

**New York Institute of Technology  
School of Architecture and Design**

**Visiting Team Report**

**B. Arch** (160 semester credits)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board  
16 February 2011

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

## **Table of Contents**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. Summary of Team Findings	1
1. Team Comments	1
2. Conditions Not Met	1
3. Causes of Concern	1
4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	2
II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation	7
1. Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	7
2. Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	21
III. Appendices:	35
1. Program Information	35
2. Conditions Met with Distinction	55
3. Visiting Team	56
IV. Report Signatures	57
V. Confidential Recommendation and Signatures	58

**I. Summary of Team Findings**

**1. Team Comments & Visit Summary**

The team appreciates the hospitality, time and effort that the school devoted to the clarity with which they presented the school for this accreditation visit.

The team finds this is a strong program with measurable progress made since the last visit. This was confirmed in discussions with faculty, students, and administration, and is clearly evident as described in the APR and confirmed during the visit.

The team room was well organized for the work of the visit presenting the school concisely with an enthusiasm that was confirmed by students and faculty and administration. Along with the specified student exhibits, the school presented an additional depth of student work through a searchable digital matrix enlarged through projection that facilitated team discussion.

Students exhibit a spirit of excitement and appreciation for the learning they are gaining and the opportunities that the school is providing. They also show a confidence from their contributions to the school and value their ability to define areas where they can become an ongoing part of the evolution of the school. The dedication and enthusiasm of the faculty, students and administration is readily apparent.

The uniqueness of each part of the dual campus presents both opportunities and challenges for the school - the school is active in pursuit of the opportunities this situation presents.

The linkage with the profession is almost seamless. The IDP program is well integrated in the program. The embrace of technology and the welcome stance to this as a challenge is a hallmark of the school and university; alumni are captivated by results and value the contribution graduates are able to make to the profession.

The level of interdisciplinary collaboration and leadership was observable with the students and conveyed through discussions with faculty and administration. Students, faculty, and administration all join together in support of common goals through projects in the school.

The student driven initiative to pursue and translate an experience from the design studio to frame a design-build studio for a community initiative is commendable – this action confirms the posture of students the team encountered as self-starters who seek out opportunities and expect to be long term contributors to their society.

An innovative digital faculty exhibition gave the team a broad understanding of the scholarship and creative research that each faculty pursues. This mode of presentation recommends itself as beneficial way of constructing and presenting the image of the faculty in the school and should be suggested to other schools as a model.

**2. Conditions Not Met**

(none)

**3. Causes of Concern**

**A. Licensure Information Provided at [www.nyit.edu/architecture/architecture](http://www.nyit.edu/architecture/architecture)**

The team noted the following language on the website: "The NAAB-certified B.Arch. degree may lead to New York State licensure plus reciprocal licensure in all states except California." The NCARB certificate assists in the reciprocal licensure in all states and several other

jurisdictions. Several of those jurisdictions have additional licensing requirements specific to their jurisdiction. The program should revisit the accuracy of the language contained in this portion of the website.

B. Homogeneity of Project Sites

The team observed an assumption of level, flat sites in dense urban settings, which limited the students' exposure to topography that could restrict the students' opportunities to deal with accessibility and broader design issues.

C. Faculty Resources

If the school is to achieve the institutions goals for a 21<sup>st</sup> century university with a focus on technology and a global presence, then a commitment to increased faculty resources is necessary.

The team is concerned that current faculty are heavily loaded in course assignments and committee work, which leaves little time for mentoring of junior faculty, adjunct faculty and students in and outside of course work, as well as, time for scholarly and creative research. Adjunct faculty members are a valuable asset to the life and vibrancy of the program. The team is concerned that the contributions of adjunct faculty are appropriately and adequately recognized by the institution.

D. Opportunities for Entire Student Cohort

While the program provides opportunities for students to engage in unique educational experiences, it would be beneficial to broaden opportunities for the diversity of students to join in these programs.

Outside observation of the process where students engage the unique education experiences offered by the program warranted concern from the team in respect to the diversity of students able to participate.

E. Selection and Technical Documentation of Contemporary Enclosure Systems

While selection and technical documentation of traditional enclosure systems was evident, it was noted that selection and technical documentation of contemporary enclosure systems was not as evident.

This should be an enumerated list (e.g., A., B., C., etc.) *Each must have a title and a brief narrative describing the cause of concern.*

**4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2005 B. Arch]**

**1998 Perspective 1.2, Architecture Education and Students:** *The program must demonstrate that it provides support and encouragement for students to assume leadership roles during their school years and later in the profession, and that it provides an interpersonal milieu that embraces cultural differences.*

**Previous Team Report (2005):** The team is impressed with the students in the School of Architecture and Design. They are knowledgeable and very dedicated to their education and the school. Their views of architecture are obviously enriched by their experience at the school.

Students in the architecture program are a diverse body with obvious respect for one another, and a strong sense of camaraderie prevails. They have formed an informal communication network that permits them to stay informed about activities at the school and on the various campuses.

The leadership of the various student organizations and groups (AIAS, Tau Sigma Delta, the Façade Club, Solar Decathlon) is energetic, committed and exhibits considerable leadership skill. With proper

encouragement and advice, it can carry forward resurgence in student activity and student-led ideas to enrich the school. To foster leadership opportunities, it is important to integrate students into the governance and policy making of the school. An example is the establishment of a Student Advisory Council that would consist of student leaders who would meet on a consistent basis with the school's administration to discuss student-centered issues.

Evidence of support and encouragement by faculty and administration, beyond allowing student groups to congregate, is limited. Students are not encouraged to participate in the governance processes within the School of Architecture and Design. There is little evidence that they are participating in establishing their individual and collective learning agendas. For example, students are not being included in faculty searches. Section 8, Committee Composition, in the NYIT *Faculty Governance Policy*, states that students may be designated to a committee. It is our concern that they are not encouraged or required to be in attendance. It is encouraging to learn that if they were in attendance they would receive a partial vote.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** As evident in the APR (under III.1.2. for the 2007 ARS) this area of concern has been satisfied and addressed. During the visit, it was evident that the program continues to support student activity and development through leadership. Students have the opportunity to engage in a variety of student organizations, serve on program committees, collaborate on sLAB projects (ie. Solar Decathlon, Intrepid) and participate in the development of curriculum (ie. Freeport Boxing Gym).

Students felt that studios were collaborative and had a sense of camaraderie. Mentorship was described as available, but found to be lacking in the first few years of the program.

Students felt they had access to multiple professors from whom to seek mentorship and advice outside of studio time. It was mentioned that because of the high number of adjunct faculty and the lack of office hours for those faculty, it was difficult to meet in person although they were available through electronic communication and volunteered personal time. Cross-reference I.1.3 –A for further information.

**1998 Perspective 1.3, Architecture Education and Registration:** *The program must demonstrate that it provides students with a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure.*

**Previous Team Report (2005):** Participation in the Intern Development Program (IDP) is a requirement for registration in most jurisdictions. The school has recently appointed an IDP coordinator, who has just initiated an informational outreach strategy. This is evidenced in a presentation to the students in the Professional Practice course at Central Islip. The students' lack of awareness of the IDP on the other two campuses indicates that the students are not adequately being prepared for licensure.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment: the program in this area has made significant progress.** The team did not encounter any students who did not understand the path from education to licensure. The students are aware of IDP and clearly understand the requirements for licensure. Many are already enrolled in the IDP program. Those who are not enrolled have generally made a conscious decision not to enroll because of a current inability to obtain credits. The students are aware that the degree is only the first step (and that in the State of New York if they choose not to obtain the B. Arch, but rather complete the program with the BSAT, then they still have the ability to obtain a license). Cross-reference - I.1.3.C.

**1998 Condition 3, Public Information:** *The program must provide clear, complete and accurate information to the public by including in its catalog and promotional literature the exact language found in Appendix A-2, which explains the parameters of an accredited professional degree program.*

**Previous Team Report (2005):** The required language does not appear in the official catalog. Searches of both the undergraduate catalog and the university Web site yielded no evidence of the language required by this condition. The *1998 Guide to Student Performance Criteria* is provided to incoming students through the fundamental design course.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion was deemed "satisfied" in 2006 NAAB response to Annual Report. The material is correct in the school catalogue and on the school Web site. For further information see II.4.1.

**1998 Condition 7, Physical Resources:** *The program must provide physical resources that are appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each full-time student; lecture and seminar spaces that accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space.*

**Previous Team Report (2005):** The team has found that the Manhattan campus does not provide adequate space for the exclusive use of students in the third-, fourth-, and fifth-year studios. This was not the case at the Old Westbury campus. However, next year when students at Central Islip are distributed between the two remaining campuses, it appears Old Westbury will also be very deficient in space.

In addition, the team found that there are adequate faculty offices for full-time faculty, but there is inadequate space for adjunct faculty on both remaining campuses. At a minimum, there needs to be some space for adjunct faculty to hang their coats, grade work, prepare for class, and privately meet students outside class.

Because of space limitations, the Old Westbury campus has been utilizing "hot desks" for students enrolled in first-year studios. Upper-level students enrolled in studio, who desire a permanent desk, are provided one. Despite the recent renovations of the school facilities at the Manhattan campus, "hot desks" must be used for students enrolled in all levels of studio, until they reach the thesis level, due to lack of space.

Further, the Manhattan campus does not have any adjunct faculty office space for access to telephones, computers, printers, mailboxes, and the like. Given the closing of the Central Islip campus, the shortage of permanent studio desks is expected to increase on the remaining two campuses. The already crowded Old Westbury library will also be impacted as the Central Islip library holdings are consolidated.

The school has plans and funding allocated for renovations to the Old Westbury campus building that should address some of the concerns identified on that campus. Currently, there are no plans to address the Manhattan campus.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** The changes that have occurred to the NAAB Conditions from the time of the last team visit no longer specify dedicated studio space or individual faculty office space. Improvements to the physical resources in the school since the last visit released the school from reporting on this in the annual reports. Significant improvements on both campuses have been made to the physical resources since the last visit. The university is continuing to advance a plan to add more studio and support spaces with restacking construction initiating in April 2011 at the Manhattan campus. Cross-reference I.2.3.

**1998 Criterion 12.7, Human Behavior:** Awareness of *the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationships between human behavior and the physical environment*

**Previous Team Report (2005):** While it is understood that required core courses in psychology and sociology may touch upon human behavior, evidence within the architecture program that correlates this awareness to the physical environment was not found.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion was satisfied as stated in the APR from the 2007 ARS, through the Introduction to History, Theory and Criticism in Architecture ARCH 160. Several written assignments demonstrated the students' understanding and awareness of how design impacts human behavior, reflected through procession and programming.

This criterion is also evident in ARCH 272 Environmental Site Planning with some of the environmental site planning projects describing how urban spaces affect individual participation within the site and in ARCH 401 Design V. Cross - reference II.1.C.2

The committee acknowledges that this criterion was addressed and deemed satisfied in the 2006 Annual Report. During this visit, the team observed that aspects of this criterion was evidenced in Environmental Site Planning, as well as in work from some of the history classes and design studios.

**1998 Criterion 12.14, Accessibility:** Ability to *design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities*

**Previous Team Report (2005):** While this criterion may be introduced in the coursework and discussed in the studio as discerned during student discussions, a true understanding and application of accessibility both in the building and site was lacking from the student work.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** Progress has been made since the last accreditation team visit principally evidenced by course work in ARCH 301 & 302. It is apparent that students are able to design projects that incorporate accessible solutions necessary to satisfy this deficiency. ARCH 402, Architectural Design VI further supports the student's capability. Cross-reference II.1.B.2.

**1998 Criterion 12.24, Building Code Compliance:** Understanding of *the codes, regulations, and standards applicable to a given site and building design, including occupancy classifications, allowable building heights and areas, allowable construction types, separation requirements, means of egress, fire protection, and structure*

**Previous Team Report (2005):** Review of student work and course syllabi revealed a lack of understanding of basic building code issues (i.e., separation of exits, dead-end corridors, and number of exits). During discussions with students they expressed a belief that they understand basic building codes.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion was responded to and deemed satisfied in the 2007 Annual Report to the NAAB. Further evidence for this criterion can be found in Student Performance - II.1. B.5.

**1998 Criterion 12.26, Building Economics and Cost Control:** Understanding of building economics and construction cost control within the framework of a design project

**Previous Team Report (2005):** The only evidence found for this criterion was in the elective course 471, Construction Supervision and Management.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion was deemed "satisfied" in 2006 NAAB response to Annual Report. Cross-reference Student Performance - II.1.B.7.

**1998 Criterion 12.29, Comprehensive Design:** Ability to *produce an architecture project informed by a comprehensive program, from schematic design through the detailed development of programmatic spaces, structural and environmental systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections, and building assemblies, as may be appropriate; and to assess the completed project with respect to the program's design criteria*

**Previous Team Report (2005):** It is clear that both the fourth- and fifth-year sequences provide an opportunity to satisfy this criterion. However, examples in the team room were lacking in execution. This is particularly true in the areas of life-safety provisions, environmental systems, and assessment of the completed project with respect to the program's design criteria.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion was deemed "satisfied" in 2006 NAAB response to Annual Report. The visiting team found this condition met. Cross-reference with Student Performance – II.1.B.6.

**1998 Criterion 12.34, Professional Internship:** Understanding of *the role of internship in professional development, and the reciprocal rights and responsibilities of interns and employers*

**Previous Team Report (2005):** The student population is mostly unaware of the IDP. In our assessment of course criteria, the team could not find evidence of the understanding of the formalized professional internship program. The school offers an externship program; however, this is an elective course and because of the prerequisites is not accessible to all students.

The school has recently appointed an IDP coordinator and efforts to give students a full understanding of the program are in the early development stages.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion was deemed "satisfied" in 2006 NAAB response to Annual Report. Cross-reference with I.1.3.C - Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment and with Public Information - II.4.3 - Access to Career Development Information.

## II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** The history and mission of the program is described in university's strategic planning website and in the school's mission statement website. Discussions with students, faculty, and university and program administrators confirm the complementary fit of the program within NYIT's 2030 plan. The program fully supports the mission of the larger institution as defined in the university's plan, offering access to all qualified students to deliver professional education that results in a professional career while also fostering institutional research that supports application connecting to a global world. The school's efforts to uphold the mission of a technological focus and global presence are evident throughout the curriculum as evidenced by special study abroad programs, visiting faculty appointments, guest speakers and global studio projects.

The program has identified design intelligence, a high level of engagement in building technology, and graduating students with strong leadership skills as core program values. University advancement materials currently published in the media show that the university celebrates the school's achievements as contributions to the overall institutional vision. Discussion with the strong growing alumni confirms support for the program mission to reach out and engage larger contexts.

With the dual campus setting of the institution in Manhattan and Old Westbury, the school has sought to maintain parity while capitalizing on the diversity of these two unique communities to grant students a larger professional perspective while unifying the place of these two parts in the institution.

#### **I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** It is evident that students and faculty have engaged each other, which has resulted in effective dialogue, in some instances even leading to collaborative curriculum development such as the Freeport Boxing Studio in the fourth year of the B.Arch. Students feel as though they have an ability to communicate openly with the faculty about their education. The faculty, as well, seem to be receptive to students' comments. Faculty enjoy this shared openness and are excited about the enthusiasm and drive from the students' involvement, as assessed through the discussion during the all faculty meeting.

The sentiment from the faculty is that the program embraces a globally diverse constituency; they seem focused to continue to grow that diversity. School web sites show that the school upholds the diversity of the students and faculty as strength of the program. Students also see the diversity, both of nationality and background, as an important factor in their studies. In discussion with students during tours and in student meetings, students are eloquent and well equipped to discuss topics related to their careers and education.

As mentioned in the Studio Culture Statement, diversity is highly valued at the School of Architecture and Design. The school supports university policy to provide faculty, students, and staff with an equitable educational environment to foster learning, teaching and working as referenced in the faculty and student handbooks.

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

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

**[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.**

---

<sup>1</sup> See Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1990.

**2011 Team Assessment:** In discussions with students, faculty, and school and university administration, and from materials presented, it is evident that the program makes an important connection to the larger academic community through ongoing collaborative efforts as a common practice. The collaborative stance of the school's design studios and special projects demonstrate instances where project definitions reach out to a broad range of communities nearby. Studio work utilizes local sites to expand the student experience while also engaging communities in the practice of architecture. Students visit and tour exemplar buildings in Manhattan as precedents and frame for the design work to follow.

Faculty participate in university sponsored interdisciplinary conferences that provide occasions for students and faculty to engage experts along with other members of the university community. The school makes connections amongst the academic activities in the school and follows up on experience gained in one setting to position opportunities for students in other areas. The Solar Decathlon is an instance of this, furthered in the program as a teaching/ research model to encourage students to see new definitions of projects as frameworks for practice and community engagement elsewhere.

With the Solar Decathlon experience, the Student-Led Architecture Build - sLAB was initiated and is now an ongoing program where faculty are advisors and coaches. The Intrepid Competition for a restoration facility on the deck of a moored aircraft carrier, now a museum, followed this pattern. Through programs such as these, the school reaches out to engage many other areas in the university; interior design and the engineering program are two. As an extension, students are now initiating and drawing out opportunities from previous studio work.

Materials presented in the team room with design lab projects and precedent studies indicate that community engagement is a hallmark of the program.

Students receive liberal arts education with a new 38-credit liberal arts sequence revised with a suite of courses to give the students the means to a liberal arts education while engaging other students in disciplines across the university. The university's broad commitment to an enriched liberal arts program brought this new liberal arts core to the entire student body.

The internal design expertise of the school is regularly called upon by the institution in numerous ways, including student work being featured in digital media and exhibitions, students and faculty being asked to give input on facilities projects, students and faculty as speakers for NYIT-sponsored conferences, and students and faculty representing the school at community events.

- B. Architectural Education and Students.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to live and work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured and respected; to emerge as leaders in the academic setting and the profession; to understand the breadth of professional opportunities; to make thoughtful, deliberate, informed choices and; to develop the habit of lifelong learning.

**[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Students at NYIT have a strong understanding of what it means to work collaboratively with diverse populations and respect individual objectives while producing meaningful outcomes. Both proficient in various technologies and equipped to understand the nuances of design, they seem prepared to seek opportunities to utilize their skills, whether through leadership positions, competitions, firm work, or design/build projects. The quality of enthusiasm and dedication to projects and career projections in talking with students seems to be a strong sentiment across the studios.

- C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship

and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located, and; prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).

**[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The physical locale and proximity to a large number of firms in the New York Metropolitan area facilitates a strong connection between academia and the profession. The IDP educator coordinator at NYIT has assumed the role with enthusiasm. The IDP educator coordinator attended the educator/coordinator's conference in 2010. The students view this position as a valuable resource. Students also credited the active AIAS chapter with helping to disseminate information and organize presentations. They cited recent visits by NCARB staff, a member of the New York State Board, and discussions with several practicing architects. Every student we queried was aware of IDP. There is also a large percentage of the student population working in local firms. While some are not working enough hours to accumulate IDP credit at this point, they are aware of the requirements and how the program works. The team did note that the educator/coordinator seemed unaware of recent changes in eligibility dates. Adequate communication with NCARB will keep the school up-to date with changes occurring in the IDP program.

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

**[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** NYIT's mission "to provide career-oriented, professional education" while maintaining a "global presence," strongly supports the school's ability to adequately prepare students for professional practice in a global economy. Building upon these basic Institutional foundations the School has provided supplemental exposure to global professional practice through international study trips to Italy, Cuba, Chile and France among others, regular precedent study of international projects, and an annual lecture and film series.

In parallel to the global preparation of NYIT's students, the program's community engagement studios prepare students to actively embrace team collaboration when solving diverse client expectations. Participation in activities such as the Solar Decathlon, Intrepid design completion and continued development of a community boxing gym in Freeport, NY all demonstrate preparation of students for their future roles in the architectural profession.

In addition to the school's curricular support of professional preparation, students have access to practicing adjunct professors, guest critics, alumni and in many cases part-time employment; which all compliment their educational activities.

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

**[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The students are receiving an education that prepares them to be active, engaged citizens and professionals in a changing world, and to seek learning opportunities to develop abilities to assess the consequences of their decisions. From discussions with students, faculty, and the administration, and in materials presented in the team room and the Gallery Exhibition, it was evident that students come to this relationship with many perspectives. Within the school, students have opportunities to participate in groups such as AIAS, Freedom by Design, NOMAS, the sLAB and the Sustainability Club, all that champion this relationship.

As indicated in the professional practice class work, students engage project management, budgets, schedules and the ethical framework that governs professional work as related the public good. The students are able to gather further insights from studio projects; in the fourth year studio, in particular; from internships and externships; and through the practice of school faculty. With the university long-term planning and self-assessment goal from the Institution's 2030 PLAN: to Strengthen the Links between University and Community via Professional Service this relationship is further defined at the level of the institution cited in the "Green Print" video on the university's web site.

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

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** Faculty from the School of Architecture and Design are members of the institution's Strategic Plan ("NYIT 2030: Setting Directions, Meeting Challenges") Steering Committee. The Strategic Plan incorporates methods for assessment and metrics for measurement of progress towards goals. An implementation matrix and score card are evidence of a process of assessment measuring the efficacy of the plan. A concise vision and mission statement bridging the profession, the institution, and the school's constituency guides the School of Architecture and Design. This document is found on the School's website, in the APR and in documentation in the Team Room. The school adopted a Tactical Plan in 2007 that outlines a 5-year planning horizon for the unit. This plan is documented in the APR and a PDF of a presentation from a working session of the faculty committee. The "2009-2010 Assessment Report" (link provided in the APR) illustrates broad faculty and student participation in the setting of objectives and the measurement of accomplishments toward achievement of the Tactical Plan.

**I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures:** *The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:*

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

- *Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.*

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

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** In meetings with faculty and from materials in the Team Room, it was evident that the evolution of the program and curriculum is an ongoing, collaborative process. These efforts, because of the structure of NYIT, are not confined to the program itself but involve the institution as a whole. The tools for assessment seem quite refined and sophisticated for evaluating student learning outcomes.

**PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES****I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:**▪ *Faculty & Staff:*

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

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** The team reviewed faculty resumes contained in the APR; the matrix illustrating faculty qualifications to teach in particular subject areas, and the Faculty Exhibit, the latter two contained in the Team Room. The school relies on a core group of full-time faculty members (26) and a diverse and dedicated cadre of part-time adjunct faculty members (120) both on the Manhattan and Old Westbury campuses. The team found that faculty members are appropriately credentialed for their roles in the curriculum. Personnel policies are outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Faculty Handbook (links for both are provided in the APR). The Collective Bargaining Agreement regulates interaction between the institution and its faculty in matters ranging from faculty searches, tenure, promotion, workloads, and eligibility for sabbatical leave. The Agreement also provides a statement regarding EEO/AA. Faculty workload is determined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement as 21 Equivalent Lecture Hours per year. Administrative mechanisms for ensuring equity in workloads as well as flexibility in assignment are outlined in the APR. An IDP Education Coordinator has been working with students in the school and as cited elsewhere in this VTR evidence that students are gaining knowledge of internship was substantiated through interviews with student groups. Evidence of institutional support of professional development, scholarship, and research was documented in the APR (and the on-line links provided), as were the policies for Sabbatical Leave, determination of rank, tenure, and promotion.

▪ *Students:*

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

---

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

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** Materials for student applications and admissions were found in the NYIT Undergraduate Catalog and on the NYIT web site and in binders in the Team Room. The school encourages more diversity in the student body by also admitting undeclared majors who follow specified procedures for entrance into the BSAT program and then apply to the BARCH. Externships and other off-campus programs and activities draw upon the density of professional expertise in the school's local and global connections. In discussions with students and faculty and from exhibits in the school, it is apparent that the academic program, campus activities, student research and scholarship, and professional opportunities all contribute to student achievement and are viewed as part of an organic whole.

**I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:**

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

**[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The School of Architecture and Design enjoys a collegial relationship with the institution's leadership as evidenced in face-to-face meetings with the President, Provost, and Associate Provost. The institution's leaders are aware of the School's contribution to the institution, profession, and broader community. The leadership expressed considerable understanding and support for professional education in architecture. The School is lead by a Dean and supported by an Associate Dean and Chairs of the individual programs. Both the institutional administrative structure and the unit institutional structure are clearly outlined in organizational charts provided in the APR. Position descriptions of the principal administrators were provided in the APR.

While the team found the administrative structure to be adequate, it is concerned that enrollment in programs in Old Westbury and Manhattan have grown, but support for the Chairs has remained constant. Coupled with the challenges of maintaining curricular and administrative parity on both campuses, administrative support for the work of the Chairs appears to be an issue requiring further examination.

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

**[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** At the institutional level the NYIT Academic Senate provides a forum for interaction between faculty, professional staff, students and administrators. The body is advisory to the "institution, assists in setting policy in the areas of academic standards, admissions, curricula, budget, institutional development, communications, calendar, and educational technology, and provides a venue for constituencies to exchange ideas within the NYIT community." (APR, p.47) A senior member of the school's faculty served as Vice-President of the Academic Senate during AY 2008-09. The Student Government Association functions at the institutional level to provide a forum for students and to elect participants in the Academic Senate.

The school maintains an advisory board of alumni and respected professionals who consult with the dean on matters of importance to the unit while also serving as a fund-raising vehicle. Curriculum Co-Coordinators are appointed to ensure that delivery of content between the Old Westbury and Manhattan campuses are equitable. The school maintains a School Personnel Committee (SPC) as stipulated by the NYIT-AAUP contract. The SPC "search[es] for and evaluate[s] candidates for full-

time appointment and sabbatical leave and conduct[s] the initial review of candidates for retention, promotion and tenure." (APR, p.49) The school maintains 17 committees that cover all aspects of unit operations. Most committees are comprised of full-time faculty members, adjunct faculty members, and students.

**I.2.3 Physical Resources:** *The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:*

- *Space to support and encourage studio-based learning*
- *Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.*
- *Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.*

**[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The School of Architecture and Design has two campus settings, one on Long Island at Old Westbury and the other in Manhattan near Lincoln Center.

Manhattan Campus: In Manhattan, the school of architecture at the Main Campus Building at 1855 W. Broadway is located on the 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, and part of the 6<sup>th</sup> floor. A lower level, 5000sf. open studio is located at 16 W. 61<sup>st</sup> St. The team observed studio-based learning in the fifth year in Manhattan - fifth year studio space on the 10th floor is the only dedicated space for students. All other studio-based learning occurs in rotating studio/classrooms.

Students and faculty report positively on the student practice of using the rotating desk studio space and staking out areas for different years as a collaborative meeting place during hours when the space is not otherwise in use. Students cited this activity as collegial, and an important dimension of their learning. Students are active in utilizing the building in Manhattan. Faculty mentioned that the large lower level multi-studio space in an adjacent building was congenial to a vibrant education atmosphere of the school.

Additional program space includes, the campus library on the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2nd, and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor (1855 W. Broadway); digital, print, and 3D Fabrication laboratories; and five rooms for faculty office space for 12 full-time and adjunct faculty. Students mentioned the shop space in Manhattan as limited considering the demand. Shop improvements were cited in the APR and shown on the visit tour - new equipment and an exhaust system supervised by a ¾- time, dedicated technician and student assistants. Future plans suggest more directly linking the digital lab and shop space to harness the complimentary nature of these resources.

The newly acquired and renovated state-of the art auditorium with 262 seats at 1817 Broadway has given the university and school a place to conduct large lectures and host visitors. The auditorium is activating the program - the many new uses include the student/faculty sponsored film series themed to films showcasing global cities to support the urban emphasis in the curriculum. Improvements in 2007 at 16 W61st Street gave 5,000 sf for a new studio with 80 drafting tables. Allocation of two additional floors in the main building will contribute new space for the program. In Manhattan, the university provides dormitory space. Students state this is helping to create more of a learning community, since students can live nearby and work in the dorm if studio space is not available.

It is expected that architecture will be allocated two additional floors in the Main Campus building with the acquisition of new office space this summer, 2011. Since 2005, \$3.5 million has been devoted to improvements made to the architecture space with \$1.5 million renovation to the newly acquired auditorium space used for lectures, films, invited lectures, meetings and seminars.

The Manhattan location clearly provides the school with an important vantage point for many dimensions of education other than school program space. The school has been able to take advantage of professional offices and company headquarters to extend the physical field of the school. This locale is

offered to students on both campuses, since students may elect to take courses at either location.

Old Westbury: The school at Old Westbury in Education Hall provides seven rooms for faculty offices, dedicated studio spaces for students after the first year, classrooms, technology labs, an architecture and interior design library, exhibition – jury space, administration suite, center gallery, shop, digital labs, and cafeteria meeting space in 51,000 sf. Students mentioned that some of the best educational discussions occurred outside of studio time in the studio location pointing to the educational advantage of dedicated space for all the levels beyond the first year. The surrounding estate setting with buildings where core courses and interior design are taught also contribute to the curricular and extracurricular experiences of student life.

Since the last accreditation visit many improvements have been made to the physical resources of the school at Education Hall, Old Westbury, including the second floor renovations, sprinkler system upgrade, school wide-Wi-Fi and smart classrooms, exhibition gallery, renovations to administration space and restrooms, fabrication lab, open-access computer lab, security upgrade with card access system, new lockers, and exterior building maintenance – all totaling \$3.5 million. The latest renovations include renovations to the corridor, and exhibition gallery.

Students find that the need for additional project review/meeting space should not require the clearing of the cafeteria as it now does. The students have expressed concern that the fabrication space cannot adequately accommodate the high percentage of student use. As Education Hall is an older building first renovated for school use in 1966, future plans suggest continuing upgrades.

The visiting team finds the existing studio and project review space on both campuses constrains interactive and didactic learning. Also, some mentioned that the rolling admissions policy places demands on space and faculty resources requiring adjustment on short notice.

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

**[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The school, with recent success in encouraging alumni support and backing for specific programs, is grappling with issues of being able to bring on, support and retain faculty members who would excel the program and curriculum. In order to establish itself with peer institutions that reflect similar aspirations/missions/goals, the institution will need to fund the program well beyond current levels. This is a current challenge for the dean and administration.

Since the last report, the team observes, in meeting with friends and alumni of the school, that the school's development program has benefited from various initiatives that directly support student learning including establishment of the Advisory Board and the Friends of NYIT School of Architecture and Design.

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

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

**[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The team recognizes the effort the institution has put forward to maintain a parity of resources on both campuses. The geographical location of the program allows for unique opportunities in tapping significant collections nearby.

**PART I: SECTION 3 –REPORTS**

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

- Program student characteristics.
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.
  - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
    - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
  - Time to graduation.
    - Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.
    - Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.
- Program faculty characteristics
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.
  - Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** Everything was provided in the APR. Location of faculty licenses appears on individual resumes.

**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

---

<sup>3</sup> In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.

Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, *including appendices and addenda should also be included.*

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** Annual Reports for 2005, 2006, 2007 were provided by links in the APR to the appropriate documents on the NYIT Web site. Annual Reports for 2008, 2009, 2010 were provided by email from NAAB staff. A copy of the verification letter for statistical consistency was included in the APR.

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

*In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit<sup>4</sup> that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.*

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** An innovative faculty exhibit format was devised for the Team Room where individual faculty research was exhibited. Work was presented digitally in a compelling set of searchable screens. The Team recommends this as a model that other schools could utilize. The Faculty Exhibit displayed a broad array of professional and creative endeavors.

---

<sup>4</sup> The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.

*PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW*

*The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.*

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** Policy evidence was found. These materials were provided in a separate set of binders in the Team Room.

**PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM****PART Two (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE -- EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA**

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

**Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:**

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

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

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met by multiple courses. Evidence of the ability to read and write is demonstrated by the required reading list and essays in course ARCH 361; while the ability to speak and listen is evidenced by regular student presentations in course ARCH 362 and the design studios. Meetings with students also confirmed their speaking abilities.

Some weaknesses were observed in the written assignments.

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** Students show a clear ability to use abstract ideas to interpret information starting in the fundamental years through ARCH 301. Through iterative modeling and sketching, students learn to question their own designs and test variations. The upper level studios clearly show a wide range of viewpoints being adopted and challenged through the thesis year ARCH 501/502. A large number of thesis projects pose poignant questions about the built environment as it relates to broader issues of community and social equity.

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

**2011 Team Assessment:** Work presented on boards, in models, and course binders in Arch 301 and in the first semester thesis course Arch 501 shows well-developed skills in the use of representational media. A level of ability with digital technology furthers design exploration throughout the multiple stages of the design process.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** While student work from course ARCH 327 most directly addressed the requirements of this criterion through the development outline specifications and construction document sets of iconic buildings, wall section drawings in course ARCH 221 supported the presence of technical documentation at an early stage within the curriculum. Illustrative modeling of building assemblies was evidenced in axonometric diagrams in course ARCH 221.

Technical documentation appears to be limited to traditional construction systems.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Particularly strong evidence of this ability was found in precedent studies in ARCH 302 Design IV and in site analysis work in ARCH 501 Design VII.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Project process work presented on boards and in the course documentation in Arch 301 and in the thesis course Arch 502 demonstrates the ability to use basic architectural skills to respond to environmental principles in developing projects and in the presentation of final outcomes. In Arch 501, the thesis documentation in booklet form presents this work formally as a sequence to portray the extent of practice.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion was well met. Precedent studies are a fundamental component of the design studios within the program and feature prominently in every design studio starting with the first semester through thesis. Student projects reflected a clear ability to comprehend

the principles present in those precedents and make good decisions in incorporating those key principles into their projects.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** ARCH 202 - Architectural Design II and ARCH 301 -Architectural Design III provide evidence of this criterion through two and three-dimensional drawings that illustrate the compositional strategies employed by precedents as well as design proposals authored by students. Evidence of this criterion is found subsequently in studio work throughout the required professional curriculum.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Using the built environment as the center point, work in Arch 161 - History Survey of Architecture and the seminar course Arch 361 summarized cultural conditions related to historical traditions and global culture and showed comparative studies to interpret this material.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Some evidence of this criterion was found in This criterion, although visible through several avenues, was really captured not in the history courses ARCH 162 - Architectural History Survey II and ARCH 361 - Architectural History Seminar as indicated, but in Design V (ARCH 401). Design V objectives clearly state that students should be analyzing "spatial structure of neighborhoods", understanding "social and cultural settings of a community", and use precedent analysis as insight to proposing "a strategy for design intervention". These course objectives provide students the tools to understand how architecture needs to respond to these conditions.

Some assignments in ARCH 361 – the portion focused on the History of Landscape, Gardens and Urban Space – where explorations of spatial patterns that characterize different cultures showed evidence, though the full breadth of the SPC was not evident.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence was found of understanding the role of applied research in building projects and in written examinations in ARCH 222 - Building Construction II specifically with respect to environmental conditions. Compliance was also evident in ARCH 325 -Environmental Systems II in examinations and student portfolios.

**Realm A. General Team Commentary:** Review of the work presented demonstrates that student performance dramatically improves as students' progress through the program. Faculty should be commended on the growth that has been exhibited in fostering critical thinking and representation skills within the student body. Making portfolio construction an ongoing part of the design courses gives students a platform from which to be continuously self-critical.

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

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

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Student performance is strong in ARCH 501- Design VII even in the low pass work. The level of ability is marginal in the low pass work in ARCH 272. Presentation and analysis was developed through the use of a variety of appropriate media in both courses.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** ARCH 301 and ARCH 302, Architectural Design III and IV provide evidence of this criterion through superimposition of wheelchair turning space circles on washrooms and elevators plans as well as indications of accessible seating areas in places of assembly. Circulation diagrams chart horizontal access between spaces. This criterion is also evident in ARCH 402 - Architectural Design VI.

The proliferation of urban sites limits the team's ability to assess student performance on sites that require more challenging accessibility strategies.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion was deemed well met. Students at NYIT have a strong grasp of sustainability and environmental ramifications of design choices, evident through projects in Environmental Building Systems 1+2 (ARCH 324+325), in addition to their work in Environmental Site Planning (ARCH 272). Students in the school have the ability to create projects that respond to the issue of sustainability, from controlling climatic issues to creating livable and healthy spaces for occupants, by utilizing passive environmental controls and techniques. As part of their visualization series, students analyze their designs through contemporary technology such as BIM and Eco-tech to better assess their own designs.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Arch 272 - Environmental Site Planning demonstrates the development of schematic projects through timed exercises. Site design emphasis found in studio projects gives further evidence of this ability.

Evidence of student work which addresses diverse topography, vegetation and watershed is limited.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** ARCH 301 and ARCH 302, Architectural Design III and IV provide evidence of this criterion through egress diagrams that accompany the design documentation. Evidence of this criterion is also seen in ARCH 402, Architectural Design VI.

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

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** The team was impressed by the students' ability to assemble a comprehensive design project in the fourth year of the curriculum. The same limitations which were evident in some of the above SPCs were observed by the team.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion was well met. Evidence of financial understanding is demonstrated through exams in course ARCH 481. Project financial pro-forma produced by students demonstrated a high level of engagement with this framework for project analysis.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** The two semester sequence of Environmental Building Systems is project based and fairly comprehensive. The course assignments and examinations for these courses clearly demonstrate that the students have an understanding of the principles of environmental systems' design with respect to embodied energy, active and passive heating and cooling, solar orientation, day lighting and artificial illumination, including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools. Several of the design projects also demonstrated an understanding in these areas.

Student understanding of acoustics and indoor air quality was inconsistent.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** ARCH 311, Structural Steel Design, and ARCH 411, Advanced Structural Systems, require students to design multi-story structures based on a given building design drawing set. Students make structural diagrams, as well as tributary, loading, shear, and bending moment diagrams. Additionally, they complete extensive calculations to size members to resist dead loads and live loads (occupant, wind, and seismic). Additionally, several other courses demonstrate the integration of this material throughout the curriculum. ARCH 221 and ARCH 222, Building Construction I & II, provide students with an opportunity to gain an understanding of wood, masonry, steel, and reinforced concrete systems. ARCH 301 and ARCH 302, Architectural Design III & IV, integrate rudimentary structural diagrams into design project requirements.

- B. 10.      **Building Envelope Systems:** *Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies*

relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Course binders from ARCH 324/222 show several examples of both high pass and low pass where students showcase their understanding of both theoretical and design aspects of building envelope construction including construction methods, insulation/R-value, climatic implications on design, and sustainable systems.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion was well met. The two-semester sequence of Environmental Building Systems is project based and comprehensive. The course assignments and examinations for these courses clearly demonstrate that the students have an understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems. In addition, projects produced by the students in the upper level design courses demonstrate an understanding of these principles and systems.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** The selection and assemblies of steel and concrete structural systems is documented in coursework from ARCH 221 & 222.

Analysis of an appropriate selection of products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse is limited.

**Realm B. General Team Commentary:** Student ability and understanding in this realm is strength of this program with some areas excepted as noted in the criteria above.

**Realm C: Leadership and Practice:**

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

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

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion was well met. An example of this ability early in the curriculum is demonstrated in AAID 102 Fundamentals 2, specifically in project B.4 where students are required to design and build a bridge between their individual design solutions. Later in the curriculum, larger teams collaborate on research and the development of design strategies for both land use planning and building solutions in ARCH 401 - Design V. Collaborative effort is clearly evident in both high pass and low pass projects. Frequently, outside the required curriculum, students engage collaboratively in projects they and faculty initiate.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** ARCH 272 Environmental Site Planning provides students the opportunity to study and understand the environmental impact of the built environment, including but not limited to paving, grading, drainage, landscaping, and zoning issues. High and Low passes from this course demonstrated student understanding of human interventions as they pertain to local ecologies.

Evidence of this SPC was observed in the materials for ARCH 272 – Environmental Site Planning where emphasis is given on understanding site configurations, zoning and regulation, physical characteristics of sites, including topography and natural site features, and then what happens with development, including code issues like ADA, zoning, etc. as well as the physical impact of development. The primary focus of the class is on physical site issues, but there is also a significant behavioral component with respect to climate, and how buildings can impact the environment of the site. Concepts explored in assignments and tested in the exams demonstrated that students understand that human actions and the design of the built environment have an impact on the natural environment. Additional material on this topic is presented in ARCH 361 seminar, during the semesters when the topic focus is the history of landscape and garden design across cultures. Though many instances of this material can be found presenting this relationship, a greater emphasis could be placed on this material in the curriculum.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Course work in Arch 481 Professional Practice and in Arch 401 Design V shows students have gained an understanding of the various client roles to which an architect must respond.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence of an understanding of project delivery methods and competing for commissions was found in ARCH 481. The selection of consultants and the assembly of teams was unevenly demonstrated in the referenced coursework.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met in ARCH 481, Professional Practice. Lectures and readings cover "Professional Practice Management & Business Principles," "Budgeting of Architectural Services," and "Professional Liability Exposures." Three multiple choice / short answer examinations include questions focused on this criterion. There was one graded assignment focused on modeling the budget, expenses, revenues, and overhead for a small architectural practice. Additionally, three quizzes focused on the topics of Business Planning, Managing Risk and Mediation, and Financial Management.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** ARCH 481, the professional practice course taught in the fourth year, was strong evidence that students understand the skills necessary to be a practicing architect. Students in the class learned about collaboration and management of clients and personnel, adapting to changing situations, and characteristics necessary to lead in this profession. Students worked both independently and in teams on a multitude of exercises which dealt with ethics, personality traits, management skills and regulatory issues.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Understanding of legal responsibilities is adequately covered in examinations of students in ARCH 481 Professional Practice. Lecture material in ARCH 481 is reinforced by the students' learning outcomes in SPC A.4, A.5, A.11, B.2, B.3, B.4, and B.5.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Course work in ARCH 272 - Environmental Site Planning and ARCH 481- Professional Practice indicates students have gained an understanding of practice and ethical consequences of actions in the built environment.

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

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met through the student's work in both ARCH 272 - Environmental Site Planning and Professional Practice - ARCH 481. Through several assignments, including group work in organizing a theoretical 501(c)3 company (481), attending and participating in local architectural review committees (272), and various exams, students are exposed to the issues pertaining to architects role in neighborhoods, preservation and public interest.

**Realm C. General Team Commentary:** The mission and vision of the school and the institution underscores and supports learning outcomes and community involvement evident in this realm. The region in which this school is located provides opportunities and ample case studies applicable to this realm. The large number of experienced and practicing faculty clearly contributes to the success in this realm.

## PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** New York Institute of Technology is chartered by the Board of Regents of the State of New York and accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104 (267.284.5000). The Middle States Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The most recent statement of accreditation is posted on the Middle States web site:

<http://www.msche.org/documents/SAS/328/Statement%20of%20Accreditation%20Status.htm>

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

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The team found an appropriate balance of professional studies, general studies, and electives in the professional curriculum as evidenced in the course catalog, the APR and the curriculum map.

### **II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development**

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

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The process for curriculum review and development by administrators and full-time faculty was clearly outlined in the APR. Discussions and interviews with the chairs from both campuses and with faculty confirmed the process described in the self-study. Architectural licensure is currently required of all full-time faculty for hiring and promotion. Hard copy reference documents were provided in the Team Room and in Web sites with further information provided in the electronic APR.

**PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION**

*Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.*

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

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The school understands the intention of this requirement based on the APR. The student files that were provided show general education courses evaluated by transfer specialists. The professional course work is evaluated by portfolio review by architecture faculty for course credit.

Correlation between transfer course credit and evaluation of SPCs is only by reference to the 2011 NAAB SPC matrix.

## PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

### **II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees**

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

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The website clearly notes in a couple of different places that the program offers two undergraduate degrees and explains that the BARCH degree is accredited.

### **II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures**

*In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:*

*The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*

*The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)*

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** In the statement on accreditation on the school's website links are provided to the NAAB Conditions and Procedures.

### **II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information**

*In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:*

[www.ARCHCareers.org](http://www.ARCHCareers.org)

*The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects*

*Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture*

*The Emerging Professional's Companion*

[www.NCARB.org](http://www.NCARB.org)

[www.aia.org](http://www.aia.org)

[www.ais.org](http://www.ais.org)

[www.acsa-arch.org](http://www.acsa-arch.org)

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Listed websites and publication links are on the NYIT website on the Career Development page.

### **II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs**

*In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:*

*All Annual Reports, including the narrative*

*All NAAB responses to the Annual Report*

*The final decision letter from the NAAB*

*The most recent APR*

*The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda*

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

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** These were readily available at the front desk in the architecture library on the Old Westbury campus upon request.

#### **II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates**

*Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education.*

*Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.*

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The school website provides a link to the NCARB website. From there, members of the public can obtain ARE pass rates for program graduates along with those from other schools across the country.

**III. Appendices:**

**1. Program Information**

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

**A. History and Mission of the Institution**

New York Institute of Technology (NYIT), a non-profit, independent, private institution of higher education founded in 1955, offers undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees in more than 90 fields of study, including architecture and design; arts and sciences; education; engineering and computing sciences; health professions; management; and osteopathic medicine. From just nine students attending classes in one New York City building in 1955, NYIT now enrolls more than 15,000 students in seven academic schools at its Old Westbury, N.Y., and Manhattan campuses and at a variety of other domestic and international locations. To date, 85,000 students have graduated from NYIT.

For the most part, NYIT's growth has been mission-related and responsive to changes in the region's demographics and the demand for new expertise in the work force.

NYIT's mission is:

- To provide career-oriented, professional education;
- To offer access to opportunity to all qualified students; and
- To support applications-oriented research that benefits the larger world.

NYIT's current leadership is committed to continuing transformation of NYIT into a 21st-century university, a concept that will undoubtedly take on different meanings in the decades ahead. To guide future growth and change, in 2005-2006 NYIT conducted a comprehensive strategic planning process called *NYIT 2030*, articulating its vision for the long-term future. *NYIT 2030* places the New York campuses as the hub in NYIT's drive to become a leading 21st-century global university. NYIT has made a conscious choice to simultaneously invest in domestic programs and facilities and strengthen its presence abroad as the way to transform the university into an organization that will continue to attract quality students, faculty and staff. Rolling five-year plans chart near-term objectives, a "2030 Scorecard" sets targets and reports outcomes, and annual operating and capital budgets support agreed-upon strategic priorities

Strategic Planning: [www.nyit.edu/planning/strategic\\_planning](http://www.nyit.edu/planning/strategic_planning)

A distinctive feature of NYIT is a focus on technology, in part, because of its name and the fact that many of its programs relate to technology or employ technology in innovative ways in other fields. NYIT played a key role in the development of 3-D computer animation. In the 1980s, the NYIT Computer Graphics Lab was one of the top computer graphics research and development groups in the world. Many of the original CGL team now form the elite of the computer graphics and technology world with members going on to Silicon Graphics, Microsoft, Cisco, NVIDIA, and others, including Pixar President Ed Catmull, Pixar co-founder and Microsoft Graphics Fellow Alvy Ray Smith, Pixar co-founder Ralph Guggenheim, Walt Disney Feature Animation Chief Scientist Lance Williams, Dreamworks animator Hank Grebe, Netscape and Silicon Graphics founder Jim Clark (James H. Clark), Microsoft Graphics Fellow Jim Blinn, Thad Beier, Andrew

Glassner, and Tom Brigham. Systems programmer Bruce Perens went on to co-found the Open Source initiative.

Another distinctive feature of NYIT is its global presence — currently offering programs at international locations in Canada, China, and the Middle East. NYIT's global presence is not simply a series of auxiliary activities, but rather a vital and integral aspect of its overall structure. These programs are central to NYIT's mission, by providing broader access to opportunity for many more students. As NYIT reinvents itself into a 21st-century university, it strives to become a truly global institution, with ideas, research, and academic discourse flowing both from New York to its international locations and from the rest of the world to New York through both virtual and physical exchanges.

There is a strong commitment to quality reflected in both the academic programs and administrative functions— as well as in the people (students, faculty, and staff) who make up the NYIT community. Providing students with a high-quality education is not simply an idealized goal, but is essential for an institution that provides professional and career-oriented programs.

## **B. History and Mission of the Program**

The Mission of the School of Architecture and Design is to provide a design and technology based 21st century professional education that enables leadership in the profession and within the community.

The School of Architecture and Design established what is defined as three Core Values, or specific educational aspirations, that guide the approach of the School. The Core Values are *Design Intelligence*, *Building Technology*, and *Leadership*.

*Design Intelligence* refers to broad based skill and intellectual rigor earned by completing a challenging curriculum in design that emphasizes individual creativity, an appreciation of history, culture, and the contributions made by architects to the art and science of building.

*Building Technology* establishes the importance placed by the School on technology as a part of education in architecture and is made manifest in a well-developed curriculum in structures, environmental systems, sustainability and building construction. Course work is often carried out with hands-on exercises.

*Leadership* is an attribute of character that the School aspires to instill in students and is cultivated in many aspects of their education, including the inclusion of program-wide team projects that demand cohesive interaction and establishment of clear organizational structures to achieve project goals. Leadership is also developed through the holistic and ethical foundations of the NYIT education experience. The School actively participates in international initiatives where student self confidence is acquired by working in collaboration with other institutions.

### **Program History**

The history of the School of Architecture and Design has been closely associated with the development of the university since its inception. The Architectural Technology Department was separated from the Mechanical Engineering Department in 1963 when the college began operations at the Old Westbury campus. Since then the program has enjoyed continuous growth. From that time, curricula leading to the two-year Associate in

Applied Science degree and the four-year Bachelor of Science in Architectural Technology degree were offered.

During the summer of 1971, courses and programs in the Arts at NYIT were restructured to form the Division of Architecture and the Arts. In addition to architecture, this Division included the fine arts curricula in painting, sculpture, and graphic design, and the curricula in interior design, advertising design, and communication arts. In January 1973, the Board of Regents of the State of New York, in response to the perceived university need for a professional degree program, authorized NYIT to offer a five-year architecture program leading to the Bachelor of Architecture. The degree path was implemented as an option in the third year of the existing four-year curriculum following the pre-accreditation visits of 1975 and 1976. The School was accredited to award the professional degree in 1978. From 1978 onward, all students accepted directly by the School to study architecture are first admitted to the four-year Bachelor of Science in Architectural Technology degree program and subsequently apply for entrance into the Bachelor of Architecture program.

In the spring of 1978, the concept of *Centers of Instruction*, which emphasized career-oriented education, was introduced at NYIT. In the fall of 1978, the divisional organization of Architecture and the Arts was replaced by two new Centers. The Media and Arts Center absorbed all the arts, interior design, and communication arts curricula, while the Center for Architecture offered an exclusively architectural curriculum. With this administrative reorganization, all instructional programs at NYIT were headed by a Director. In 1986, the word "Center" was changed to "School", the name of its administrative head was changed from "Director" to "Dean", and "Associate Directors" became "Chairpersons". All functions and duties remained the same. From 1983 to 2006, The School of Architecture offered courses at our three New York campuses: Manhattan, Old Westbury, and Central Islip. NYIT made the decision to close most of its classes at its Central Islip location in 2006 to better focus its resources.

In 1991 the School of Communication Arts was disbanded, and the Department of Fine Arts, including Fine Arts, Graphic Arts, and Interior Design were rejoined with the School of Architecture to become the School of Architecture and Fine Arts. In 1995, the School was again reconfigured to offer degrees in architecture and interior design.

The Bachelor of Fine Arts in Interior Design program gained professional accreditation from the Foundation for Interior Design Education Research (FIDER) in 1984. FIDER was renamed CIDA and the Interior Design Program currently possesses CIDA accreditation status. The Interior Design program offers courses at Old Westbury and shares space with both the architecture program in Education Hall and the fine arts program in the nearby Midge Karr Building. In 2010 The School of Architecture and Design realigned its foundation courses to facilitate greater interdisciplinary/collaborative alignment with the BFA in interior design, the BARCH and BSAT degrees.

The Board of Regents of the State of New York authorized the offering of a post-professional Master of Architecture in Urban and Regional Design in 1997. This program is offered at the Manhattan campus and is comprised of a three-semester, 36-credit curriculum, focusing on the issues of metropolitan and regional design.

The administration of the university and that of the School of Architecture and Design continues to evolve. In September 2000, the Board of Trustees appointed the former Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Edward Giuliano, to be the President of the university. With the appointment of Dr. Giuliano and the recruitment of Dr. Richard Pizer as Provost, the university demonstrated its continued commitment to academic advancement and

growth as well as a renewed commitment to the quality of academic services and support of the university faculty.

In February 2001, following a national search, NYIT president Edward Guiliano appointed Judith DiMaio, then an associate professor at Yale University's School of Architecture and the director of the undergraduate major in Architecture at Yale College, as dean of NYIT's School of Architecture and Design.

The School of Architecture and Design is, in many respects, in the best position it has been in its history. Enrollment has increased since the last accreditation period.

Accomplished adjunct and full-time faculty are infusing the classrooms and curriculum with new, invigorating levels of expertise. We collaborate on projects with many external partners including other universities, community groups, government officials, professional associations and interdisciplinary partnerships. Our Advisory Board is made up of world class leaders in the profession who provide valuable advice and guidance. Our students and faculty receive awards, invitations to lecture or consult, and have even been invited to testify before the U.S. House of Representatives on the importance of renewable energy. Alumni participation has risen to record levels.

**I.1.1.c Activities and Initiatives that demonstrate the program's benefit to the institution through discovery, teaching, engagement, and service**

Community Service: Service to community is visible in the School's external joint collaboration projects with the AIA Regional Urban Design Assistance Team (R/UDAT) on the Staten Island waterfront (Design V), on the Coney Island Waterfront Brooklyn (Design V), and in the village of Port Jefferson (Design IV) and Freeport, Long Island (Design V) studio projects. The Castelmare, Italy (Design VII and VIII) and Potsdam (Design VII and VIII) studios are international examples of community service. For example, the Freeport Community (Design V) Studio took place in the fall of 2009. As a result of this studio, faculty and students met the Director of the PAL boxing program in Freeport (the non-profit PAL boxing program provides an after-school athletic and academic program for troubled Freeport teens, and has produced several Golden Gloves champions and Olympic contenders). The program was in need of upgraded and expanded facilities and our students proposed that they form a group to help design and build a new PAL boxing facility. Working in teams of three, students developed designs for the project, with a competition to decide the winning scheme. The students and faculty advisors Giovanni Santamaria and Janet Fink volunteered for this on-going community project in an effort to nurture a climate of civic engagement and a commitment to professional and public service and leadership.

PAL boxing:

[http://www.nyit.edu/index.php/architecture/announcements/community\\_service\\_learning\\_project\\_with\\_pal\\_boxing/](http://www.nyit.edu/index.php/architecture/announcements/community_service_learning_project_with_pal_boxing/)

AIA R/UDAT: <http://www.aia.org/aiaucmp/groups/aia/documents/pdf/aias078002.pdf>

Staten Island:

[http://www.silive.com/northshore/index.ssf?/2008/09/can\\_they\\_work\\_wonders\\_on\\_state.html](http://www.silive.com/northshore/index.ssf?/2008/09/can_they_work_wonders_on_state.html)

Freeport: <http://www.freepornty.com/index.aspx?NID=461>

Port Jefferson: [http://iris.nyit.edu/~tnauheim/Sustainable\\_NYIT/news.htm](http://iris.nyit.edu/~tnauheim/Sustainable_NYIT/news.htm)

Competitions: The faculty and students of the School regularly participate in local and international competitions which often bring local and international media attention to the university. Some recent examples include student Henry Jones who submitted his team's Design V Studio Coney Island team proposal to the "Municipal Art Society Coney Island ideas competition" or student Jiyoun Kim's first place prize in the "AIA Young Architects

*Forum/Committee on Design Ideas Competition*" or the "Build a Better Burb competition" where SOAD Faculty member Tobias Holler, Alumni Ana Sera and Student Katelyn Mulry were selected as finalists.

AIA YAF/COD:

[http://blog.aia.org/yaf/2010/06/ideas\\_competition\\_recipients\\_announced\\_at\\_aia\\_national\\_convention.html](http://blog.aia.org/yaf/2010/06/ideas_competition_recipients_announced_at_aia_national_convention.html)

BBB NY Times: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/11/realestate/11lizo.html>

BBB Vimeo <http://vimeo.com/13052474>

Coney Island: <http://www.flickr.com/photos/masnyc/sets/72157612562191426/detail/>

Design Expertise: A distinctive feature of the School of Architecture and Design is the broad based skill set students accumulate through the rigor of the design studio and technology sequences. The School's design studio sequence is 32% of the BARCH curriculum. The internal design expertise of the School is regularly called upon by the institution in numerous ways including student work being featured on digital media and exhibitions, students and faculty being asked to give input on facilities projects, students and faculty as speakers for NYIT-sponsored conferences, and students and faculty representing the school at community events.

Design Studio: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fMF2VVkB0aI>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gu1BBpLsUqA&feature=related>

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_YPNUsEYpSo&feature=related](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_YPNUsEYpSo&feature=related)

Structural Design: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fhdx2HTH7to&feature=related>

Global Access: Being known as a global university is part of NYIT's 2030 vision. Today more than ever, design takes place within a global framework. As this framework expands, the knowledge needed to practice is becoming broader and more diverse in scope. To help students think and act creatively and critically as designers within a global framework the NYIT School of Architecture and Design actively pursues international exposure opportunities for our students including study abroad programs, summer abroad programs, international visiting professor programs, and studio projects in distant locations. This type of engagement often involves site-specific interventions in areas of unique opportunity such as Valparaiso Chile, where students worked on a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

- Global Liaisons: Studio projects in foreign locations have included global liaisons with the Universitat Potsdam, Politecnico di Milano, Tongji University and the Universidad de Chile.
- Summer Abroad: The summer abroad programs since the program's last reaccreditation included programs in Spain, the Netherlands, France, Germany, Chile, China, Italy, and Egypt.
- Visiting Professors: The visiting professors included professors from China, France, Italy and Cuba.

Porro Studio Paris: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JX0W29ZrhX0&feature=related>

Chile Studio: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XgO59\\_F8Qbo](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XgO59_F8Qbo)

<http://picasaweb.google.com/andrewheid/ValparaisoBook#slideshow/5462602677911369250>

Global Gallery: <http://iris.nyit.edu/architecture/gallery.html>

Interdisciplinary Research: Interdisciplinary research is a part of NYIT's 2030 vision. Since the program's last accreditation, the School of Architecture and Design's student-led architecture-build projects have produced "Green Machine Blue Space - Americas

first Solar Hydrogen House”, “Open House - an open source residence” and “We-Home”. These interdisciplinary Solar Decathlon initiatives included collaborations with other academic programs at NYIT including; Engineering, Business and Management, Communication Arts and Culinary Arts. These efforts continue to bring educational dividends and facilitate ongoing public discourse on the benefits of sustainable design and building technology. In 2010 the School renamed this student-led architecture-build program sLAB.

New York Times: [http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/17/realestate/17lizo.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/17/realestate/17lizo.html?_r=1)

LI News Tonight: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e35QqP\\_QmXA](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e35QqP_QmXA)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VEhqJM1xZa0&feature=related>

Professional-Career Oriented Education: NYIT's 2030 vision is to be known for Career-Oriented undergraduate, graduate and professional programs. As of Oct. 2009, NYIT School of Architecture and Design alumni hold the largest number of active professional architecture licenses (1,177) of any architecture school in New York State.

Student Leadership: The School of Architecture and Design encourages students to develop leadership qualities via student-led initiatives and extracurricular engagements such as those referenced in Sections I.2.1.b.11 and I.2.1.b.12 of this report. Other examples include the 2007-2008 AIAS studio culture task force which produced “Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture” which NYIT AIAS president Evan Lepore (graduated in 2008) helped draft. In 2010, NYIT student Nikolas Batis was the first NYC BARCH school member asked to sit on the AIA New York chapter board. Student leadership was also visible when the NYIT Solar Decathlon team took their quest for true energy independence to Washington D.C., where three student members of the team were invited to testify before a U.S. House of Representatives subcommittee. They encouraged members of the House of Representatives to set a clear national strategy with specific milestones that will lead the country towards a clean and renewable energy economy. The solar house was subsequently donated to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, a collaborator on our entry’s hydrogen fuel cell technology, at Kings Point, Long Island. The grand reopening of the solar house took place during graduation day at the Merchant Marine Academy where President Bush hosted the commencement. The house was featured in a Discovery/Times documentary, on “This Old House,” and in a DIY cable TV documentary, as well as on numerous news broadcasts around the world.

US House Hearings:

[http://www.fuelcelltoday.com/media/pdf/archive/Article\\_1055\\_NYIT%20Solar%20Decathletes%20Go%20On%20to%20Showcase%20Their%20Work.pdf](http://www.fuelcelltoday.com/media/pdf/archive/Article_1055_NYIT%20Solar%20Decathletes%20Go%20On%20to%20Showcase%20Their%20Work.pdf)

AIAS Studio Culture: [https://www.acsa-arch.org/files/resources/AIAS\\_Toward%20an%20Evolution%20of%20Studio%20Culture\\_2008.pdf](https://www.acsa-arch.org/files/resources/AIAS_Toward%20an%20Evolution%20of%20Studio%20Culture_2008.pdf)

#### **I.1.1.d Activities and Initiatives that demonstrate the benefits derived to the program from the institutional setting**

Community Service: The University is an active participant in the Metro New York community. The University facilitated the donation of the 2007 Solar Decathlon house to the town of Hempstead Long Island. The house will be used as an administrative office and students and alumni are participating in the evolution of the adjacent energy park.

LI News Tonight: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u6PJnYMXgwQ>

Global Access: The university’s global campuses in Amman-Jordan, Abu Dhabi-United Arab Emirates, Manama-Bahrain, Nanjing-China and Vancouver-Canada increasingly

provide emerging opportunities for global engagement. The School of Architecture and Design has Interior Design programs in Abu Dhabi (accredited in 2008) and in Bahrain which offer faculty offshore teaching opportunities. For example, Dr. Taha Al-Douri, a past architecture history professor in New York assumed the Chair position in Abu Dhabi for the interior design program and communicates with the department in New York on a regular basis. In 2009, the School of Architecture and Design faculty and students from New York collaborated in an interdisciplinary international competition with NYIT faculty from the Vancouver campus. Also see University-wide events below.

Global Locations: <http://www.nyit.edu/locations/>

Liberal arts core curriculum: In September 2010 NYIT will implement its new "Discovery" core curriculum, intended to provide all undergraduate students with the strong liberal arts foundation that will be needed for professional and personal success in the 21st century. The 38-credit sequence consists of foundation courses (to introduce concepts and subjects in communication and writing, speech, scientific process, information literacy, mathematics, research, and professional communication) and seminars. Seminars share an interdisciplinary approach, active/integrated learning strategies, depth, and difficulty. Faculty (from all NYIT schools) have developed these core seminars and students are able to choose from a wide variety of topics. Learning outcomes are mapped in every course in the curriculum (including major courses) and evidence of mastery will be gathered, evaluated, analyzed, and fed back to the faculty for continuous improvement.

Core Curriculum: [http://www.nyit.edu/arts\\_and\\_sciences/core\\_curriculum](http://www.nyit.edu/arts_and_sciences/core_curriculum)

Location: NYIT's campus locations in Old Westbury and Manhattan feature unique and contrasting settings, urban and suburban, which offer students the opportunity to study in two different environments. For example, the Design V Community Design Studio alternates semester-long projects on Long Island and in New York City. Every student in the school has an opportunity to take courses and experiment in these two very different settings, each faculty member has the opportunity to teach in a setting which offers its own unique challenges and issues.

Old Westbury: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x4rJFvYuDGE&feature=related>  
Manhattan: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oql0400d\\_uU](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oql0400d_uU)

Mission: The holistic development of young professionals through both liberal arts and practicum-based learning is a central theme in the missions of both the School of Architecture and Design and New York Institute of Technology. This philosophical bond is amplified by the above mentioned new "Discovery" core curriculum which focuses the delivery of educational objectives.

SOAD Mission: <http://www.nyit.edu/architecture/about/mission/>

Multidisciplinary Project Support: The "Green Machine Blue Space," "Open House," and "We-Home" Solar Decathlon projects received financial support from NYIT to close the gap between project costs and student fund-raising efforts. The participation of students and faculty from other programs in the university – engineering, management, interior design, communication arts, and culinary arts added much richness to these efforts. Another commitment by the university has been the establishment of a Center for Metropolitan Sustainability, creating a multidisciplinary home (starting in 2009) for future Solar Decathlon projects and the current Smart Space project, effectively promoting integration of new perspectives and insights into the instructional research and service activities.

Center for MS: [http://www.nyit.edu/metropolitan\\_sustainability/](http://www.nyit.edu/metropolitan_sustainability/)

Student, Faculty and Alumni Promotion: The achievements of architecture students and faculty are prominently featured in NYIT's advertising, videos, magazines and promotional material. It's "I Graduate" print ads, run in high profile venues such as the *NY Times* and the *Wall Street Journal*. These ads feature architecture students and prominent architects such as Frank Gehry, Richard Meier, and David Childs. The ads have won many awards including one from the SIAA, recognizing creativity and communication accomplishments in the service industry. Both Richard Meier (2009) and David Childs (2005) were honored with honorary degrees at NYIT commencements.

Student: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JdN0it8GRjg>  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IC-wnW6ap10&NR=1>  
[http://www.nyit.edu/magazine/new\\_ads\\_connect\\_students\\_with\\_top\\_execs\\_winter\\_2010](http://www.nyit.edu/magazine/new_ads_connect_students_with_top_execs_winter_2010)

Faculty: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1ujEqDYJ28g>

Alumni: [http://www.nyit.edu/magazine/winter\\_2010](http://www.nyit.edu/magazine/winter_2010)

University-wide events: In 2010, an interdisciplinary conference sponsored by NYIT ("Think Green") was held in Nanjing-China. In recent years, the university has also held conferences at the United Nations in New York one on water (2008) and one on energy (2010). Sustainability conferences sponsored by the Center for Metropolitan Sustainability are held each spring at one of NYIT's campuses. Events such as these reinforce both the missions of the university and School of Architecture and Design.

Think Green: [http://www.nyit.edu/think\\_green/](http://www.nyit.edu/think_green/)  
UN Water Conf.: [http://www.nyit.edu/magazine/nyit\\_energizes\\_u.n.\\_conference\\_winter\\_2010](http://www.nyit.edu/magazine/nyit_energizes_u.n._conference_winter_2010)

Work Environment: NYIT is one of the best colleges in the nation to work for, according to a new 2010 survey by *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. The results in *The Chronicle's* third annual report on "The Academic Workplace," are based on a survey of more than 42,000 employees at 277 colleges and universities in the United States. Only 97 universities achieved "Great College to Work For" recognition for specific best practices and policies. Results are reported for small, medium, and large institutions, with NYIT included among the large universities (10,000 or more students). NYIT also received an outstanding rating in the category of compensation and benefits, in recognition for offering fair pay and benefits that meet the needs of its employees. In addition to highly competitive financial compensation, among the benefits NYIT offers to full-time employees are non-contributory health and dental insurance, tuition remission, flexible spending accounts, life insurance, and a generous paid time-off policy.

LI News Tonight: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GTC8m0sDAM&feature=related>  
Chronicle of H.E.: <http://chronicle.com/section/The-Academic-Workplace/156>

#### I.1.1.e Description of liberal arts and practicum-based learning program

The integration of theory and practice is crucial to the study of Architecture. It is arguably the discipline which comes closest to the Renaissance phenomenon of combining art and science. Like the other visual arts, the act of making architecture requires the use of the eye, the mind, and the hand. Unlike the other arts, architecture has the functional task of creating built environments for human activity, and becomes an expression of human

values. Architecture must not only address issues of making form and space, but also the interrelated physical, social, political, economic and cultural values of the time. The curriculum reflects this breadth of knowledge.

Design is an intellectual exercise and art form. It requires the integration of liberal knowledge and the technology of building. Pedagogically, the design studio provides a project based, experiential learning format which allows students to apply knowledge from all other areas of the curriculum (See Section I.1.1.d Liberal Arts Core Curriculum). The school maintains that the emphasis on design and practicumbased learning within the curricula prepares students for effective participation in the profession and for rendering service to the public.

Diverse course offerings allow students to explore the interrelationships and specializations occurring in the architecture and interior design fields. These courses supported by the foundation and core curriculum, share an interdisciplinary approach. Students define their own goals and career paths based on the knowledge acquired in the classroom and tested through the varied projects in the design studio and technology sequence and other project based courses in the program.

### **C. Long-Range Planning**

The college's strategic plan for the next 20 years—known as NYIT 2030—was published in 2006 and begins with the vision and goals that guided the university since 2000. Development of the plan provided an opportunity for the NYIT community to take stock, identify needed mid-course corrections, and chart a course for the long-run future.

Specifically, NYIT 2030 pursued a dual objective:

- To establish overarching strategies to guide the university as it embarked on its next quarter-century of operations; and
- To chart its course in operational terms for the next five years.

#### **The Development and Adoption of the 2030 Plan**

To create the 2030 plan, the NYIT community came together in a participative process and reached conclusions for the common good. More than 200 members of the NYIT faculty, staff, and administration provided significant time and wisdom as members of one or more of the 13 planning groups; hundreds more attended meetings or completed surveys or sent e-mail messages to the Steering Committee. Data were developed, roundtables held, and students and alumni were surveyed and invited to town meetings to express their views. The president provided regular updates to the community and the trustees over the 18-month plan development process. The plan was accepted by the NYIT Academic Senate and NYIT Board of Trustees in May 2006.

#### **A Vision for Accomplishing NYIT's Mission in the 21st Century**

The groups working on *NYIT 2030* defined a vision for the future that would be flexible enough to adapt to emergent circumstances and precise enough to provide effective guidance. The following six views were established to be true to NYIT's historic mission while pulling it toward meaningful transformation and building on current strengths.

The NYIT of 2030 should be recognizable in terms of today's institution but at the same time be different in exciting ways:

- Known for its career-oriented undergraduate and unique and distinctive graduate and professional programs;
- Known for its thriving graduate centers featuring interdisciplinary research, degree programs, and “best-in-class” work in a small number of highly targeted niches;
- Known as a global and partially virtual university with NYIT in New York as its quality hub;
- Known as a model student-centered university;
- Known as a leader in teaching with technology; and
- Known as a well-funded institution with dependable revenue from a variety of sources.

The university will maintain main campuses in New York City and Old Westbury with additional campuses and sites in the United States and abroad.

**The Implementation of the Plan: Allocating Resources, Tracking Activities and Assessing Outcomes.** *Plan Outcomes:* At the 30,000-ft. level, there is the strategic plan itself and part of the plan was to create a high-level dashboard (called the “2030 Scorecard” and updated annually) to focus attention at all levels in the university on key priorities. University-level metrics for each strategic goal allow the Board of Trustees and others in university-wide leadership positions to gauge progress and provide the means for integrating performance results (against the plan) with resource allocation decisions. Those same metrics, when disaggregated at the unit (school, department, campus) levels, permit local leadership to track and manage their individual units’ contributions to overall institutional goals. The first scorecard was shared with the Board of Trustees at its December 2009 meeting.

*Plan Tracking:* At the 10,000-ft. level, there are deliverables and accountabilities, broken down into months and years and tracked using “Project Status Reports” (updated several times per year). These documents cover one academic year at a time and specify tasks, accountabilities, and timetables and are used by the 2030 Steering Committee to track activities. Administrative processes are in place for assigning responsibility and developing action plans to accomplish plan goals, evaluate accomplishments, and make required adjustments over time.

*Resource Allocation:* Underlying the five-year operating budget and capital planning effort is the principle that there must be, to the greatest extent possible, direct linkage between NYIT’s financial plans and the anticipated outcome(s) for each institutional goal. This has been and continues to be done – and a key link is the 2030 Scorecard, which, as the high-level tool for tracking outcomes against goals, it is used at the senior level to guide decisions regarding resource allocation.

#### I.1.4.b Institutional Planning Documents

- Planning Website  
<http://www.nyit.edu/planning/>
- Strategic Plan – NYIT 2030 Setting Directions Meeting Challenges  
<http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/about/NYIT2030-SettingDirectionsMeetingChallenges.pdf>
- 2030 Scorecard  
<http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/about/2030ScorecardOctober2008.pdf>

- Project Status Reports  
[http://www.nyit.edu/planning/strategic\\_planning/status/](http://www.nyit.edu/planning/strategic_planning/status/)
- Institutional Assessment Plan  
[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/Institutional\\_Assessment\\_Plan1\\_8\\_09\(1\).pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/Institutional_Assessment_Plan1_8_09(1).pdf)

#### **I.1.4.c Program Planning**

School of Architecture and Design faculty, administration and students were involved in the participative process which developed the NYIT 2030 plan. Program planning took place as outlined below:

**Strategic Plan:** The strategic planning goals and objectives during the time period of the last accreditation are as outlined in the 2004 NAAB APR. Much of the subsequent self-improvement and internal planning effort during the subsequent 2005-2006 period of time was focused on internal improvement in the specific areas identified in the last Visiting Team Report. The results of these efforts were validated on July 21, 2006 when the NAAB formally extended the term of accreditation to a full six year term. The 2004 APR is available in the Education Hall Library.

**Tactical Plan:** As part of the development process for the “NYIT 2030: Setting Directions, Meeting Challenges Strategic Plan”, the School of Architecture and Design refocused its planning objectives into a 5-year time horizon called the “School of Architecture and Design Tactical Plan”. Discussions were held with faculty, administration, and members of the student body to collect comments. The School of Architecture and Design started compiling these inputs and objectives into a tactical plan and held a faculty-wide meeting in the 16 West 61st Street lecture hall to collect final comments. The final copy of the tactical plan was produced on April 11, 2007. The plan aligned the School’s planning goals with the NYIT 2030 plan and the previous Strategic Plan outlined in the 2004 APR. The plan identified the following multi-year objectives:

- Develop core competency Design
- Develop core competency Technology
- Develop core competency Management (changed to Leadership)
- A max. sustainable short-term growth rate for the BARCH program of 4%/year
- Align student population growth with facility and infrastructure growth
- Consider a new NAAB Masters of Architecture program (1st professional Masters degree).
- Produce environmentally sensitive designers and leaders
- Strengthen scholarship and research
- Create new interdisciplinary opportunities
- Strengthen development opportunities
- Strengthen public relations
- Leverage shared resources between programs
- Increase geographic cross pollination
- Use experience to enrich community projects
- Emphasize building as research

Many of the results presented in this APR document are the result of decisions and actions taken by the university and the School of Architecture and Design to implement the 2007 tactical school plan. The Tactical Plan is available on the School Assessment website:

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2012\\_Tactical\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2012_Tactical_Plan.pdf)

Evolution of the Plans: Beginning in 2008, the School of Architecture and Design focused on feeding continuous faculty and student input into the goals and objectives of the 2007 tactical plan. Opportunity to evolve the plan is vested in the various committees, coordinator positions which represent the resident talent of the school (faculty, administrators and students). Committee and Coordinator reports are available on the NYIT Assessment website:

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2009-2010\\_Assessment\\_report.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2009-2010_Assessment_report.pdf)

To support and communicate and evolve these planning initiatives, the school holds regular assessment day meetings and convocations twice a year and retreats once a year. These are supplemented with student led town hall meetings, faculty meetings, committee and coordinator meetings as outlined in the assessment reports. Some recent examples include:

- 4/2008 Faculty Retreat Topic: Nomenclature, Technology Curriculum and Changes to Core Curriculum
- 9/2008 Convocation Topic: Fall Semester
- 1/2009 Convocation Topic: Spring Semester
- 1/2009 Assessment Day Topic: Comprehensive Design Improvement & Assessment
- 9/2009 Faculty Retreat Topic: Preparing Self-Assessment for Accreditation & Recent Curriculum Changes
- 9/2009 Convocation Topic: Fall Semester
- 9/2009 Assessment Day Topic: Comp. of NAAB + CIDA SPC with NYIT core learning outcomes
- 12/2009 Town Hall Meeting Topic: Studio Culture Policy, Technology and Facilities
- 1/2010 Convocation Topic: Spring Semester
- 1/2010 Assessment Day Topic: Future of Architecture (SOAD strengths/opportunities for future education)
- 9/2010 Convocation Topic: Fall Semester
- 9/2010 Assessment Day Topic: NAAB Site Visit Planning and writing skills

#### **D. Self-Assessment**

NYIT follows an Institutional Assessment Plan ([http://www.nyit.edu/planning/institutional\\_assessment/](http://www.nyit.edu/planning/institutional_assessment/)) that ensures that programs have the data they need to evaluate important aspects of their success including, e.g., basic statistics with respect to student enrollment, retention, and graduation rates; student satisfaction; post-graduation employment; and employer satisfaction. These statistics are reported for all programs and locations enabling internal benchmarking. The university office of Institutional Research and Assessment also conducts targeted surveys and other research to respond to questions and concerns of individual programs as needed.

Self-Assessment processes in the School of Architecture and Design are summarized in a manner which sets forth the methods and schedule by which the school measures its standing on six key aspects of success:

- Contribution to NYIT's strategic initiatives

- Progress toward achieving the school's mission
- Accomplishment of multi-year objectives
- Faculty and student views on teaching and learning
- Effectiveness of individual courses
- Effectiveness of student support services

Information from a variety of direct and indirect assessments is evaluated by faculty, administrators and students, often working as committees focused on different aspects of the school's functioning, and used to develop recommendations for improvement.

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2009-2010\\_Assessment\\_report.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2009-2010_Assessment_report.pdf)

#### **I.1.5.a Progress towards Mission**

The Mission of the School of Architecture and Design is to provide a design and technology based 21<sup>st</sup> century professional education that enables leadership in the profession and within the community.

The School of Architecture and Design established what is defined as three Core Values, or specific educational aspirations, that guide the approach of the School. The Core Values are *Design Intelligence*, *Building Technology*, and *Leadership*.

Design Intelligence:

- Evaluation of student learning outcomes in the studio sequence
- Student performance in local and national competitions
- Student acceptance into first tier master's programs

Building Technology:

- Evaluation of student learning outcomes in the building technology course sequence
- Evaluation of student learning outcomes in the visualization sequence
- Evaluation of student learning outcomes in the structures sequence
- New technology tools introduced into the curriculum

Leadership:

- Number of community design projects
- Number of student-led projects
- Faculty and Student scholarships and awards

#### **I.1.5.b Progress towards Multi-year objectives**

As indicated above, information on progress made toward multi-year objectives is documented in the following:

- SOAD Assessment Report
  - o School of Architecture and Design committee reports
  - o School of Architecture and Design coordinator reports
  - o Alumni reports

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2009-2010\\_Assessment\\_report.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2009-2010_Assessment_report.pdf)

- School of Architecture and Design - Planning Objectives Progress Report

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010_Objectives_progress_1of2.pdf)

[2010\\_Objectives\\_progress\\_1of2.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010_Objectives_progress_1of2.pdf)

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010_Objectives_progress_2of2.pdf)

[2010\\_Objectives\\_progress\\_2of2.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010_Objectives_progress_2of2.pdf)

#### I.1.5.c Progress on multi-year objectives since the last visit

2005-2010 Planning Objectives Progress Report: The School of Architecture and Design “2005-2010 Planning Objectives Progress Report” summarizes the school’s accomplishment of multi-year objectives in 2 year increments since the last reaccreditation visit. Per the 2009 NAAB Conditions, the progress has been aligned with NYIT’s strategic goals for 2030 (left-hand column) and with NAAB’s five perspectives (right-hand column). The link is available below:

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010\\_Objectives\\_progress\\_1of2.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010_Objectives_progress_1of2.pdf)

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010\\_Objectives\\_progress\\_2of2.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010_Objectives_progress_2of2.pdf)

#### I.1.5.d NYIT School of Architecture and Design Strengths

On December 12, 2009 the School of Architecture and Design produced an “environmental scan” that compared the school to other NAAB schools of architecture and design for the purpose of redesigning its new website. Many of the strengths of the school were also identified at a convocation assessment day program held by the School of Architecture and Design on Jan. 10, 2010.

The faculty of the school have identified the following as the strengths of the program:

- Emphasis on sustainability and sustainable technologies
- Holistic synthesis of liberal arts
- Integration of global awareness and experiences throughout the curriculum
- Use of pedagogy that integrates interdisciplinary practice
- The solar decathlon program
- Student diversity
- Engagement with technology

#### I.1.5.e NYIT School of Architecture and Design Challenges and Opportunities

The faculty and students of the school have identified the following as challenges for the program:

- Program growth in Manhattan requires additional studio space (and the cost of Manhattan real estate is high); the alternative is to cap enrollment.
- Future program growth in Old Westbury will require additional space for growth.
- In New York State, NYIT School of Architecture and Design alumni hold the largest number of Architectural Licenses of any school, but performance on the New York State Architectural Registration Exam could be improved.
- With our rapid growth, infrastructure improvements need to be better aligned with growth.

The faculty and students of the school have identified the following as opportunities for the program:

- Establishment of a NAAB first professional Masters degree program
- Student-led design-build
- Community engagement

- Global Cross Pollination
- Building as research

#### **I.1.5.f Solicitation of Faculty, Student and Alumni views**

The views of faculty, students and alumni are solicited in the following ways:

##### **Faculty**

- Committee participation affords faculty and students opportunities to exchange views.
- Coordinator meetings allow faculty the opportunity to exchange views on curriculum.
- Faculty meetings, retreats, convocations and assessment day meetings allow faculty the opportunity to exchange views on School issues.

##### **Student**

- Faculty advisor sessions allow students to present issues and concerns to advisors.
- Town Hall meetings are scheduled to facilitate communication when issues of importance arise.
- Student evaluations of teaching (semester end). NYIT students complete standardized evaluations at the conclusion of each course (all classes, all terms, and all locations and administered by the office of Institutional Research and Assessment) to provide instructors and their supervisors with information about students' perceptions of the effectiveness of individual courses and instructors.
- Student evaluations of NAAB criteria (semester end). NYIT students complete standardized evaluations of the successful or unsuccessful meeting of specific NAAB student performance criteria in those classes responsible for meeting NAAB criteria.
- Entering student survey (annual, October). MAP-works survey identifies first-year students who need support and intervention.
- Graduating student survey (annual, January) provides data on student employment, income, further schooling and retrospective information about their experiences at NYIT.
- National Survey of Student Engagement (every 3 years - in rotation with the Noel-Levitz survey) provides benchmarked information about student participation in activities that support learning.
- Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (every third academic year – in rotation with the NSSE) provides benchmarked information about the importance students place on a variety of services and their satisfaction with those services
- Targeted student surveys (as needed) focus on student satisfaction with a variety of services; often used to target specific services, subpopulations and/or locations.

##### **Alumni**

- The Friends of the School of Architecture and Design alumni group provides informal feedback to the School, Dean and faculty.
- The Advisory Board which includes alumni serves as a vehicle for external feedback on school programs, plans and activities.

Improvement initiatives based on the results of these assessments are summarized in the Planning Objectives Progress Report and described in more detail in the committee and coordinator reports:

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2009-2010\\_Assessment\\_report.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2009-2010_Assessment_report.pdf)

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010\\_Objectives\\_progress\\_1of2.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010_Objectives_progress_1of2.pdf)

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010\\_Objectives\\_progress\\_2of2.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2005-2010_Objectives_progress_2of2.pdf)

#### **I.1.5.g Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program**

The views of faculty, students, alumni and members of the architecture profession are solicited by NYIT in the following ways:

- *Program-level outcomes assessment process.* The Assessment Committee of NYIT's Academic Senate oversees annual assessment of student learning outcomes in all academic programs; indirect measures are developed by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Assessment plans and results are posted on the Assessment web site to facilitate sharing of best practice. [http://www.nyit.edu/planning/outcomes\\_assessment/academic\\_assessment/](http://www.nyit.edu/planning/outcomes_assessment/academic_assessment/)
- *National Survey of Student Engagement* (every 3 years) provides benchmarked information about student participation in activities that support learning.

[http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2009-2010\\_Assessment\\_report.pdf](http://www.nyit.edu/images/uploads/planning/2009-2010_Assessment_report.pdf)

#### **I.1.5.h. Institutional Requirements for Self-Assessment and Processes for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes and Program Improvement**

Institutional planning and assessment activities are guided by the following principles:

- NYIT has systematic, coordinated processes overseen by a steering committee and a vice president to set institutional targets, monitor results, and use those results to inform decision-making and resource allocation.
- NYIT has a written and updated Assessment Plan for the university.
- Numerical targets are set within the 2030 Scorecard to measure the effects of the university's strategic plan on key performance indicators.
- A five-year financial planning process links planning with assessment by means of the 2030 Scorecard.

#### **I.1.5.i Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, Academic Programs**

The processes the Institute uses for assessment of student and program learning outcomes are the same processes used to assess pedagogy (see section I.1.5.g above):

- A course level outcomes assessment process.
- A program-level outcomes assessment process.
- A general education and core competency assessment process.
- Administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (every 3 years.)

The Assessment Committee of NYIT's Academic Senate, has responsibility for oversight of student learning assessment for all academic programs throughout the university. In addition to providing feedback to Deans and faculty members about their assessment activities and quality improvement plans, the Committee is also formally mandated to prepare an annual report to the Senate, the provost and the president. This report reviews and evaluates the assessment activities of all academic programs, offers recommendations, and proposes changes to policy that strengthen both assessment and data-driven efforts to improve student learning.

Composed of faculty from all of NYIT's academic schools and staff from the libraries and Student Affairs, the committee is chaired by the vice president for planning and assessment. Academic Deans and their designated representatives are *ex officio*

members. In addition, the provost, the associate provost, the director for the center for teaching and learning, the Dean of operations, assessment, and accreditation for global academic programs, and the assessment coordinator are members. The institution-wide process provides that:

- Each spring, Deans and program faculty agree on which aspects of their programs will be assessed the following year and how.
- All undergraduate programs also assess core learning outcomes designated by the Assessment Committee to be examined across the university, intended to stimulate conversations about improving general education outcomes among the full range of departments and schools.
- Each fall, Deans and program faculty submit the assessment analysis and results from the prior academic year and an improvement action plan to the Committee; the Committee reviews these documents and provides feedback.

In both reviews, the Committee's goal is to engage program faculty in conversation with Committee members about how well the program is helping students achieve stated learning outcomes.

In the School of Architecture and Design, student learning outcomes assessments are carried out in three basic ways:

- Indirect assessment data such as reports from the National Survey of Student Engagement are considered by the faculty as a whole, in recent years during "assessment days" just prior to the opening of each semester or at faculty retreats where suggestions are made for improvement.
- Direct assessment data based on review and appraisal of student work in relation to course outcomes is generally carried out by course/area coordinators and the faculty in that area. For example, studio coordinators meet briefly with faculty before each studio to discuss progress. They also schedule joint reviews to remain in touch with the work in all studios. Regular faculty meetings are scheduled before and during the semester. All faculty teaching the course are required to attend. At the initial meeting prior to the start of the semester there is a discussion of the results of the previous year's course along with an evaluation of the effectiveness of course objectives during that semester. At the meeting, examples of the previous semester's student work are reviewed. The course objectives are discussed. Modifications are made based on the outcomes of the previous semester's student work. During the semester, one faculty meeting is scheduled to discuss the progress of the studio. Modifications are made if it is recognized that all course objectives are not being met.
- Direct assessment data based on review and appraisal of student work in relation to program outcomes is discussed at retreats, convocations, and in Coordinator and Committee meetings where feedback is collected.

### **I.1.5.j Results of self-assessments**

#### **I.1.5.j.1 Results from formal and informal solicitation of faculty, student and alumni views**

##### **Faculty**

- New BARCH degree credit reductions in anticipation of establishing a first professional Masters Degree Program will be implemented in Fall 2010 semester
- New Student Performance Criteria assessment website implemented and student work uploaded

- Faculty exhibits and lectures continue to increase with recent Amoia and Friedman events, and with Karahan, Campani and Palmore scheduled
- Sponsorship funding for capital improvements to Ed. Hall Gallery has been obtained
- Manhattan and Old Westbury Facilities report produced by the SOAD Facilities Committee
- Technology Hardware and Software report produced by faculty
- Additional NYIT facility space procured on 61st Street Manhattan
- A series of technology workshops were organized (Ecotect, Revit, Rhino)
- New website for the fabrication lab was launched

Student

- New studio space requested (Manhattan 61st Street location procured)
- Additional lockers for storage installed
- Technology improvements implemented with IT department

Alumni

- New alumni sponsored lecture series
- Alumni sponsored student trips to AIAS and AIA events
- Alumni sponsored field trips and class lectures

Combined

- Students Representatives are now required to be invited on all committees (other than SPC)
- All committees are required to submit goals and achievements on a semester by semester basis
- New website launched in March 2010 focusing on web 2.0 media tools
- Staff members were trained in the websites Content Management System
- Blogging and Social Media tools made available to SOAD
- Additional digital Storage Space has been Ordered

**I.1.5.j.2 Results for the School of Architecture and Design from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)**

According to its developers, “survey items on the National Survey of Student Engagement represent empirically confirmed ‘good practices’ in undergraduate education. That is, they reflect behaviors by students and institutions that are associated with desired outcomes of college.” NYIT uses the NSSE results to suggest to program faculty areas where student learning can be improved through changes in policies and practices more consistent with good practices in undergraduate education. NYIT administered the NSSE for the first time in 2008 to a sample of undergraduates (freshmen and seniors). A total of 155 students from the School of Architecture and Design responded.

Results showed a high “Level of Academic Challenge” with scale scores of seniors in the top 10% of all NSSE results.

Criteria include:

- Time spent preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, and other activities related to the academic program)
- Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations
- Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings

- Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more
- Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages
- Number of written papers or reports fewer than 5 pages
- Coursework emphasizes: Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory
- Coursework emphasizes: Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences
- Coursework emphasizes: Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods
- Coursework emphasizes: Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations
- Campus environment emphasizes spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work

The school's results for "Active and Collaborative Learning" were also strong, significantly higher than all other schools at NYIT, and with seniors again scoring in the top 10% of all NSSE. According to the NSSE materials, this scale is based on items that show "Students...intensely involved in their education and are asked to think about and apply what they are learning in different settings. Collaborating with others in solving problems or mastering difficult material prepares students to deal with the messy, unscripted problems they will encounter daily during and after college."

Active and Collaborative Learning	Architecture	All NYIT – Old Westbury	All NYIT - Manhattan	All NSSE
1st year students	50	41.1	46.0	42.5 52.7 50.8
Seniors	60.6	53.3	52.7	50.8

Items in the scale included reports that the students:

- Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions
- Made a class presentation
- Worked with other students on projects during class
- Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments
- Tutored or taught other students
- Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)

#### I.1.5.j.3 Results for the School of Architecture and Design from the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey

The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey measures student satisfaction and priorities, showing how satisfied students are, as well as what issues are important to them in the areas of student centeredness, campus life, instructional effectiveness, recruitment and financial aid effectiveness, campus services, academic advising, registration effectiveness, safety and security, and campus climate.

NYIT has administered the survey twice: first in 2005 and again in 2009. The results from the first administration focused university-wide attention on problems in enrollment services, particularly with the perceived inaccessibility and unresponsiveness of the offices of the bursar, registrar and financial aid – consistent across all academic schools and campuses. The area was completely restructured and, in the 2009 administration of the survey, received satisfaction scores on a par with benchmark institutions.

Comparison between NYIT schools showed students in the School of Architecture and Design to have about the same levels of satisfaction as students in NYIT's other schools except in the area of perceived safety and security in Old Westbury (an area of institutional strength otherwise, with NYIT scoring among the top in the nation on this scale). Efforts have been undertaken to improve the situation including: better lighting, more frequent security patrols (particularly in the evening) and installation of a card access system.

**I.1.5.j.4 Results from Graduates and Alumni**

- Graduating Student Survey results: 21% of respondents intend to go on to Grad. School
- Alumni Activities have been coordinated with the NYIT Development office
- NYIT SOAD has initiated a yearly group reception at the AIA National Convention
- AIA CES credits are offered at all School lectures
- FONSAD (the Friends of the School of Architecture and Design) raised \$60,000 since Nov. 2009
- FONSAD sponsored Robert Ivy, Richard Meier and George Miller lectures
- FONSAD funded AIAS student trip and student travel to Paris (spring 2010)
- FONSAD's Oct. 2009 networking event raised over \$17,000 w/100 people in attendance
- FONSAD initiated many student field trips and office visits
- Established annual FONSAD scholarship (Students Peter Pitzer and Laura Zanghi winners Sp 2010)

**I.1.5.j.5 Results from student learning outcomes assessments**

- Refer to the SOAD Assessment and Self Improvement Plan Reports
  - School of Architecture and Design committee reports
  - School of Architecture and Design coordinator reports
  - School of Architecture and Design - Planning Objectives Progress Report
- A new digital web interface was designed and implemented to make Student Performance Criteria Work visible to all faculty
- Coordinators are required to assess their areas of responsibility on a yearly basis
- A New NYIT core degree map was designed to be implemented in Fall 2010
- Comprehensive design: redesigned curriculum
- Visualization curriculum: redesigned
- Designed common foundation year; Nomenclature revisions for the first 2 years of the program were implemented to leverage interdisciplinary education
- Summer program offerings have been expanded to include the Netherlands. Architettura Moderna - Atelier Italia Nord, Egyptian Expedition and Netherlands (all fully subscribed)
- Fabrication Lab assessment reports were produced
- Ecology for Architects ARCH 220 established as an introductory elective course to theories and practices of sustainable design

**2. Conditions Met with Distinction (See Student Performance Criteria for Team comment)**

- A.7 Use of Precedents
- B.3 Sustainability
- B.7 Financial Considerations
- B.11 Building Service Systems Integration
- C.1 Collaboration

**3. The Visiting Team**

Representing the ACSA

Donna Dunay, FAIA

G.T. Ward Professor of Architecture

Chair, Board of Advisors, International Archive of Women in Architecture

School of Architecture & Design

College of Architecture and Urban Studies Virginia Tech

Blacksburg, Virginia 24060

(540) 231-5512

[ddunay@vt.edu](mailto:ddunay@vt.edu)

Representing the AIA

Kenneth E. Crabiel, AIA, CDT, LEED® AP

Associate

Cannon Design

1100 Clark Avenue

St. Louis, MO 63102

(314) 425-8701

(314) 598-7668 mobile

[kcrabiel@cannondesign.com](mailto:kcrabiel@cannondesign.com)

Non-voting member

Sharon Carter Matthews, AIA

1204 Whitney Avenue, #109

Hamden, CT 06517

(203) 230-9167 home

(202) 468-1283 mobile

[sharon.matthews@att.net](mailto:sharon.matthews@att.net)

Representing the AIAS

Danielle McDonough, Assoc. AIA, LEED® AP

2010-2011 Vice President

American Institute of Architecture Students

1735 New York Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 2006

(202) 626-7472 office

(202) 626-7414 fax

[Mcdonough.da@gmail.com](mailto:Mcdonough.da@gmail.com)

Representing the NCARB

Susan Schaefer Kliman, Ph.D., AIA

Klimatic Architecture

6375 E. Tanque Verde Road, Suite 130

Tucson, Arizona 85715

(520) 352-0145

(520) 352-0144 fax

[skliman@klimatic.com](mailto:skliman@klimatic.com)

Non-voting member

Brian Kelly, AIA, Associate Professor

School of Architecture Planning and Preservation

University of Maryland

College Park, Maryland 20742

(301) 405-4592

[bkelly@umd.edu](mailto:bkelly@umd.edu)

**V. Confidential Recommendation**

Upon consideration of the terms of accreditation in Section 2 of the *2010 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*, including an assessment of compliance with the *2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*, the team unanimously recommends to the NAAB Board:

Institution, Academic/Administrative Unit: New York Institute of Technology


Degree Title: B. Arch (160 semester credits)

Term of Accreditation: 6 years



Donna Dunay, FAIA  
Team Chair

Representing the ACSA



Kenneth E. Crabiell, AIA, CDT, LEED®AP  
Team member

Representing the AIA



Danielle McDonough, Assoc. AIA, LEED®AP  
Team member

Representing the AIAS



Susan Schaefer Kliman, Ph.D., AIA  
Team member

Representing the NCARB