree content.
- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships.
- Student diversity initiatives.

---

\(^1\) This is understood to be the APR from the previous visit, not the APR for the visit currently in process.
[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The policies and procedures that govern how applicants are evaluated for admission and advanced placement are described in the APR in Section II.3, under “Evaluation of Preparatory Education” (pp. 97-98). The school’s website describes the admissions process for applicants in detail. A spreadsheet template is used to evaluate preprofessional degree content. The school’s Graduate Admissions webpage contains a section about financial aid. This webpage has information about educational loans and the school’s assistantships and fellowships for which students may apply. As described in the APR (pp. 99-100), the directors of graduate, concentration, and certificate programs serve as advisors to M. Arch students in their respective programs or certificates.

II.4.7 Student Financial Information:

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of compliance with this condition is found in the APR (p. 100). Links are provided to various university and school webpages that offer information regarding tuition, living expenses, and other costs. Students are advised to consider expenses such as the cost of drawing and modeling materials, printing, and laser cutter lenses. The school’s Graduate Admissions webpage contains sections on tuition and costs, financial aid, educational loans, and assistantships and fellowships. A separate webpage describes the costs associated with the school’s various off-campus study programs.
PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit Annual Statistical Reports in the format required by the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to the 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.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The APR (p. 101) contains a copy of the letter sent to the NAAB by Clemson's Office for Institutional Research certifying that data reported in the Annual Statistical Reports was accurate and consistent with reports sent to other national and regional agencies. The school also provided copies of the submitted Annual Statistical Reports.

III.2 Interim Progress Reports: The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (see Section 10, NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2015 Edition).

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The Interim Progress Reports from the 2013 NAAB team can be found under "Clemson School of Architecture Accreditation Reports and Documents" at: http://www.clemson.edu/csaah/departments/architecture/about/accreditation.html
IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

B.8 Building Materials and Assemblies
C.3 Integrative Design
Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrices for the Four Pathways

Pathway A.

![Pathway A Matrix]

Pathway B.

![Pathway B Matrix]
Pathway C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arch 210</td>
<td>Visualization I</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 211</td>
<td>Architectural Studies I</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 215</td>
<td>History and Theory I</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 216</td>
<td>Site and Context</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 218</td>
<td>Architecture Studies II</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 219</td>
<td>History, Theory II</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 221</td>
<td>Studio 1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 223</td>
<td>History and Theory of Art</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 225</td>
<td>Studio 2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 231</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 233</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 235</td>
<td>Advanced Architectural Design</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 236</td>
<td>Architecture Studio II</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 238</td>
<td>History, Theory III</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 239</td>
<td>Studio 3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 241</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 242</td>
<td>Architecture Studio III</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 243</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 244</td>
<td>Architecture Studio IV</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 245</td>
<td>History, Theory IV</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 246</td>
<td>Studio 4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 247</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 248</td>
<td>Architecture Studio V</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 249</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 250</td>
<td>Architecture Studio VI</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 251</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 252</td>
<td>Architecture Studio VII</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 253</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 254</td>
<td>Architecture Studio VIII</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 255</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 256</td>
<td>Architecture Studio IX</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 257</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 258</td>
<td>Architecture Studio X</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pathway D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arch 610</td>
<td>History of Architecture</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 611</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 612</td>
<td>Studio 1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 613</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 614</td>
<td>Studio 2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 615</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 616</td>
<td>Studio 3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 617</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 618</td>
<td>Studio 4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 619</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 620</td>
<td>Studio 5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 621</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 622</td>
<td>Studio 6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 623</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 624</td>
<td>Studio 7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 625</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 626</td>
<td>Studio 8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 627</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 628</td>
<td>Studio 9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 629</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 630</td>
<td>Studio 10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch 631</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
Bruce E. Blackmer, FAIA
NAC/Architecture
1203 West Riverside Avenue
Spokane, WA 99201-1107
(509) 838-8240
(509) 838-8261 fax
bblackmer@nacarchitecture.com

Representing the ACSA
Dr. Branko Kolarevic, Professor
Co-Director, Computational Media Design (CMD) Program
University of Calgary
Faculty of Environmental Design
2500 University Drive NW
Calgary, AB, Canada T2N 1N4
(403) 220-7976
(403) 284-4399 fax
branko.kolarevic@ucalgary.ca

Representing the AIAS
Amanda Ochs
12446 North Golden Mirror Drive
Tucson, AZ 85721
(520) 223-1157
armandakochs@email.arizona.edu

Representing the NCARB
Karen Williams, AIA, NCARB, LEED®AP BD+C
Project Architect/Manager
PIVOT Architecture
44 W. Broadway
Eugene, OR 97401
(850) 445-3027
karenewilliams@gmail.com

Non-voting member
Dennis S. Ward, FAIA, NCARB
President
FW Architects
PO Box 2261
Florence, SC 29503
(843) 662.9961
(842) 665.5055 fax
dward@fw-architects.com
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce E. Blackmer, FAIA, NCARB
Team Chair
Representing the AIA

Dr. Branko Kolarevic
Team Member
Representing the ACSA

Amanda Ochs
Team Member
Representing the AIAS

Karen Williams, AIA, NCARB, LEED®AP BD+C
Team Member
Representing the NCARB

Dennis S. Ward, FAIA, NCARB
Non-voting member