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I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The visiting team thanks the University of Southern California (USC) School of Architecture administration, faculty, staff, and students for their generosity and hospitality, as well as the gathering and presentation of site visit materials to support the effective virtual site visit for the Bachelor of Architecture and Master of Architecture. Thanks to Director of Graduate and Post-Professional Architecture Programs Alvin Huang and Director of Undergraduate Programs in Architecture Doris Sung, and a special thank you to NAAB Coordinator and Associate Director of Graduate Architecture Programs Selwyn Ting, for their high level of attentiveness to the team's needs and responsiveness throughout the process. All of their hard work leading up to and during the visit helped to make for a productive and enjoyable accreditation visit.

The Bachelor of Architecture program consists of a 5-year degree. The Master of Architecture program consists of a two-year and three-year track. Both degrees offer students the opportunity to enroll in the IPAL program, of which USC is a founding partner. Both programs offer additional education in the form of minors for bachelor's students, and certificates for graduate students, of which 30% of students participate.

The school is uniquely situated in Los Angeles and works hard to reflect the diversity of the community they are situated in. The School of Architecture easily demonstrates excellence in diversity in its faculty, staff, students, and administration. Students in both programs have impressive diversity in academic and economic background, race, and origin. The school is enhancing the pipeline and access to architecture through their A-Lab program in a significant way, which brings in high school students for a semester of learning and exploration. The school's approach to a holistic review of students continues to enhance diversity and speaks to their search and development of the citizen architect.

The bachelor's and master's programs are positioned to mold citizen architects of the students that enter the program. With deeply seeded appreciation for diversity, practice, and the changing world, USC students are well sought after and ready to make a difference. One of many highlights noted by all in the program is the Architecture Guild. In its 63-year history, the Guild continues to provide a unique opportunity for connection to professional practice through mentorship, charettes, and other events. This connection to the profession continues to inspire current students and draw interest from new faculty and students.

In the many virtual meetings and conversations with faculty, staff, and students, the community and culture created in the School of Architecture is highly evident. Collegial spirit and open communication flow through every aspect of the program of those that inhabit Watt and Harris Halls. The support and care shared amongst all members of the school is tangible even in a virtual visit and exemplary. While the facilities currently meet the needs of the program, adequate space is a pressing challenge that is expected to increase in the near future.

The program has made great efforts in closing the funding and communication gap between the university upper administration and the School of Architecture with the creation of the Faculty Council that has more frequent and direct communication with the dean. Interim Dean Willow Bay is helping foster that communication and leading efforts in better connecting university administration and the school. The School of Architecture is looking forward to the future with a new dean appointment that will continue to foster programming currently in place and provide strong leadership to the evolving program.
There have been many changes in the past few years as we emerge from the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as adjusting to the NAAB 2020 Conditions and Procedures. The faculty, staff, and students have worked together to rebuild their sense of community and reinvigorate their studios as they join back in person full time. With the change to the new Conditions and Procedures, assessment comes to the forefront of programs and their development. While the program is exceeding in curricular development, the evolution of assessment and program benchmarks will require additional attention.

Thank you again to all of those who participated in the visit and fill the School of Architecture with diversity, culture, and sense of school pride.

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

B.Arch.
SC.6 Building Integration
4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education
5.2 Planning and Assessment
5.6 Physical Resources
5.7 Financial Resources

M.Arch.
SC.6 Building Integration
4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education
5.2 Planning and Assessment
5.6 Physical Resources
5.7 Financial Resources

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2014 Conditions Not Met

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.

Previous Team Report (2014): The 2013 APR report was verified by the USC Vice President of Admissions and Planning, who also verified the 2007-2012 annual reports. The program provided the 2007 Annual Report. The 2013 Statistical Report, Part 1 was provided through the NAAB website. The 2008-2012 annual reports and NAAB responses were not available.

2020 IPR Board Review: After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Southern California, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that
the program has demonstrated progress toward addressing some deficiencies, but is required to provide the Long-Range Plan for the school, including a financial plan. The program is required to submit a narrative in its next APR outlining how these deficiencies have been addressed, and provide evidence of such at the next accreditation visit.

2023 Team Analysis: Condition I.3.2 Annual Reports is no longer included in the 2020 Conditions and Procedures. The program has complied with the I.3.2 requirements and provided a public link to all Interim Progress Reports and Program Annual Reports dating back to 2014, which is the time of the last visit.

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.

Previous Team Report (2014):
B. Arch: [X] Not Met
M. Arch: [X] Not Met

The visiting team found no evidence of a comprehensive approach to 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.

2020 IPR Board Review: After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Southern California, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated progress toward addressing some deficiencies, but is required to provide the Long-Range Plan for the school, including a financial plan. The program is required to submit a narrative in its next APR outlining how these deficiencies have been addressed, and provide evidence of such at the next accreditation visit.

2023 Team Analysis: Condition B.7 Financial Considerations is no longer included in the 2020 Conditions and Procedures. ARCH 526 which is required for both B.Arch. and M.Arch students has exercises that provide integration of value engineering but does not focus on dollar amounts. The program is in the process of incorporating a cost analysis exercise in ARCH 500AL and ARCH 605BL.

III. Program Changes

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

2023 Team Analysis:
Given the creation and implementation of the 2020 Conditions and Procedures, the USC School of Architecture has undergone several changes. One of the changes to the NAAB Conditions and Procedures is the integration of assessment. The USC School of Architecture is beginning to implement their own assessment plan, and plan to have the first round complete in Fall of 2023. The school has also worked to realign and identify its curriculum to correlate with the Program and Student Criteria. The program continues on their path of molding and shaping "Citizen Architects" and are effectively using the new Conditions and Procedures to do so.

Since the last accreditation cycle, the program also saw their past Dean Milton Curry step down in 2022. The school and program are now led by Interim Dean Willow Bay, and they are in the midst of a dean search, which they hope to prove fruitful. In an effort to increase communication to the dean level with faculty, the school has created the Faculty Council, which was spoken highly of in many of the team’s site visit meetings. With the great success that the school of Architecture has seen, they have also created a
new degree program, the Bachelor of Science in Inventive Technologies. In addition, they have created two new research centers—Housing in the City and Wellness in the Built Environment.

In addition, with diversity equity and inclusion as a cornerstone of the Institution, the school has been working hard at their 5-Year Diversity and Inclusion Plan which will come to completion in 2023. One of the major elements is the creation of the Diversity Liaison role, which has been implemented. As part of the Diversity Plan, the M.Arch. in particular worked to increase student diversity, which successfully bolstered their enrollment.

IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

1—Context and Mission *(Guidelines, p. 5)*
To help the NAAB and the visiting team understand the specific circumstances of the school, the program must describe the following:

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

☒ Described

2023 Team Analysis:
The University of Southern California is located in Los Angeles, California. Founded in 1880, it has always been described as a “city university.” The USC School of Architecture was founded in 1919, at the intersection of a liberal arts college, professional schools, and art schools. There are three elements used to define the institutional context and mission—USC is a large private research university, the university is set in the heart of a metropolis located on the Pacific Rim, and USC is committed to a liberal education and serving the collective good. All of these items directly connect to the School of Architecture and their pedagogy.

The USC School of Architecture has over 100 faculty and over 670 students, while offering numerous degree programs. The program offers minors to those in undergraduate programs of other USC schools, and a certificate program for other graduate students. They also work hard to connect with the community with ALab, a program to connect local high school students to architecture. School of Architecture students can also participate in any of the hundreds of minors offered by the larger university. Students benefit from many aspects of USC as a whole, including expanded classroom space, information resources and library system, and support systems for work life balance and mental health. Many faculty hold dual appointments across various departments including Art History, Cinematic Arts, Engineering, Geospatial Science, and Gerontology. These faculty are also supported with university funding and recognition.
USC Architecture provides many ways for students and faculty to continue learning. One major and unique element if the Architecture Guild that works to extend the learning effort beyond the classroom. In conversations with faculty, staff, and students, there was continued appreciation for their work including engagement, portfolio reviews, mock interviews, mentorship, and design competitions. The Guild is made up of leaders in architecture, construction, engineering, finance, and real estate. The school offers several global study fellowships; full semesters for undergrad in Italy, Spain and Asia; and summer for graduate in France and Mexico. There are also a host of student organizations that are architecture and design focused including APX, AIAS, GASA, NOMAS, SAWA, SPACE, and AISSA. Many of the above items were confirmed in conversations with faculty, staff, administration, and undergraduate and graduate students.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

☒ Described

2023 Team Analysis:

Design: Design is framed in the context of the program’s focus on “Citizen Architects” who “must navigate and negotiate climate change, social equity, human/planet wellness and economic dynamics while designing safe, reliable, technically-sound, innovative and beautiful spaces and contextually-appropriate buildings.” A more in depth discussion is provided in APR section 3.1 PC.2 Design, which provides a detailed and thorough description of the studio sequences, educational objectives and content in both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs. The APR also describes a number of extracurricular activities that support this shared value including a lecture series, a student charette competition, required
semester-end portfolio submissions, and social activities involving design. This information was verified during the site visit. For example, the Architectural Guild provided details of their involvement in the portfolio review process.

**Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility:** USC believes in “Citizen Architects,” a term which defines their students as active citizens whose practices are often defined in relation to the world’s challenges. This shared value is expressed throughout the program and addressed in almost every course indicated in PC.3 and aligns with USC’s Sustainability Plan. The program’s extracurricular experiences describe campus engagement that focuses on human wellbeing and a healthy built environment. The Presidential Working Group on Sustainability Education, Research and Operations (PWG) includes representatives from the School of Architecture to help advance campus sustainability and serve the surrounding community. Two main goals are to advance human wellbeing, ecological health and biodiversity, and promote a healthy and nature informed built environment; and to integrate the natural built environment across the campuses and into the surrounding communities. At the site visit, students confirmed this shared value by discussing their participation in sustainability focused projects and collaboration in off campus workshops.

**Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion:** The school’s values and implementation is discussed in Section 5.5, Social Equity, Diversity and Inclusion and Section 3.1, PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion, which describes how the program furthers and deepens students’ understanding of a diverse cultural and social contexts by allowing them to participate in courses and extracurricular activities while interacting with diverse communities. More information can be found in the USCA Strategic DEI Plan as well as the USC’s Diversity and Inclusion page on the website. The APR indicates that once a year the overall sequence of courses and relationships between course content is assessed and is designed to make sure the content remains relevant and addresses the mission of the curriculum related to DEI. USC performed a benchmark survey conducted by the faculty to quantify gender, ethnic, and racial diversity in their course readings, case studies, guests, and to describe community service. This resulted in more awareness of the school’s strengths and weaknesses and revealed gaps in race and ethnicity, and ability v/s disability disabled community. USC indicated that priorities in the school’s next five year plan will include increasing full time faculty diversity, scholarships, and academic support for first generation and transfer students. A primary reason for students choosing to attend USC is the SOA’s reputation of being a diverse community and the exposure to various career paths. This information was confirmed during the site visit.

**Knowledge and Innovation:** The APR outlines USC’s approach to research as more than simply the act of sourcing and/or compilation of existing knowledge. Referencing language from the Long-Range Planning document, the APR outlines an “intersectional approach” to knowledge and innovation through coursework which allows students to engage all four of their programs including architecture, landscape and urbanism, building science, and heritage conservation. A more in-depth discussion is provided in APR section 3.1 PC.5 Research and Innovation. PC.5 provides a detailed and thorough description of the studio sequences, educational objectives and content in both the B.Arch. and M.Arch programs as well as lists of supporting courses that stress research and innovation in each program. The APR also describes a number of extracurricular activities that support this shared value including an annual research symposium and poster exhibition. The newly formed and growing Wellness and Housing research centers are also mentioned as means of potential contribution.

**Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement:** The program does both broadly, and from a curricular level instills a spirit of leadership and collaboration within the realm of allied design and planning professions, and community engagement through the general online messaging, credo, and mission and vision presented by the program. As an encompassing term to the role which USC’s shared values represent, USC School of Architecture literature and media frequently refer to the term - and its implied role in public leadership and engagement - of the “Citizen Architect.” In terms of actual course examples in which the program addresses leadership, collaboration, and community engagement, the program identifies ARCH 525 and ARCH 526, which are referenced in relation to PC.1 and PC.6.
Lifelong Learning: Direct instruction of leadership and collaboration occurs in ARCH 525 and ARCH 526, which cover a broad learning of the basic areas of Professional Practice, balancing architectural services with conventional and new approaches to business practices in the changing world. Students learn about leadership skills, traits and concepts, emphasizing that credibility is the heart of leadership. PC.6, Leadership and Collaboration, describes USC’s cultural mission of educating students as “Citizen Architects” to engage and shape the complexity of the built environment. PC.1, Career Paths, discusses this in more detail. To encourage continuous engagement and connection during and after graduation the USC provides opportunities to several extracurricular activities including student externship and membership to the USC Architectural Guild connections to the profession. These activities were confirmed at the site visit by faculty, students, and the Architectural Guild board.

3—Program and Student Criteria (Guidelines, p. 9)
These criteria seek to evaluate the outcomes of architecture programs and student work within their unique institutional, regional, national, international, and professional contexts, while encouraging innovative approaches to architecture education and professional preparation.

3.1 Program Criteria (PC) (Guidelines, p. 9)
A program must demonstrate how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address the following criteria.

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

B.Arch. ☒ Met

M.Arch. ☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
B.Arch.: The program demonstrates the understanding of career paths to becoming a licensed architect through course and lecture content in ARCH 525 Professional Practice and ARCH 526 Professional Practice. Course content prepares students for responsibilities and rigors of architectural licensure and practice. Career paths covered include various roles in public service and private practice in which a licensed architect serves. Other programming supporting career paths includes the IPAL program which allows students to take any and all divisions of the ARE’s while being full-time USC students. In addition, the Architecture Guild, which is a non-profit alumni support organization, provides a bridge to students between the program and profession. The Guild provides students with multiple career building resources including competitive design charrettes, a mentorship program, and volunteer outreach programs. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is review of course content and student grades with regard to PC.1 topics. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under there Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via review of team room materials, as well as conversations with students, faculty, and the Guild.

M.Arch: The program demonstrates the understanding of career paths to becoming a licensed architect through course and lecture content in ARCH 525 Professional Practice and ARCH 526 Professional Practice. Course content prepares students for responsibilities and rigors of architectural licensure and
practice. Career paths covered include various roles in public service and private practice in which a licensed architect serves. Other programming supporting career paths includes the IPAL program which allows students to take any and all divisions of the ARE's while being full-time USC students. In addition, the Architecture Guild, which is a non-profit alumni support organization, provides a bridge to students between the program and profession. The Guild provides students with multiple career building resources including competitive design charrettes, a mentorship program, and volunteer outreach programs. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is review of course content and student grades with regard to PC.1 topics. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program's first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via review of team room materials, as well as conversations with students, faculty, and the Guild.

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

B.Arch.
☒ Met

M.Arch.
☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
B.Arch.: The program demonstrates design at different settings, scales, and methods through syllabi, course handouts, and projects in ARCH 102AL Architectural Design I; ARCH 102BL Architectural Design I; ARCH 202AL Architectural Design II; ARCH 202BL Architectural Design II; ARCH 302AL Architectural Design III; ARCH 302BL Architectural Design III; ARCH 402AL Architectural Design IV; ARCH 402BL Architectural Design IV; ARCH 500 Comprehensive Architecture Design; and ARCH 502AL Architectural Design V. The sequence of ten studios further instills design in the students and the concept of the Citizen Architect. Other programming supporting design includes the lecture series, student competitions, semester end portfolio reviews, and social activities involving design. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under there Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials, as well as meetings with faculty and students.

M.Arch: The program demonstrates design at different settings, scales, and methods through syllabi, course handouts, and projects in ARCH 605AL Graduate Architecture Design Comprehensive; ARCH 605BL Graduate Architecture Design Comprehensive; and ARCH 705 Topic Studio. The sequence of six studios further instills design in the students and the concept of the citizen architect. Other programming supporting design includes the lecture series, student competitions, semester end portfolio reviews, and social activities involving design. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and
benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials, as well as meetings with faculty and students.

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

- **B.Arch.**: Met
- **M.Arch.**: Met

**2023 Team Analysis:**

**B.Arch.**: The program demonstrates ecological knowledge and responsibility through exercises, lectures, discussions, reviews, and readings on designing environmentally sound, reduced carbon footprint, and climate responsive buildings in ARCH 202bL Architectural Design II; ARCH 211 Materials and Methods of Building Construction; ARCH 215 Design for Thermal and Atmospheric Environment; ARCH 302aL Architectural Design III; ARCH 302bL Architectural Design III; ARCH 411 Architectural Technology; and ARCH 500aL Critical Topics in Architecture. Other programming supporting ecological knowledge and responsibility includes ARCH 315, ARCH 202aL, ARCH 502, and lecture series. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is review of course material and syllabi for content related to PC.3. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via review of team room materials.

**M.Arch.**: The program demonstrates ecological knowledge and responsibility through exercises, lectures, discussions, reviews, and readings on designing environmentally sound, reduced carbon footprint, climate responsive buildings in ARCH 575A Design for Thermal and Atmospheric Environment; ARCH 575B Design for the Luminous and Sonic Environment; ARCH 511 Building Systems; ARCH 605BL Graduate Architecture Design Comprehensive; and ARCH 605AL Graduate Architecture Design Comprehensive. Other programming supporting ecological knowledge and responsibility includes ARCH 514AL, ARCH 514BL, ARCH 561, ARCH 562, ARCH 563, and ARCH 526. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is review of course material and syllabi for content related to PC.3 and passing marks. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via review of team room materials.

**PC.4 History and Theory**—How the program ensures that students understand the histories and theories of architecture and urbanism, framed by diverse social, cultural, economic, and political forces, nationally and globally. (p.9)
2023 Team Analysis:

B.Arch.: The program demonstrates history and theory through exams, quizzes, reading responses/discussions, sketchbook exercises, rhetorical critiques and studio projects in ARCH 214a World History of Architecture, ARCH 214b World History of Architecture, ARCH 314 History of Architecture. Other programming supporting history and theory includes all school lectures, symposia, and research. Current assessment plans rely on annual reviews by history theory and studio faculty as well as program directors, but coursework assessment is limited to required history courses alone. One example provided is updating of course content in ARCH 214A and ARCH 214B to address the learning sequence and inclusion of DEI content. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via review of team room materials.

M.Arch.: The program demonstrates history and theory through exams, quizzes, reading responses/discussions, sketchbook exercises, rhetorical critiques, and studio projects in ARCH 514a World History of Architecture, ARCH 562 Architecture Themes and Case Studies, ARCH 514b World History of Architecture, ARCH 561 Urbanism Themes and Case Studies, and ARCH 563 Contemporary Architectural Theory. Other programming supporting history and theory includes all school lectures, research symposia, and individual course-based research initiatives. Current assessment plans rely on one-year curricular assessment and two-year program assessment. In addition, the program reviews course content for overall composition, DEI contexts, and the application of theory in studio courses. The review process relies heavily on passing course grades as indicators. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via review of team room materials.

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

B.Arch. ☒ Met

M.Arch. ☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:

B.Arch.: The program demonstrates research and innovation through coursework, such as exams, quizzes, readings, sketchbook exercises, and studio projects in ARCH 114 Architecture Culture and Community, ARCH 211 Materials and Methods of Building Construction, ARCH 214A World History of Architecture, ARCH 214B World History of Architecture, ARCH 314 History of Architecture Contemporary Issues, ARCH 411 Architectural Technology, ARCH 501AL Critical Topics in Architecture, and ARCH 502AL Architectural Design V. Other programming supporting research and innovation includes school lectures, exhibitions, research, and affiliated organizations. Current assessment plans rely on
observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work and faculty course evaluations. One example provided is the review of sequencing of courses and their context. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials.

M.Arch: The program demonstrates research and innovation through lectures, exercises, studio projects, and assignments linked to faculty research in ARCH 562 Architecture Themes and Case Studies; ARCH 564 Descriptive and Computational Architectural Geometry; ARCH 575A Design for Thermal and Atmospheric Environment; ARCH 563 Contemporary Architectural Theory; ARCH 705 Topic Studio; ARCH 793A Architecture Directed Design Research; and ARCH 593B Architecture Directed Design Research. Other programming supporting research and innovation includes elective courses such as ARCH 512, ARCH 609, ARCH 414, and ARCH 529, as well as school lectures, exhibitions, and research. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is the introduction of the annual USC Architecture Research Symposium that engages faculty and students. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials, meetings with students, and meetings with the Architecture Guild.

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

B.Arch.
☒ Met

M.Arch.
☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
B.Arch.: The program demonstrates leadership and collaboration through projects, assignments, lectures, and course presentations in ARCH 525 Professional Practice and ARCH 526 Professional Practice. Other programming supporting leadership and collaboration includes group projects in above courses and studios, school lecture series, the Architecture Guild, and student organizations. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials, meetings with students, and meetings with the Architecture Guild.

M.Arch: The program demonstrates leadership and collaboration through Projects, assignments, lectures, and course presentations in ARCH 525 Professional Practice and ARCH 526 Professional
Practice. Other programming supporting leadership and collaboration includes group projects in above courses and studios, school lecture series, the Architecture Guild, and student organizations. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program's first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials, meetings with students, and meetings with the Architecture Guild.

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

**B.Arch.**

☒ Met

**M.Arch.**

☒ Met

**2023 Team Analysis:**

**B.Arch.:** The program demonstrates the fostering and implementation of a learning and teaching culture through the studio culture agreement which is reinforced by course syllabi and activities in studio courses ARCH 102AL Architectural Design I, ARCH 114 Architecture: Culture and Community, ARCH 102BL Architectural Design I, ARCH 202AL Architectural Design II, ARCH 202BL Architectural Design II, ARCH 302AL Architectural Design III, ARCH 302BL Architectural Design III, ARCH 402AL Architectural Design IV, ARCH 402BL Architectural Design IV, ARCH 500 Comprehensive Architectural Design, and ARCH 502AL Architectural Design V. The studio culture agreement document is based on the school's implementation of citizenry and connecting to the USC unifying values of integrity, accountability, excellence, open communication, well-being, and diversity, equity, and inclusion. Other programming supporting learning and teaching culture includes Architectural Guild and student organizations. The program assesses student learning via faculty, administrator, and advising feedback and has made improvements incorporating a student representative from each studio section to the Architecture Student Council, who meet with the Director and Associate Director monthly to discuss issues, as well as “Convos” which are open forums hosted each semester. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. Currently, assessment of learning and teaching culture does not include students. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials, as well as conversations with faculty, staff, and students.

**M.Arch.:** The program demonstrates the fostering and implementation of a learning and teaching culture through the studio culture agreement which is reinforced by course syllabi and activities in studio courses ARCH 605AL Graduate Architecture Design Comprehensive, ARCH 605BL Graduate Architecture Design Comprehensive, and ARCH 705 Topic Studio. The studio culture agreement document is based on the school’s implementation of citizenry and connecting to the USC unifying values of integrity, accountability, excellence, open communication, well-being, and diversity, equity, and inclusion. Other programming supporting learning and teaching culture includes use of staff planned events, peer groups, group projects, and peer engagement and critique. The program assesses student learning via faculty, administrator, and advising feedback and has made improvements such as doing away with a formal
signed studio culture document and incorporating the values into syllabi and course work. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program's first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials, as well as conversations with faculty, staff, and students.

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

B.Arch.
☑ Met

M.Arch.
☐ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
B.Arch.: The program demonstrates social equity and inclusion through syllabi, lectures, reading, and projects in ARCH 114 Architecture Culture and Community, ARCH 314 History of Architecture Contemporary Issues, ARCH 302AL Architectural Design III, and ARCH 302BL Architectural Design III. Course content and lectures in ARCH 114 and ARCH 314 cover diverse social and cultural context in lectures as well as required readings. Selected reading topics and authors reiterate this diversity. ARCH 302AL and 302BL further the knowledge via implementation in studio topics and projects. Other programming supporting diversity, equity, and inclusion includes the 5-year DEI plan which is being renewed this year, as well as the program's overarching pedagogy of creating citizens architects. The lecture series and Architecture Guild play a critical role in linking social equity and inclusion at the school level to practice. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is the survey used to evaluate the gender and ethnic diversity of jurors, readings, and case studies. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program's first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials, meetings with faculty, students, and the Architectural Guild.

M.Arch: The program demonstrates social equity and inclusion through syllabi and lectures in ARCH 514AL Global History of Architecture, ARCH 514BL Global History of Architecture II, ARCH 605AL Graduate Architecture Design I, and 605BL Graduate Architecture Design II. Diverse cultural and social context is explored in the history courses, while a further look into this context and backgrounds is studied in the studio courses. Other programming supporting diversity, equity, and inclusion includes the 5-year DEI plan which is being renewed this year, as well as the program's overarching pedagogy of creating citizens architects. The lecture series and Architecture Guild play a critical role in linking social equity and inclusion at the school level to practice. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is the survey used to evaluate the gender and ethnic diversity of jurors, readings, and case studies. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program's first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine
actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials, meetings with faculty, students, and the Architectural Guild.

3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes (Guidelines, p. 10)
A program must demonstrate how it addresses the following criteria through program curricula and other experiences, with an emphasis on the articulation of learning objectives and assessment.

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

B.Arch.
☒ Met

M.Arch.
☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
B.Arch.: The program demonstrates health, safety, and welfare through syllabi, handouts, lectures, and assignments in ARCH 525 Professional Practice and ARCH 526 Professional Practice. Other programming supporting HSW includes supplemental school activities such as the Architectural Guild and the lecture series. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is the review of design studio sequencing and student grades. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials.

M.Arch.: The program demonstrates health, safety, and welfare through syllabi, handouts, lectures, and assignments in ARCH 525 Professional Practice and ARCH 526 Professional Practice. In addition, many of the topics covered are then implemented in design studios and ARCH 575AL. Other programming supporting HSW includes supplemental school activities such as the Architectural Guild and the lecture series. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is the review of design studio sequencing and student grades. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials.

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

B.Arch.
☒ Met

M.Arch.
☒ Met
2023 Team Analysis:

B.Arch.: The program demonstrates professional ethics, regulatory requirements, and fundamental business processes through syllabi, course handouts, case studies, assignments, and lectures in ARCH 525 Professional Practice and ARCH 526 Professional Practice. Ethics are covered in detail in lectures and a course handout on AIA ethics, regulatory requirements are covered in lectures and reinforced in assignments covering several levels of codes, and business processes are covered in detail in lectures. ARCH 526 takes a deep dive into the use of Building Information Modeling and how professional practice topics are realized in a 3D space. Other programming supporting professional practice includes the Architectural Guild programming, lecture series, student organizations, and the IPAL program. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is review of course content and planned improvements of the integration of business skills, design programming, and design accountability with data into course content. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials and meetings with students and faculty.

M.Arch.: The program demonstrates professional ethics, regulatory requirements, and fundamental business processes through syllabi, course handouts, case studies, assignments, and lectures in ARCH 525 Professional Practice and ARCH 526 Professional Practice. Ethics are covered in detail in lectures and a course handout on AIA ethics, regulatory requirements are covered in lectures and reinforced in assignments covering several levels of codes, and business processes are covered in detail in lectures. ARCH 526 takes a deep dive into the use of Building Information Modeling and how professional practice topics are realized in a 3D space. Other programming supporting professional practice includes the Architectural Guild programming, lecture series, student organizations, and the IPAL program. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is review of course content and planned improvements of the integration of business skills, design programming, and design accountability with data into course content. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials and meetings with students and faculty.

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

B.Arch.
☒ Met

M.Arch.
☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:

B.Arch.: The program demonstrates life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations through lectures and workshops in ARCH 525 Professional Practice, ARCH 500 Comprehensive Architectural Design, ARCH 411 Architectural Technology. Other programming supporting regulatory context includes
ARCH 202AL, ARCH 211, ARCH 302AL, and ARCH 302BL. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, and reports for coordinators. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials.

M.Arch.: The program demonstrates life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations through lectures and assignments in ARCH 525 Professional Practice, ARCH 526 Professional Practice, ARCH 605BL Graduate Architecture Design, and ARCH 611 Advanced Building Systems Integration. Other programming supporting regulatory context includes ARCH 511, ARCH 523AL, ARCH 523BL, ARCH 575AL, ARCH 575BL, and ARCH 605AL. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials.

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

B.Arch.
☒ Met

M.Arch.
☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
B.Arch.: The program demonstrates understanding of emerging systems, technologies, and building construction through lectures, projects, and course syllabi in ARCH 302BL Architectural Design III and ARCH 500 Comprehensive Architectural Design. Content for ARCH 302BL and ARCH 500AL shows the transfer of knowledge from other courses into their studio projects such as integration of technical requirements. Other programming supporting technical knowledge includes ARCH 211 and ARCH 202AL, as well as the school lecture series and annual BIM symposium. Additional courses were listed in the APR that provide in-depth concentration on specific topics. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials.

M.Arch.: The program demonstrates understanding of emerging systems, technologies, and building construction through syllabi, projects, and lectures in ARCH 605AL Graduate Architecture Design Comprehensive and ARCH 605BL Graduate Architecture Design Comprehensive. Other programming supporting technical knowledge includes ARCH 511, ARCH 523AL, ARCH523BL, ARCH 575AL, ARCH
575BL, and ARCH 526, as well as the school lecture series and annual BIM symposium. These additional courses provide in-depth concentration on specific topics such as materials, structural design, thermal environment, visual environment, and legal and economic context. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room material.

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

**B.Arch.**

☑ Met

**M.Arch.**

☑ Met

**2023 Team Analysis:**

**B.Arch.**: The program demonstrates the synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and environmental impacts through student work in ARCH 500 Comprehensive Architectural Design. Thought process and synthesis was visible in individual assignments as well as the final presentation package. Other programming supporting design synthesis includes course content and sequencing that culminates at the ARCH 500 course. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is review of the design sequence to focus on deliverables of SC5 and SC6. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials.

**M.Arch.**: The program demonstrates the synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, accessible design, and environmental impacts through student work in ARCH 605AL Graduate Architecture Design Comprehensive and ARCH 605BL Graduate Architecture Design Comprehensive. While the depth of regulatory requirements and site conditions were inconsistent a satisfactory level of ability was found. The focus on building design and visualization was more evident in final presentations, while synthesis of the above items was mostly found in separate assignments. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. One example provided is review of the design sequence to focus on deliverables of SC5 and SC6. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials.
SC.6 Building Integration—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance. (p. 12)

B.Arch.
☒ Not Met

M.Arch.
☒ Not Met

2023 Team Analysis:
B.Arch.: The program identified and provided coursework and student work from ARCH 500 Comprehensive Architectural Design. The team’s review found that ARCH 500 demonstrated integration of building envelope systems, structural systems, environmental control systems, and life safety systems in most work samples. Measurable outcomes of building performance were missing from projects in ARCH 500. ARCH 215 Design of Thermal and Atmospheric Environment provided an assignment covering building performance but did not show the ability to integrate said performance in a design project. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials.

M.Arch.: The program identified and provided coursework and student work from ARCH 605BL Graduate Architecture Design Comprehensive. The team’s review found that ARCH 605 demonstrated integration of building envelope systems, structural systems, and life safety systems. Environmental control systems and measurable outcomes of building were not sufficiently found in student work. While building performance was found as questions in exams and quizzes, it was not found in student work which is the primary evidence for SC6. Building and environmental controls were found in a small number of projects but lacked consistency across student work samples. Current assessment plans rely on observations and review from school administration and some faculty, assessment plans list metrics such as student work, faculty course evaluations, reports for coordinators, and participation in other events. This assessment plan is forward looking, as this is the program’s first round of assessment under these Conditions. The program has implemented an assessment plan, where learning outcomes are directly related to the criterion, and benchmarks are present but vague. The plan currently lacks specificity for what data is collected and aggregated and would benefit from clearer benchmarks to determine actionable improvements and their implementation. These findings were confirmed during the site visit via team room materials.

4—Curricular Framework (Guidelines, p. 13)
This condition addresses the institution’s regional accreditation and the program’s degree nomenclature, credit-hour and curricular requirements, and the process used to evaluate student preparatory work.

4.1 Institutional Accreditation (Guidelines, p. 13)
For the NAAB to accredit a professional degree program in architecture, the program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education:

- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
- Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)
University of Southern California
Visiting Team Report
April 17-19, 2023

- New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE)
- Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)
- WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC)

B.Arch.
☒ Met

M.Arch.
☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The University of Southern California is a member of the WASC Senior College and University Commission. The program provided the current formal notification and official record of action taken by WSCUC. USC’s accreditation was reaffirmed, and the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation conducted under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation.

4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum (Guidelines, p. 13)
The NAAB accredits professional degree programs with the following titles: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and optional studies.

4.2.1 Professional Studies. Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program are the core of a professional degree program that leads to licensure. Knowledge from these courses is used to satisfy Condition 3—Program and Student Criteria. The degree program has the flexibility to add additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. In its documentation, the program must clearly indicate which professional courses are required for all students. (p.13)

4.2.2 General Studies. An important component of architecture education, general studies provide basic knowledge and methodologies of the humanities, fine arts, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences. Programs must document how students earning an accredited degree achieve a broad, interdisciplinary understanding of human knowledge. In most cases, the general studies requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution’s baccalaureate degree. Graduate programs must describe and document the criteria and process used to evaluate applicants’ prior academic experience relative to this requirement. Programs accepting transfers from other institutions must document the criteria and process used to ensure that the general education requirement was covered at another institution. (p.13)

4.2.3 Optional Studies. All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum to allow students to develop additional expertise, either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking courses offered within the department offering the accredited program but outside the required professional studies curriculum. These courses may be configured in a variety of curricular structures, including elective offerings, concentrations, certificate programs, and minors. (p.14)

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

The number of credit hours for each degree is outlined below. All accredited programs must conform to minimum credit-hour requirements established by the institution’s regional accreditor.
4.2.4 **Bachelor of Architecture.** The B. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 150 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in general studies, professional studies, and optional studies, all of which are delivered or accounted for (either by transfer or articulation) by the institution that will grant the degree. Programs must document the required professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.

4.2.5 **Master of Architecture.** The M. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate coursework and a minimum of 30 semester credits of graduate coursework. Programs must document the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for both the undergraduate and graduate degrees.

4.2.6 **Doctor of Architecture.** The D. Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 210 credits, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate and graduate coursework. The D. Arch. requires a minimum of 90 graduate-level semester credit hours, or the graduate-level 135 quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in professional studies and optional studies. Programs must document, for both undergraduate and graduate degrees, the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.

B.Arch. ☒ Met

M.Arch. ☒ Met

**2023 Team Analysis:**
The USC School of Architecture offers two NAAB-accredited first professional degree programs: the 5-year B. Arch. program, and the 3-year M. Arch. program (+3), with a 2-Year Advanced Standing (+2) option. Within the B. Arch, USC identified in the program catalog the courses and credits required in Professional Courses, General Studies, and Optional Studies that fulfilled NAAB accreditation requirements. It is important to note that in General Studies, USC met the CORE competencies required by WASC. General Studies are integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, with in-depth study in a given area of knowledge. In the M. Arch program, the catalog states that all graduate students must complete 168 credit hours. A minimum of 30 semester credit hours are conducted at the graduate level, and 45 units will comprise non-architectural content.

**4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education** *(Guidelines, p. 16)*
The NAAB recognizes that students transferring to an undergraduate accredited program or entering a graduate accredited program come from different types of programs and have different needs, aptitudes, and knowledge bases. In this condition, a program must demonstrate that it utilizes a thorough and equitable process to evaluate incoming students and that it documents the accreditation criteria it expects students to have met in their education experiences in non-accredited programs.

4.3.1 A program must document its process for evaluating a student’s prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria when it admits a student to the professional degree program.

4.3.2 In the event a program relies on the preparatory education experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain accreditation criteria, the program must demonstrate it has
established standards for ensuring these accreditation criteria are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.

4.3.3 A program must demonstrate that it has clearly articulated the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content in the admissions process, and that a candidate understands the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program before accepting an offer of admission.

B.Arch.
☒ Not Met

M.Arch.
☒ Not Met

2023 Team Analysis:
Applicants to the USC School of Architecture, at the B.Arch. level must complete the Common Application; and the school reports that aside from the 70-80 freshman students it also enrolls approximately 15 transfer students, using the same common application process and online portfolio submission process. It is possible, in selected instances, that a transfer student from an accredited community college or other university may be eligible for advanced placement at the 2nd-year level if previous work includes a minimum of 32 semester units of acceptable academic credit in a pre-architecture program. The three areas in which transfer students request some form of advanced standing (studio, required professional course work, electives and general education requirements) are evaluated using a system of comparative content/skills evaluation via syllabi and the review of graphic and design artifacts within the portfolio. The APR outlines the means by which evaluations are made for students wishing to transfer with credit/units. With regard to the reliance of preparatory education in the fulfillment of NAAB required accreditation criteria, USC employs numerous means to review and evaluate transfer student materials and coursework. They report that in most instances applicant portfolios, using the slide room platform, are reviewed by a team of foundations-level (years 1+2) design faculty. The APR outlines that of the approximately thirty transfer students who are admitted each year, about one third are required to take the full ten studio sequence, approximately a third of them take a condensed six week ARCH 102AB + ARCH 105L summer transfer sequence to satisfy NAAB requirements and competencies assigned to ARCH 102ABL. USC requires a letter grade of ‘B’ or better in each summer transfer course to ensure a solid degree of preparation. According to the APR the final third of admits are allowed to transfer credit from their previous institution for ARCH 102ABL + ARCH 105L, based on evaluation of their portfolio work and transcripts. USC reports that students seeking to transfer must meet the standards established by NAAB.

At both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. level, course waiver petitions are completed by the student and reviewed as part of the student advising process. The goal of the review of individual course waiver petitions is to waive, or remove the requirement of, an otherwise required course for the degree based on a student’s prior coursework. Example waivers were shared during the team visit and advising meeting. Syllabi of prior coursework are submitted by students seeking advanced standing and reviewed by the USC program chair to ensure critical alignment and/or coverage of select topics and skills. This assessment is sometimes also cross-checked with course artifacts to ensure consistency and clarity of course work transcription/translation. In certain instances, particular coursework or syllabi are reviewed by instructors directly when skills or content require a certain degree of subject expertise. Students found to have coursework or skill-based shortcomings are directed toward a three-year track vs the more typical two-year track. Students falling into this circumstance are informed of the gaps and associated issues and advised accordingly. This was verified via the visiting team student advising and admissions meetings. Examples of the evaluation forms such as B.Arch. Petition form-215, 214a, 214b, etc. were shared with the visiting team although the team was not able to see any of those in a completed format with notes regarding finite evaluation and equivocations. Documentation of this type would be helpful in gauging the transitions planned toward a clearer internal and external assessment strategy.
Much of the evaluation system is similar at the graduate level however unlike the undergraduate portfolio which is broken into numerous components of evaluation, the graduate review is a singular assessment. In addition to the portfolio the students’ academic performance (GRE and TOEFL when appropriate). The USC Office of Graduate Admission is the preliminary reviewer of M. Arch applications. This office manages the central online application system and ensures that all necessary documents have been submitted. Credential review is processed through the evaluation of undergraduate degree and institutional accreditation, or for international students, a U.S. bachelor’s degree-equivalency through program and institutional recognition by the country’s Ministry of Education (or equivalent). For international students, this office also verifies credentials for I-20 and DS-2019 forms; financial qualifications; and filters for language scores. GPAs from all applicants, are regularized to a 4.0 GPA scale to allow for better comparison.

In meetings with admissions and advising, the team was able to review the evaluation forms and process used by the School of Architecture. While there is a robust system in place, the record keeping of the review process is missing, causing uncertainty in the consistency of reviews. In addition, the review forms being used reference outdated NAAB Conditions and Procedures, which brings to question how applicants are reviewed and processed. It is critical that review of preparatory education be done in a manner to confirm all students graduating with a NAAB accredited degree meet all 2020 Condition and Procedure requirements.

5—Resources

5.1 Structure and Governance  (Guidelines, p. 18)
The program must describe the administrative and governance processes that provide for organizational continuity, clarity, and fairness and allow for improvement and change.

5.1.1 Administrative Structure: Describe the administrative structure and identify key personnel in the program and school, college, and institution.

5.1.2 Governance: Describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures and how these structures relate to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

B.Arch.
☒ Described

M.Arch.
☒ Described

2023 Team Analysis:
For both the B.Arch. and M.Arch, under the University bylaws, Interim Dean Willow Bay is designated as the chief academic officer of the School of Architecture and serves as the primary administrator for undergraduate and graduate architectural curriculum and operations. The Undergraduate program is led by Director Doris Sung and Associate Director Lee Olvera. The Graduate program is led by Director Alvin Huang and Associate Director Selwyn Ting. All communication flows through the dean and includes communication with Office of Student and Career Services, Office of Communications and Marketing, Office of Advancement, Office of Finance and Administration, Office of the Dean, and academic leadership. The School of Architecture provided an organizational chart in the APR which clearly and logically defines the role of specific leadership and faculty within the school. In terms of governance, there are three primary organizations or activities which allow for the role of faculty and staff in the governance of the School of Architecture including faculty meetings, the Faculty Council, and faculty retreats. Faculty Meetings are monthly meetings presided over by the dean, where all faculty of the school are invited to participate. These provide a forum for the discussion of school affairs. The Faculty Council (FC) is a body elected to participate in shared governance of the school as outlined in the University governance policies and bylaws. The FC represents the collective faculty of the School of Architecture. The Faculty Council communicates the faculty’s views and interests therein and to the
senior leadership team. Faculty Retreats are typically 1-day, off-campus annual retreats that are required as part of each faculty member’s service percentage. These have appeared to have recently restarted from a hiatus due to COVID Pandemic considerations. This range of measures were implemented following the unsuccessful degree of dialogue maintained between faculty and the dean in prior administrations. The sum of these measures in principle point to a robust governance structure between faculty, staff, and the dean, and has been continued even during the current temporary administration of Interim Dean Willow Bay, who has welcomed the input and feedback which the FC has provided. The opportunity now exists, as the School of Architecture nears their decision to select a new dean, to continue this successful governance plan for the benefit of the program in years to come. Students integrate into the governance with the USC Student Council as well as the School of Architecture Council.

5.2 Planning and Assessment (Guidelines, p. 18)
The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies:

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

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

B.Arch.
☒ Not Demonstrated

M.Arch.
☒ Not Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
Evidence identified by the team in the narrative provided within the APR, team room material including the criteria assessment plans and other evidence provided for program and student criteria, and discussions with program administrators, included a number of the components required for this criterion. However, evidence for some important components of the program and criteria-level assessment and planning processes were not identified. These include a description of the multi-year strategic objectives for the programs, a description of the specific data and information sources used to inform the development of student learning objectives, clear benchmarks and performance targets used to guide program-level and criteria-level assessment processes. Current assessment for Program and Student criteria lacks specificity on what data is collected and aggregated, as well as definitive benchmarks. Since benchmarks are missing or vague, they cannot be used to determine actionable improvements.

The APR provides a high-level overview of the administrative and leadership structure within the school. It also provides a description of some strategic objectives under the previous deans. However, the APR mentions an ongoing search to select a new dean, which may result in a change in these strategic objectives. Therefore, the current multi-year strategic objectives of the programs are not clear. Two documents are provided describing the 2020-2021 academic year objectives for the M.Arch. and B.Arch. programs. This information was verified in discussion with the program and school leadership. The APR provides an overview of several foundational goals that apply to both the M.Arch. and B.Arch. With regard to key performance indicators, the APR identifies three primary ones: admission metrics, retention graduation rates, and post-graduation employment. Discussion with program leadership identified those as shared indicators for both the programs and the institution as a whole.
The APR provides information regarding improvements in increasing program selectivity while at the same time increasing the diversity of the student population. Data is also provided on current graduation, retention, and graduate placement rates. Yet no historical reference points, benchmarks, or targets were provided, which makes it difficult to assess how the program is progressing towards achieving its goals. The lack of multi-year strategic objectives also made it difficult to assess the progress of the program as required in this sub-criterion. Discussions with program administrators did not identify any additional benchmarks beyond those listed in the APR. The APR describes several challenges relating to recruitment, and funding cuts due to pandemic. Faculty challenges relating to availability of incentive funding, pre and post award support for grants, and teaching releases are also identified. These challenges were confirmed in discussions with program faculty. For students, the need for more financial support to enable diversifying the student body is identified as a challenge. The ongoing search for a new dean was identified as both a challenge and an opportunity. Conversations with the interim dean, and faculty confirmed these challenges and their optimistic outlook. Additional challenges identified in meetings with faculty include limitations of physical resources, IT needs, compensation, and availability of teaching assistants. The APR describes several paths for receiving feedback from the university and from the profession. A description of how this feedback affects curricular and program changes is also provided. The APR provides examples of how qualitative feedback received from faculty and students was used to inform changes in studio hours, zoom protocols, and in-person events. Discussions with representatives of the Architectural Guild confirmed the involvement of alumni and other professionals in the feedback processes. The integration of outside opinions in the assessment documents provided in the team room were unclear.

5.3 Curricular Development (Guidelines, p. 19)
The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for assessing its curriculum and making adjustments based on the outcome of the assessment. The program must identify:

5.3.1 The relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including NAAB program and student criteria.

5.3.2 The roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

B.Arch.
☒ Demonstrated

M.Arch.
☒ Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
The program demonstrates a transparent process of assessing its curriculum and making adjustments based on the outcome. The current curriculum assessment process is managed by the program directors in partnership with the school’s Curriculum committee, under the oversight of the Dean and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs. Evaluations of the curriculum are conducted through one-on-one meetings with course coordinators and instructors, assessment of semester-end portfolio submittals, results of the student course evaluations and structured conversations with student leaders. Based on the results of these evaluations, further discussions occur with the school’s diversity liaisons, the associate dean, other directors, and finally regular meetings with the dean. Occasionally, a special task force is assembled to examine issues unique to this program before initiating a full curricular review. The program director must review substantive changes and submit a proposal to the school’s standing Curriculum Committee before being presented for a full faculty vote. This standing Curriculum Committee is composed of faculty members, student reps (undergraduate and graduate) and staff who assist in coordination with the University. Each month, the chair of the Curriculum Committee brings any proposal approved by the Curriculum Committee to the faculty meeting for a full faculty vote. If not approved, it is returned to the Curriculum Committee for further review and revision before another vote for approval. Once the faculty approves the proposal, it is sent to the University Committee on Curriculum (UCOC) for review and
The general process is enhanced and refined at yearly faculty retreats. The process and relationship with program directors, faculty and students was confirmed during the team’s site visit.

The program is in the middle of completing its conversion to the NAAB 2020 conditions. USC began this process of shaping the trajectory of the school’s programs in the spring of 2020. They provided a NAAB Criteria-Specific Assessment in Section 3, which provides the full timeline for conversion to the 2020 NAAB Criteria and Assessment processes, which is expected to be fully implemented by fall 2023. The APR notes that the Directors reviewed the results of the course preliminary survey from Fall 2020 - Spring 2022 and using the syllabi, discussions with faculty, and their own familiarity with the program and its goals, preliminary target NAAB criteria were developed for each required course of each program. The courses were surveyed for course content relevant to each NAAB criterion, which yielded relative strengths of each courses’ contribution to the criteria. Files for the B.Arch. and M.Arch. program and student criteria showing the outcome of the survey are provided in the APR. The files also show shared values for both programs and a matrix of per course, per criterion description of relevant course content. This has resulted in the broad integration of the NAAB criteria throughout the curriculum as shown in the B.Arch. and M.Arch. Target Criteria. USC intends to refine the assessment process through workshops, task forces, or subcommittees, faculty, administrators, and invited participants who will review processes and assessment metrics. The APR includes a chart with the general structure and flow of the curricular and per-criteria assessment and improvement process, which describes the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in the process and the frequency and schedule of Assessments and minor adjustments. This information was verified in discussions with the faculty and staff during the site visit.

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development (Guidelines, p. 19)
The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate and adequately funded human resources to support student learning and achievement. Human resources include full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. The program must:

5.4.1 Demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty in a way that promotes student and faculty achievement.

5.4.2 Demonstrate that it has an Architect Licensing Advisor who is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. These duties include attending the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay up-to-date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.

5.4.3 Demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.

5.4.4 Describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, mental well-being, career guidance, internship, and job placement.

B.Arch.
☒ Demonstrated

M.Arch.
☒ Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
USC is demonstrating that it balances the workloads of all faculty in a way that promotes student and faculty achievement through a variety of initiatives, mentoring, staffing, and P&T policies along with university-wide resources dedicated to addressing these issues. The APR specifically notes the percentages of Teaching, Research and Service each type of faculty member should expect. While the APR also notes their initiative to identify and balance coursework assignments based upon the “effort” associated with some courses above or below others, there is no clear assessment of this value. The
APR notes funding in support of teaching and research which is made available to the various faculty types and their efforts to ensure consistency and quality of course delivery via a balance of student to faculty ratio that ensures coursework quality is not jeopardized. They also make special note that no courses are taught by teaching assistants as a means of maintaining quality and compensation equity. USC has an ongoing faculty mentoring program with a two-tier primary and secondary faculty mentoring system. In addition, they report initiatives to promote mentoring which are supported internally by the USC Mellon Mentoring Forum and Provost Mentoring Awards, with mentorship focused informal activities such as the Joseph and Rosemary Madl Tenure-Track Faculty Roundtable Dinner.

The institution is in compliance, and USC has had at the head of these programs an individual involved in sharing licensing related information with students via summits and activities. Michael Hricak, FAIA is the current AXP coordinator. This was confirmed during the site visit with student leaders and the general student body of both M.Arch. and B.Arch. students, and that Michael is easily available and knowledgeable.

The APR outlines that the University offers a wide range of professional development workshops and seminars on an ongoing basis at several centers and programs, such as TrojanLearn, available across campus for both faculty and staff. These include an invitation-based year-long program with the on-campus Center for Excellence in Teaching (CET) aimed at providing additional teaching skills and professional development. During the team visit, access and support of these professional development opportunities was verified by staff employees. Additionally, research development is supported via a number of university-wide and school specific annual funding models designed for the various faculty types. The USC Office of Research, the Visions and Voices initiative, and Advancing Scholarship in the Humanities and Social Sciences along with smaller program specific grants and funding mechanisms which culminate in an annual research symposium. The functionality of these support systems was also verified by the faculty and administration during the team visit. The pursuit of professional licensure is supported in numerous ways including a long-running Summer Short Course in Heritage Conservation. USC also has NotLY, or Not Licensed Yet initiative, which seeks to help young people in architecture successfully transition from the university to the profession. This all-volunteer group has reportedly coordinated nearly 500 classes to more than 20,000 attendees. The school’s Bim Bop workshop program also supports professional development by sharing the value and skill of Building Information Modeling for professional practice.

Various support services are available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, mental well-being, career guidance, internship, and job placement. The USC School of Architecture Office of Student Services is staffed by two full-time academic advisors, two part-time work-study students, and one other Student Services staff member with the title Student Programs Advisor, who supports the Global Studies programs. All of these employees serve under the school’s Student Services executive director, who reports to the dean. Freshman students seem well cared for as they move from high school to college level with required orientation meetings and numerous advising sessions to help ensure success. Through the University-wide Advisement Database, departmental advisors are required to perform audits for each student at various levels of their education along with midterm grades being reported and failing students being communicated with directly to help ensure student success. During the team meeting with staff the support systems were verified and reported as well-used and highly functional. Students from both the M.Arch. and B.Arch. program report their satisfaction with the support network and systems that exist.

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (Guidelines, p. 20)
The program must demonstrate its commitment to diversity and inclusion among current and prospective faculty, staff, and students. The program must:

5.5.1 Describe how this commitment is reflected in the distribution of its human, physical, and financial resources.

5.5.2 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next
accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program’s faculty and staff demographics with that of the program’s students and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.

5.5.3 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its students since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program’s student demographics with that of the institution and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.

5.5.4 Document what institutional, college, or program policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other social equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

5.5.5 Describe the resources and procedures in place to provide adaptive environments and effective strategies to support faculty, staff, and students with different physical and/or mental abilities.

B.Arch. ☒ Demonstrated

M.Arch. ☒ Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
In the 2017-2018 school year, the School of Architecture began implementing its five-Year Diversity and Inclusion Plan. A major portion of the plan was the creation of the new role Diversity Liaison who serves as a member of the dean’s leadership team, and reflects the school’s commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion. The Diversity Liaison works on a variety of tasks including full time and part time faculty searches, help in reviewing and developing curriculum and pedagogical goals, student organization support and activities, scholarships, and review of student applications. The school has also implemented the A-lab as a pipeline for high school students in a semester long program. Since the last visit, the school has worked to increase diversity of full-time faculty with the hiring of six new members, five of which are women or people of color. They have also hired a new director for the Masters of Heritage Conservation that is a woman or color. Since bringing on new hires, the program has seen several members retire or be recruited elsewhere. The program is committed to diversity in the hiring of new tenure track faculty and involves their Diversity Liaison in the hiring process. Part time faculty is extremely diverse, taking advantage of the local setting, where 25 of 33 part time faculty are women or people of color. The program seeks to maintain its diverse staff with its status currently of 75% non-white and two thirds female. In comparison of faculty and staff to students, the student body of both B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs are more than half female and less than one-quarter are domestic white. Currently faculty do not reflect the diversity of the student body, but the hires that have been recently made are making strides towards reflecting the student body. Increasing faculty diversity is also included in the 5-Year Diversity and Inclusion Plan. This plan also includes other benchmarks determined by the school. Since the last accreditation cycle, diversity of the undergraduate program has increased exponentially, doubling the number of Black American students, and a cohort of 25% Latinx and 24% Asian. The graduate program has seen less success in increasing diversity and plans to target domestic diversity as most international students in the master’s program hail from Asia. The School of Architecture demographics are more diverse in every category when compared to USC as a whole and have seen great change from the previous visit. Other benchmarks are included in the School Diversity Plan.

USC is an Equal Opportunity Employer and since the last cycle of accreditation has developed a wide range of offices, task forces, programs, and initiatives that were provided in the APR. Many of these are at the institutional level and include but are not limited to the Office of Equity and Diversity, Provost Diversity and Inclusion Council, DEI funding for hiring and retaining diverse faculty, and programming for First Generation students. At the school level, there have been Town Halls held on the topics, Citizen Architect Fellows program created, Architecture Guild mentoring, targeted outreach, DEI admissions review, funding for student groups such as NOMAS, and an endowment of the Global Studies program. There is an additional program at the school level for faculty including funding and training. The Associate
Provost for Institutional and ADA compliance works with each school to ensure access. Faculty and staff work closely with the university disability accommodation coordinator. Much of Harris and Watt Hall has been adapted to be accessible with a few grandfathered spaces remaining such as the Photo Lab, one joint studio in Harris, and one staff office. Many of the technological advancements also allow for greater access for those with visual or hearing impairments. Since the Covid-19 pandemic, mental health has become a priority with more counselors housed on campus, two of which are in Harris Hall.

5.6 Physical Resources (Guidelines, p. 21)
The program must describe its physical resources and demonstrate how they safely and equitably support the program’s pedagogical approach and student and faculty achievement. Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

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

If the program’s pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, off-site, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

B.Arch.
☒ Not Demonstrated

M.Arch.
☒ Not Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
The School of Architecture has not demonstrated that they have sufficient space to support the program’s pedagogical approach and student and faculty achievement. However, they have provided evidence of the buildings and accommodating spaces and resources and identified their needs and the consequences of not having those needs met. Long Range Planning notes that “Within the next 5-10 years, the school will need to examine, plan and implement more significant tangible facilities improvements and upgrades.” The need for improvements to the School of Architecture physical resources are supported by the APR, long range planning, conversations with students and faculty, and site visit observations.

The APR notes that there are separate studios for B.Arch. and M.Arch. students with common labs and digital services. They provide furnishings and pin-up space for every enrolled student in the accredited programs. The furnishings in these spaces are more flexible and conducive to allow for collaboration with peers. Large monitors and common printing and plotting areas are incorporated in the studios. Evidence of access to digital hardware and software is provided on the USC’s website. At the site visit meeting the team confirmed student access to facilities; however, students lack physical space dedicated as a student lounge. The School of Architecture acknowledges a need to fix the continued issues that they have with the quality of temperature control in two of their undergraduate studios. Also, they plan to take advantage of outdoor courtyards for reviews by upgrading the Harris Courtyard with an open-air learning pavilion for meetings and small gatherings.

The School of Architecture appears to have lecture halls, seminar spaces and small group study rooms to meet their non-studio teaching needs. A chart showing the assigned and joint spaces was provided and aligned with the USC facility floor plans. The APR notes that Fabrication facilities including fully equipped wood and metal shops are shared. The space is overseen by a full-time staff member/director and assisted by a full-time faculty member for welding. Also, training opportunities are provided for students at the start of the semester. The school provides laser cutting, 3-D printing, robotics and CNC milling in
digital fabrication labs. These labs are in numerous spaces. Evidence of these facilities is located on the USC website and was confirmed at the site visit. The school has identified the need to create a digital output center in the Clipper Lab and to increase technologies within the studios, using large-scale monitors, which was implemented and confirmed during the visit. Four other school operated classrooms need attention—both in terms of new technology and in some cases light control. The Space and Technology Committee has started working on a proposal to upgrade the four primary teaching classrooms. Other identified problems are (1) a decade old noise and dust abatement problem in the Shop. The system is undersized for its extensive use. A system evaluation has been done but work has been delayed due to the high-cost estimate. (2) The desire to increase the level of design-build and overall fabrication at the school cannot be accomplished because the shop area in general has reached its capacity. (3) There is a lack of air-conditioning in the CNC milling lab, prohibiting the use of technology during very hot periods. (4) Currently, spray painting has been banned to promote a healthier work environment, but appropriate locations for the construction of spray booths have not been found.

The APR indicates that offices are provided for full time faculty and part-time faculty that have access to discipline-specific offices. However, at the site visit meetings the team confirmed that only full-time faculty have private offices and offices are shared by part-time faculty. Research is done in several areas including the faculty’s offices, the basement offices, and the offices on the third floor of Watt Hall. Funding is sometimes provided to support some specific faculty related research conducted in off-campus studios. Full time faculty use their own office for mentoring, advising, and office hours. Part-time faculty tend to use the outdoor courtyard tables, the exterior garden spaces, assigned individual students or shared desks within studio, third floor patio spaces, and other exterior locations around the facilities to meet with students. In addition, many faculty now hold office hours by ZOOM. Faculty expressed concerns about a lack of sufficient space due to non-accredited programs occupying spaces that they could use. Identified needs include providing sun control on the 3rd floor of Watt Hall. The faculty offices on this side experience significant heat gain in the afternoon and is detrimentally impacted by the sound from the shop area. The APR notes that some program’s pedagogy such as the semester-long overseas programs do not require physical resources, the Physical and Digital Facilities staff, which serve on the Space and Technology Committee, and emergency preparedness is offered through the Office of Fire Safety and Emergency Planning. The school has a need for more storage facilities within the school, which impacts establishing efficient solutions for storing large materials, such as the end of the year review display systems which they have been rebuilding every year. The lack of onsite storage puts tremendous stress on the shop yard.

5.7 Financial Resources (Guidelines, p. 21)
The program must demonstrate that it has the appropriate institutional support and financial resources to support student learning and achievement during the next term of accreditation.

B.Arch.
☒ Not Demonstrated

M.Arch.
☒ Not Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
For both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. tracks, the program has demonstrated that it has sufficient institutional support and financial resources to support student learning and achievement, but the visiting team notes this matter as a concern from a long-range planning standpoint. A general review of the school's income and expense statement from 2021 (which dates from before enrollment numbers stabilized to pre-COVID numbers) indicated a break-even balance between revenue and expenses.

As noted in the school’s “Long Range Planning” document, program enrollment numbers have essentially returned to pre-COVID Pandemic levels, which is crucial as general program financial health remains directly proportional to enrollment numbers and the tuition revenue carried with those numbers. Yet, even
the program notes that “...we see 2-3 years of continued volatility as these programs regain traction in the
marketplace.” Even with this volatility, the M.Arch. program is seeing a 20-percent increase in external
applications to the program, which is starkly contrary to the University’s institution-wide decline in
graduate applications. If the program can continue to grow its cohorts in future years, the initial issue is
largely addressed. But as the program themselves noted in their APR response to this criterion: “The
School has not significantly altered our funding model since the last visit; nor does it plan on any changes
to funding models at this time. The program continues to be tuition revenue driven with most revenues
coming from undergraduate and graduate tuition. School revenues also include grant and foundation
funding, and philanthropic donations.”

The Long-Range Planning document provided by the school outlines in broad brush strokes the need for
seeking efficiencies in the cadre of faculty members while reducing operational costs in areas such as
faculty travel and global studies. Yet based on visiting team observations, little range of austerity exists
with which the school can seek additional efficiencies. It is mentioned in the Long-Range Planning
document that the school intends to launch a fundraising campaign to “dramatically excite and engage
new constituents to financially support the school...” with institutional advancement plans of
approximately $30-45 million in donor funding. Little or no specificity is provided as to where this
advancement fundraising will be directed over the next eight to ten years, even though interviews and
observations noted several deficiencies in spatial needs, equipment needs, and resources are at present
undefined. A clearer, more specific School of Architecture financial plan is needed to holistically combine
revenue growth plans stemming from enrollment growth with advancement planning in response to the
program’s range of needs.

5.8 Information Resources

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

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

B.Arch.
☒ Demonstrated

M.Arch.
☒ Demonstrated

2023 Team Analysis:
The APR provided a sufficient description of the library and information resources available for faculty and
students. The School of Architecture has a dedicated library with a head librarian who guest lectures
regularly in courses, and another staff member. The library has a 70,000-volume collection of books and
journals and around 1100 videos. The architectural library is open for students six days a week and
includes 105 reader seats and four public use computers. The library is part of a network of eighteen
libraries within the University, which contains 4.6 million volumes. The APR also describes the USC
library’s electronic resources. The APR’s information has been verified in discussions with students,
faculty and program administrators.

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

6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees  (Guidelines, p. 23)
All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition, Appendix 2, in catalogs and promotional media, including the program’s website.

B.Arch. ☒ Met

M.Arch. ☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The USC Architecture website link provided in the APR provided public access to the exact language required for NAAB-Accredited Degrees.

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures (Guidelines, p. 23)
The program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program’s website:

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

B.Arch. ☒ Met

M.Arch. ☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The team confirmed that the links provided in the APR are easily accessed by the public and provide access to the 2020 Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation as well as the 2014 Conditions and 2015 Procedures for Accreditation.

6.3 Access to Career Development Information (Guidelines, p. 23)
The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that help them develop, evaluate, and implement career, education, and employment plans.

B.Arch. ☒ Met

M.Arch. ☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The team confirmed the links to the Alumni Resources website provided in the APR. The site links multiple opportunities for all students to access career development and placement services. The various websites include, but are not limited to, the USC Architecture Job Board, Alumni newsletter, and USC Facebook group. There are multiple points of access throughout the USC Architecture website. In meetings with students, it was confirmed the great levels of support they receive.

6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents (Guidelines, p. 23)
To promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program’s website:

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

B.Arch.
☒ Met

M.Arch.
☒ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The team confirmed that the link provided in the APR labeled USC Architecture Accreditation Reports and Related Documents provided public access to the following documents: interim progress reports and program annual reports, 2013 Architecture Program Report, 2104 Visiting Team Report, 2020 USC Five-Year IPR Letter, NCARB ARE pass rates, 2020-21 Studio Culture document, About Diversity Equity and Inclusion, USC Unifying Values Document, USC Integrity and Accountability Code, and USC Definition of Excellence in Teaching.

6.5 Admissions and Advising (Guidelines, p. 24)
The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern the evaluation of applicants for admission to the accredited program. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers from within and outside the institution. This documentation must include the following:

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

B.Arch.
☒ Met

M.Arch.
☒ Met
2023 Team Analysis:
The USC Undergraduate Admissions page, as provided in the APR, has clear tabs with information for first time, first year, transfer, and international students. The USC Graduate Admissions page offers links to each program where you can select specific degrees and their requirements. The School of Architecture webpage has an admissions tab as well that dives into the specifics of admissions for B.Arch. and M.Arch. applicants. For each type of student there is clearly listed information regarding a checklist of required materials and the required portfolio submission. For B.Arch. students, the process of reviewing transcripts and portfolio is detailed on the USC Architecture Admissions page and describes the three levels of standing available to transfer applicants. For M.Arch. students, there is a document online that outlines the 2-year and 3-year tracks available, and the requirements for each. If students are eligible for advanced standing in the M.Arch. program they are notified upon acceptance. The admissions office reviews transfer students and content of non-accredited degrees with university sanctioned forms. This typically applies to general education requirements. For studio standing, a portfolio review is required to determine standing. The B.Arch. standing options for first-year, second-year or summer start. For M.Arch. portfolios are reviewed for standing in the two-year or three-year program. Several links to the Financial Aid website, as provided in the APR, review USC's commitment to affordability and provide detailed information regarding financial aid and scholarships available and how to apply for each, for both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. The USC Architecture webpage, provided in the APR, also provides information that is program specific, and links back to the Financial Aid website. The School of Architecture is actively working towards their five-year Diversity and Inclusion Plan and has met several of their goals at the undergraduate level and remains focused on increasing diversity at the graduate level. While the school has several Diversity initiatives including fellowship and aid for historically underrepresented communities and student equity and inclusion programs, it is not a listed deciding factor in the admissions process. The program confirmed diversity goals are not promoted as a basis for admissions.

6.6 Student Financial Information (Guidelines, p. 24)

6.6.1 The program must demonstrate that students have access to current resources and advice for making decisions about financial aid.

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

B.Arch.
☒ Met

M.Arch.
☐ Met

2023 Team Analysis:
The program has demonstrated that students have access to current resources and advice for making decisions about financial aid. The USC Office of Financial Aid manages and administers all undergraduate financial aid, including grants, scholarships, loans and Federal Work-Study. USC reports that nearly two-thirds of USC undergraduate students receive financial aid, in the form of merit scholarships, need-based grants, Federal Work-Study and student loans. International students are not eligible to receive federal or USC need-based financial aid, however they may be awarded merit scholarships and/or other departmental awards. Numerous university maintained web pages such as “Preparing for USC maintained by the USC Enrollment Services” and the "USC Net Price Calculator" offer students a host of support and access to critical financial aid information.
V. Appendices

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

PC.1 Career Paths
The visiting team observed a program that was strongly oriented towards preparing students to understand the potential career paths and issues of licensure in their path ahead. The curriculum of ARCH 525 and 526 is robust in its curriculum that covers practice in depth. The ethos of the school, creating the Citizen Architect, is bolstered by the value of practitioner professors and all faculties connection to the community. In addition, the Architectural Guild supplements teachings with hands-on experience with practitioners and the surrounding community of designers and architects.

SC.2 Professional Practice
The visiting team was impressed by the thorough incorporation of the citizen architect and their connection to professional practice being woven into the entire curriculum. ARCH 525 and ARCH 526 reviews professional practice in its entirety, while also honing in on current affairs and local issues. The school's connection to the community and profession makes these lessons even more invaluable. The Architectural Guild plays a large role in the success of practice outside of the classroom inviting students into mentorship programs and other events. It was noted in meetings with students that many choose USC for its connection to practice, reality, and the ability to be well sought after upon graduation.

5.3 Curricular Development
The USC School of Architecture has taken great care in evaluating the 2020 Conditions and Procedures and how they merge with the existing curriculum and ethos of the school. Course assessment is done both holistically and with great attention to detail, and directly correlates to the changes in curriculum to address the new C&P’s as well current world and local events. The process is transparent and detail-oriented, and it will continue to benefit from an evolving assessment process.

5.5 Social Equity Diversity and Inclusion
The School of Architecture has been carrying out the 5-Year Diversity and Inclusion Plan created in 2017-2018 and has had great success in achieving many of their goals. With a School of Architecture population that is more diverse than the Institution, they have worked hard to increase student, staff, and faculty diversity, and continue those improvements. The creation of the Diversity Liaison has effectively brought Diversity Equity and Inclusion to all conversations, which is an impressive feat. The A-lab also works to bring in local high school students, enlarging the pipeline of students to the field of architecture.
Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix
**B. Arch PROGRAM AND STUDENT CRITERIA MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Non-Curricular Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102A</td>
<td>105L</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>502A</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102B</td>
<td>202A</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213B</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>214B</td>
<td>213A</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213B</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>214B</td>
<td>213A</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213B</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>214B</td>
<td>213A</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213B</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>214B</td>
<td>213A</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213B</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>214B</td>
<td>213A</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213B</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>214B</td>
<td>213A</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213B</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>214B</td>
<td>213A</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213B</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>214B</td>
<td>213A</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213B</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shared Values**
- Design: X
- Equity, Diversity & Inclusion: X
- Knowledge & Innovation: X
- Leadership, Collab. & Community Engagement: X
- Lifelong Learning: X

**Program Criteria**
- PC.1 Career Paths: X
- PC.2 Design: X
- PC.3 Ecological Know. & Respon.: X
- PC.4 History & Theory: X
- PC.5 Research & Innovation: X
- PC.6 Leadership & Collaboration: X
- PC.7 Learning & Teaching Culture: X
- PC.8 Social Equity & Inclusion: X

**Student Criteria**
- SC.1 HSW in the Built Environ.: X
- SC.2 Professional Practice: X
- SC.3 Regulatory Context: X
- SC.4 Technical Knowledge: X
- SC.5 Design Synthesis: X
- SC.6 Building Integration: X
## BA/BS COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Non-Curricular Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shared Values

- Design
- Env. Stewardship & Professional Respon.
- Equity, Diversity & Inclusion
- Knowledge & Innovation
- Leadership, Collab. & Community Engmt.
- Lifelong Learning

### Program Criteria

- PC.1 Career Paths
- PC.2 Design
- PC.3 Ecological Know. & Respn.
- PC.4 History & Theory
- PC.5 Research & Innovation
- PC.6 Leadership & Collaboration
- PC.7 Learning & Teaching Culture
- PC.8 Social Equity & Inclusion

### Student Criteria

- SC.1 HSW in the Built Environ.
- SC.2 Professional Practice
- SC.3 Regulatory Context
- SC.4 Technical Knowledge
- SC.5 Design Synthesis
- SC.6 Building Integration

### Non-Curricular Activity

- Competitions
- USC Affiliated Organizations
- Generation Next Event
- Symposiums
- Volunteering
- Faculty Committee Activities
- Research
- Class Assistantships
- Architectural Guild Activities
- EXPO
- IPAL
- All school lectures
- Student Organizations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Non-Curricular Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>409a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Foundation</td>
<td>Graduate Architecture Design</td>
<td>Graduate Architecture Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510b</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>515a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History of Architecture</td>
<td>Advanced Architectural Theory</td>
<td>Contemporary Architectural Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523 b</td>
<td>514 a</td>
<td>526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture Themes and Case Studies</td>
<td>Building Systems and Structural Design</td>
<td>Building Systems and Structural Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive and Computational Architectural Geometry</td>
<td>Design for Thermal and Environmental Environ.</td>
<td>Design for the Luminous/Sonic Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505aL</td>
<td>514b</td>
<td>523a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanism Themes and Case Studies</td>
<td>Graduate Architecture Design</td>
<td>Architecture Directed Design Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514b</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro. Practice: Pre-Design, Project + Office Admin</td>
<td>Building Structures and Seismic Design</td>
<td>Pro. Practice: Legal, Econ Context, Project Doc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>605aL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Systems</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Architecture Directed Design Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514b</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>605bL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for the Luminous/Sonic Environment</td>
<td>Advanced Architectural Systems Integration</td>
<td>Architecture Directed Design Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>Major: Pre-Design, Project + Office Admin</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575a</td>
<td>575b</td>
<td>793a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for the Luminous/Sonic Environment</td>
<td>Advanced Architectural Systems Integration</td>
<td>Architectural Guild Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575b</td>
<td>793b</td>
<td>793b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>Campus Resources</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>793b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Values</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>Campus Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity, Diversity &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership, Collabor. &amp; Community Engnt.</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Criteria</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.1 Career Paths</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.2 Design</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.3 Ecological Know. &amp; Respon.</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.4 History &amp; Theory</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.5 Research &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.6 Leadership &amp; Collaboration</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.7 Learning &amp; Teaching Culture</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC.8 Social Equity &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Criteria</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC.1 HSW in the Built Environ.</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC.2 Professional Practice</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC.3 Regulatory Context</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC.4 Technical Knowledge</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC.5 Design Synthesis</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC.6 Building Integration</td>
<td>Competencies: Design, Environmental, Sustainability</td>
<td>All school lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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