National Architectural Accrediting Board

2025 Visiting Team Report

Program: New York Institute of Technology (B.Arch., M.Arch.)

Type of Visit: Continuing Accreditation

Date of Visit: 11/9/2025-11/12/2025

Contents

A. Summary of Visit 2
B. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit 4
C. Program Changes 5
D. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation 6
1. Context and Mission 6
2. Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession 8
3. Program and Student Criteria 12
4. Curricular Framework 30
5. Resources 33
6. Public Information 42
E. The Visiting Team 47
F. Report Signatures 48

A. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The NAAB visiting team would like to thank the School of Architecture and Design for its generous hospitality during our visit. The APR document and evidence files are extremely well organized and are central to our understanding and appreciation of both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs. In particular, the team wants to recognize the efforts of Giovanni Santanmaria, Associate Dean for academic operations for his gracious leadership in the preparation and organization for the visit, and to thank Gabriella Pace, the dean's executive assistant for her support of the team's travel logistics. Additionally, the team would like to express our admiration for the impressive and high-quality exhibitions of student and faculty work throughout the building in Long Island, Manhattan and in the team rooms.

In our meetings, the team heard how much the NYIT community respects and appreciates Dean Maria Perbellini's vision for the school and her leadership and advocacy for student learning and faculty growth and development. The dean spoke of her respect and admiration of the students, faculty and staff, and specifically of her leadership team.

Although there are two campuses, one in Manhattan and one in Old Westbury on Long Island, we heard a consistent message about the strong sense of community, collegiality and belonging in the school. The two-campus model is a unique feature of the NYIT architecture programs and the dean, leadership and faculty move effortlessly between the campuses and have developed robust relationships with alumni and practice communities on Long Island and New York City. The B.Arch. program is offered at both campuses serving students with different lifestyle choices, including commuting from the family home. We heard that design projects are often located in Brooklyn and Queens for the diversity of urban conditions and community engagement as well as the opportunity for Old Westbury and Manhattan cohorts to meet. The M.Arch. is offered only in Manhattan and offers unparalleled access to the professional community, with some offices and alumni within two blocks, and access to the city's impressive cultural attractions as well as numerous multi-cultural neighborhoods.

NYIT's Bachelor of Architecture program is an affordable path for students seeking a professional degree in architecture. Many students are first generation, Pell eligible students and the programs' curricular structure provides a rigorous professional education, with numerous opportunities for engagement and mentoring that will have a positive impact well into the professional practice years. There is clearly one school and one community that is drawn together to support the success and achievements of a diverse student population. Resources at the school level include clubs, peer tutoring, mentoring and scholarships and are complemented by a scaffolding coaching mentorship and programs at the institute level. Student success and opportunity is on everyone's mind; the faculty and staff meet students where they are, with dedication to holistic student well-being and achievement.

The department of architecture offers a rich variety of opportunities for learning with a design focus on buildings as the primary subject of inquiry. Cultural, social and environmental conditions are proposed as integral conditions of building design and complementary course work in representation, environmental analysis and simulation demonstrates a thoughtful and highly

curated curriculum and one that is continuously improved. The School's robust investment in digital technologies including highly skilled staff allows these technologies to weave seamlessly into the design studio and become constituent tools in the student's design toolbox. In the B.Arch. and M.Arch. the building design outcomes are both comprehensive, well documented and beautiful. The team had the opportunity to see studio work in development and witness an array of analog and digital drawings and modeling integrated in the design workflow. NYIT graduates are not only practice-ready but are also called upon to share their knowledge of leading-edge technologies for representation, simulation and fabrication in the work environment.

b. Conditions with a Team Preliminary Finding as Not Achieved *(list number and title, and subconditions)*

For the B.Arch. program, the team found all conditions for accreditation achieved.
For the M.Arch. program, the team found all conditions for accreditation achieved.

B. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

B.Arch.

Previous Team Report (2017) Conditions Not Met/Not Yet Met

2014 Conditions, A.7 History and Culture, Not Met - Understanding of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, and regional settings in terms of their political, economic, social, and technological factors.

2017 Team Assessment: The team was unable to find sufficient evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level, including within AAID 160 Introduction to History, AAID 161 Survey History Architecture I, AAID 162 Survey History Architecture II, ARCH 361 Architectural History and Theory Seminar, and ARCH 362 City Planning. The team did not find any student work or anything in the course curriculum that covered indigenous or vernacular architecture. The team requested additional evidence, which was provided by the school. The team was still unable to locate the appropriate material.

2025 Team Analysis:
The team found a revised robust architectural history sequence with NAAB SPCs linked to syllabi with the inclusion of broad non-western content in the course sequence: ARCH 161Global History of Architecture I and ARCH 162 Global History of Architecture II and a new course ARCH 362 History and Theory of the City with a focus including North and West Africa and the Global South. Multiple sections of ARCH 361 Architectural History and Theory Seminar offer elective topics including Modern Korean Architecture and Urbanism and Architecture and Solidarity on Latin America. Additionally, design studios coordinate with the history sequence affording portability to design decision making. An upper-level studio (ARCH 402) is a community design project based in New York City's neighborhoods (Flatbush, Brooklyn, Inwood) allowing students the opportunity to engage with the values and culture of a user through interviews with residents and activists. The studio explores the impacts of gentrification, subsidized housing, rezoning and displacement of residents. Through lectures, seminar, studio design and user engagement, students gain an understanding of the role diverse and at times conflicting user values have in the built environment.

2014 Conditions, A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity, Not Met - Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to buildings and structures.

2017 Team Assessment: The team was unable to find sufficient evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level, including within AAID 160 Introduction to History, AAID 161 Survey History Architecture I, AAID 162 Survey History Architecture II, ARCH 361 Architectural History and Theory Seminar, and ARCH 401 Architectural Design V. Specifically, the team did not find discussion on the social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures. The team requested additional evidence, which was provided by the school. The team was still unable to locate appropriate material.

2025 Team Analysis:
B.Arch.
Following the last accreditation VTR, discussions among New York Tech (NYIT) School of Architecture and Design (SoAD) leadership, faculty, and coordinators have led to major improvements in the B.Arch. curriculum, which positively influenced the development of the

M.Arch. program (initial accreditation in 2020). Specifically, the revised History and Theory sequence (discussed previously) now offers a comprehensive understanding of the social, cultural, economic, and political forces in architecture. Additionally, upper-level design studios are set in communities surrounding New York City and incorporate community stakeholders offering students and invaluable experience with diverse user needs, values and cultures impacting architectural design decisions. Further, the thesis year incorporates the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals including urgent global challenges such as climate change and resilience in the built environment, and affordable housing. Through lectures, seminars, studio design and user engagement, students gain an understanding of the role diverse and at times conflicting user values have in the built environment.

M.Arch.

Previous Team Report (2022) Conditions Not Met/Not Yet Met

The 2022 visiting team did not recommend any conditions as "Not Achieved"

2025 Team Analysis
N/A

C. Program Changes

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

2025 Team Analysis:

OVERALL
The B.Arch. program was last accredited under the 2014 Conditions. Both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs now use a robust assessment structure with assignment-based rubrics, internal/external reviews and leadership meetings. A rigorous system of organization archives non-curricular activities, faculty materials, and student work. All syllabi have been standardized with a template that clearly maps learning outcomes, grading, and NAAB criteria to specific assignments for shared accessibility and program assessment.

B.Arch.
Key changes include:

- **Adoption of 2020 Accreditation Conditions:** The B.Arch. program successfully implemented the new Conditions, validated in part by the M.Arch. program's Initial Accreditation in 2022.
- **Focus on DEIB and Social Responsibility:** A more integrated approach to **Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB)**, fostering inclusive learning environments and a commitment to social responsibility, has been embedded across the curriculum.
- **Curriculum Expansion:** The curriculum now includes contemporary issues like **climate action, sustainability, globalization, and equity**. Upper-level studios and history-theory courses explicitly address social injustices and positive social impact.
- **Capstone Studio Updates:** The thesis studios (ARCH 501/502) now focus on the **United Nations Sustainable Development Goals** and urgent global challenges like climate change, resilience, and affordable housing.
- **Technology Integration:** Visualization and technology courses have been updated to include **emerging digital technologies** such as parametric design, BIM, building performance simulation, virtual reality, and artificial intelligence.

These adjustments underscore the School of Architecture and Design's commitment to career-oriented education that prepares students to contribute to a "healthier, safer, and more sustainable world."

M.Arch.
Initial accreditation in 2022 was under the 2020 Conditions and there are no changes to note.

D. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

Several conditions are under a temporary stay. A list of those conditions can be viewed here: *https://www.naab.org/blogs/naab/2025/09/18/stay-on-naab-conditions-with-dei-related-language*

1—Context and Mission (*Guidelines*, p. 5)

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
To help the NAAB and the visiting team understand the specific circumstances of the school, the program must describe the following:

- *The institutional context and geographic setting (public or private, urban or rural, size, etc.), and how the program's mission and culture influence its architecture pedagogy and impact its development. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the mission of the college or university and how that shapes or influences the program.*

- *The program's role in and relationship to its academic context and university community, including how the program benefits–and benefits from–its institutional setting and how the program as a unit and/or its individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. Also describe how the program, as a unit, develops multidisciplinary relationships and leverages unique opportunities in the institution and the community.*

New York Institute of Technology serves as a private, non-profit institution with current enrollment of approximately 8,000 full-time students across multiple campuses. The APR describes how New York Tech School of Architecture and Design (SoAD) thrives due to its strategic location, university setting, and interdisciplinary partnerships. It's dual campuses—one in Manhattan's Columbus Circle and the other in Long Island's Old Westbury—offer students access to world-class cultural institutions, professional design networks, and tranquil academic environments. The team visited both campuses.

Through coursework and a broad range of supplementary activities and opportunities, the mission and culture of SoAD emphasize innovation and real-world engagement, which shape a pedagogy rooted in critical thinking and creativity. The curriculum is enriched by hands-on resources and a global perspective, preparing students for dynamic architectural careers. The school's faculty are immersed in NYIT-wide initiatives and excel in its representation by spearheading or heavily contributing to the development of institute-wide initiatives.

New York Tech's mission is to provide career-oriented professional education. SoAD benefits from advanced facilities like fabrication labs, robotic labs, and a dedicated architectural library. The university's infrastructure supports in-person learning and seamless collaboration between campuses. Additionally, SoAD fosters multidisciplinary engagement through partnerships with other NYIT schools, encouraging innovative, cross-disciplinary coursework and research. These

combined elements create a rich, diverse, and professionally immersive educational experience for both students and faculty.

The school and the institution are committed to the one institute across two NY campuses and utilize each respective campus and atmosphere as a defining characteristic and experience for students, honing in on the juxtaposition yet connectivity of urban metropolitan and semi-urban campuses to aid in community engagement in varying degrees.

- *The ways in which the program encourages students and faculty to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective opportunities (e.g., field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities).*

According to the APR, The NYIT School of Architecture and Design (SoAD) offers diverse learning experiences that extend beyond the classroom. The APR describes international opportunities, including Study Abroad, Travel Studios, and Exchange Workshops in countries such as Italy, Germany, Finland, Japan, and Brazil. These programs, often led by faculty, are supported by the Dean's travel scholarship fund and enhance cultural and contextual understanding, especially through the Thesis Travel Program for fifth-year B.Arch. students.

The Dean's Atelier Studio provides select students with advanced design instruction from renowned architects like Alberto Campo Baeza and Daniel Sundlin, complemented by expert-led presentations. Annual design competitions, such as the ARCH 402 Comprehensive Studio, foster collaboration and community engagement across both campuses.

SoAD student organizations—AIAS, NOMAS, Arquitectos, and IDSA—receive mentorship and funding to attend national conferences. These groups are guided by faculty advisors and integrated into school governance through the Student Affairs Committee (SAC), which promotes leadership and professional development. Institution wide connection of the school is reinforced with a student government association senator. This allows NYIT-wide requests for funding to assist in the development of students.

Workshops held each semester include international exchanges and are open to undergraduate and graduate students. The Lecture and Exhibition Series, rebranded in 2016, features symposia, exhibitions, and talks by global experts on themes like technology, resilience, and environmental design. These events are collaboratively planned by students and faculty, offering exposure to emerging issues and professional practices.

Together, these initiatives create a dynamic and engaged learning environment that supports academic growth, professional development, and cultural exchange.

Program Summary Statement of 1 – Context and Mission
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 SoAD identified three core values, or educational aspirations, to guide our approach:

- *Design Intelligence, refers to the development and application of critical skills and knowledge attained through a comprehensive curriculum, emphasizing individual creative inquiry, theory, history, culture, technology, research and contributions from leaders, and innovators in diverse fields.*

- *Technology, establishes the importance of integrating prevailing and emerging technologies in academic and professional approaches manifested in a design centered and innovation driven curriculum.*
- *Leadership, is instilled in our students and graduates throughout their education through collaborative, team-based projects clearly organized to achieve project goals. Leadership is developed through the holistic and ethical New York Tech educational experience and international initiatives where students gain expertise working across disciplines, institutions, and organizations.*

Link: https://www.nyit.edu/academics/architecture-and-design/about/.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: Architects practice design as a collaborative, ***inclusive***, creative, and empathetic enterprise with other disciplines, the communities we serve, and the clients for whom we work.
A portion of this Condition is under a temporary stay.

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

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis

Design:

The APR describes "Design" as the foundation of the Bachelor and Master of Architecture programs, serving as both a pedagogical basis and a strategic focus for long-term development. The APR and course description describe the experiential, project-based learning, of the design studio sequence and the learning to integrate knowledge from across disciplines such as technology, history, theory, and construction. This interdisciplinary approach to design thinking encourages intellectual rigor, creativity, and applied research, while promoting ethical judgment and cultural awareness. Design is not only a method of instruction but also a means of engaging with global and community needs, emphasizing sustainability and human well-being.

In terms of long-range planning (APR pg. 32-36), the School of Architecture and Design (SoAD) has a five year strategic plan objectives with "Design Intelligence - Design, Knowledge and Innovation" as one of the objectives in the five-year plan. The SoAD prioritizes design through innovative curricula introduced by Dean Maria Perbellini leadership (appointed 2016). The curricular updates described throughout the APR were made to prepare students to critically and creatively anticipate and adapt to future challenges in architectural practice, especially those driven by emerging technologies. The architecture program values align with NYIT's broader mission to cultivate critical and creative thinkers who combine artistic and engineering mindsets.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. Strategic planning outcomes and initiatives are reviewed annually with the institutional planning process.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility:

The APR states that a holistic approach to stewardship of the environment is central to the culture and curricula of the NYIT School of Architecture and Design. This was confirmed in our meeting with the faculty and in our review of the work across the curriculum. Issues related to environmental stewardship and professional responsibility unfold in the third through fifth year studios of the B.Arch. and in all years of the M.Arch. and are reinforced in lecture and seminar courses. The programs focus on sustainable practices, ecosystem resilience, and human well-being, and note that their ethical belief is that architects serve in the role of caretaker. The programs introduce ecological literacy and environmental awareness in an active manner throughout the curriculum. B.Arch. students participated in the 2011 Solar Decathlons which led to an invitation for students to testify to Congress about sustainable energy. The student-led Architecture Build program (sLAB) has engaged in numerous extracurricular projects. The school's focus on curricular and extra-curricular support also includes support for USGBC LEED study groups, AIAS, Freedom by Design, and participation in programming such as Youth Climate Workshops as part of the 2021 UN Climate Change Summit and COP26.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. Strategic planning outcomes and initiatives are reviewed annually with the institutional planning process.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: ***This Condition*** is under a temporary stay.

Knowledge and Innovation:
The NYIT School of Architecture and Design (SoAD) prioritizes knowledge and innovation, and these values are central pillars of the curriculum and the school's long-term planning. Under Dean Maria Perbellini's leadership, the School has launched new graduate programs, revised curricula, and invested in advanced fabrication labs and digital technologies. Research is embedded across academic programs encouraging hands-on learning, interdisciplinary collaboration, and experimentation. Faculty contribute to the students' awareness of disciplinary research through numerous award-winning publications, global exhibitions, and competitive grants, while students engage in innovation-driven projects, competitions, and showcases. Initiatives like the Dean's Atelier Studio and sLAB workshops foster real-world engagement and creative exploration.

Emerging technologies, especially AI, are being integrated throughout the curriculum. A Minor in AI and Design is in development to prepare students for future transformations in architecture and design.

Students are required to engage in parametric design, building information modeling, building performance simulation, virtual reality, and artificial intelligence. The school has been able to increase the computing infrastructure at both the Old Westbury and Manhattan campuses with support through the IDC Foundation to support student learning. The use of digital technologies is incorporated into studio courses across all years of the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs. Strategic partnerships with global institutions and recurring curriculum reviews ensure that faculty research informs teaching and that students remain competitive in evolving professional landscapes. The newly appointed IDC endowed chair serves the role of increasing outreach and partnerships. Through exhibitions, symposia, and collaborative community based studios, SoAD continues to cultivate a proactive, inclusive, and future-focused academic environment that supports the next generation of creative innovators.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. Strategic planning outcomes and initiatives are reviewed annually with the institutional planning process.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement:
A portion of this Condition is under a temporary stay.

The program provides several opportunities for student leadership, collaboration and community engagement. Examples include participation in the Student Advisory Committee (SAC), student organizations including AIAS, NOMAS and Arquitectos, and the "Atmosphere" event and annual publication, as well as mixed-cohort foundation studios and paired-teaching models.

Community engagement was demonstrated through the B.Arch. Community Design Studio and the M.Arch. Material Tectonics design-build course. Material Tectonics (ARCH 724) is an active design-build course with nonprofit clients; studios cite collaborative work and visiting scholars participate in reviews.

The program also partners with external groups and resources such as OSPAR, SOURCE, visiting scholars, and alumni mentors. During the visit, the team observed and verified that these activities are active and valued by students and faculty.

A notable example of leadership within the program is the ACE (Achieving Academic Excellence) initiative. This proactive effort identifies first- and second-year students who may be struggling academically and engages them through individualized support plans. The program seeks to understand each student's specific challenges—whether academic, financial, or personal—and provides coordinated advising, mentoring, and financial guidance to help students identify their challenges in order to persist and succeed in the architecture program. This initiative reflects the school's commitment to student self-actualization, student well-being, and equitable access to academic success.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. Strategic planning outcomes and initiatives are reviewed annually with the institutional planning process.

During the visit, the team met with leaders from the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) and students in ARCH 401, visited live studios, reviewed studio work and portfolio materials, and spoke with faculty about these experiences.

Lifelong Learning:
A commitment to Lifelong Learning is highlighted in a range of activities and engagement. SoAD notes a goal to educate the "whole architect" by way of programs optimizing their maturity intellectually, artistically, socially, professionally, and personally. This includes referencing faculty publications on books, magazines, and journals, lecture series and events, symposia, organizational involvement, design competitions, biennials, study abroad programs, travel fellowships, alumni networking, professors of practice, internships, and portfolios. Research and innovation are listed as additional lifelong learning opportunities allowing sustained self-motivated applied research and practice including but not limited to externships and new practicum-based programs.

SoAD notes that they continue this through engaging in experiential, virtual, and physical innovative research. Focused on materials, fabrications, digital technologies, grants, and collaboration of multi-disciplinary projects and assessments. The criteria is shown and listed as being a primary key curricular shared value through the following courses and activities: AAID 140, Arch 161, Arch 401, Arch 481, lecture series, projects abroad, and special activities.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. Strategic planning outcomes and initiatives are reviewed annually with the institutional planning process.

Throughout the site visit, resource visits, and direct meetings reinforced the initial APR statements. Students, staff, faculty, and leadership voiced the continued application of learning throughout the matriculation of students. The diverse workshops, labs, conferences, events, lectures, course work, and non-curricular activities. Students noted the ability to have involvement in internships, externships, student competitions, organizations, and field-trips. Institution wide, they are afforded the ability to cross-collaborate on some multi-disciplinary work. Several faculty are embedded in research and advancement at the institute and industry levels and bring such insights and developments back to the faculty, staff and students.

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

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

PC.1 Career Paths
How the program ensures that students understand the paths to becoming licensed as an architect in the United States and the range of available career opportunities that utilize the discipline's skills and knowledge. (p.10)

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
During the visit, associate dean Anthony Caradonna noted during our interview with him that these topics are discussed with students, especially in ARCH 880 and ARCH 481. The visit confirmed that students understand the U.S. licensure path and the range of career options, particularly after taking these courses.

The IPAL pathway is described as "in development" and currently not fully adopted by the state, so it cannot serve as evidence at this time.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum.

During our meetings, the vice-president of strategic planning mentioned that when the larger institution followed alumni from the NYIT innovation and entrepreneurship academy, they found that many were graduates from the architecture school who had their own practices with innovative work at the intersection of design and technology.

The program reports that licensure and career awareness are addressed in required a sequence of coursework addressing issues of practice, CDs/BIM, site/planning; advising with an NCARB/AXP coordinator and with regular presentations from NCARB/NYSED participation; alumni mentoring/networking. The B.Arch. curriculum introduces professional roles, licensure expectations, and career paths through ARCH 481 Professional Practice, including AXP, ARE 5.0, and current practice and delivery methods.

The program also reports that most faculty and guest jurors are licensed or pursuing licensure, and that students meet with AXP coordinators and state licensure representatives come to the school for presentations. An official AXP coordinator is available on both campuses.

Because many of the program's faculty are practicing architects, students benefit from opportunities to visit their professional offices and gain firsthand exposure to architectural practice and workplace culture—often without the formality of a structured internship.

A notable example of experiential learning is the Externship Program, through which select students participated in short-term placements with firms such as BIG (Bjarke Ingels Group). This experience provided meaningful professional engagement and networking opportunities, offering students—especially those from underrepresented or disadvantaged backgrounds—access to major design offices and global professional networks that might otherwise be unavailable to them.

The B.Arch. program describes a recurring assessment process using learning outcomes scorecards. They mention that course adjustments to ARCH 327, ARCH 272, and ARCH 481 reflect the outcomes of the assessment process.

Independent interviews with the dean, associate dean, and AXP coordinator confirmed that these activities are being implemented as reported. Additionally, The vice-president of strategic planning mentioned that when the larger institution followed alumni from the NYIT innovation and entrepreneurship academy, they found that many were graduates from the architecture school who had their own practices with innovative work at the intersection of design and technology.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis
The APR demonstrates that the M.Arch. program addresses professional roles, career trajectories, and pathways to licensure through required coursework and structured advising. Courses such as ARCH 705/772 incorporate regulatory frameworks and the restructured ARCH 880 introducing professional practice provides instruction in contracts, legal responsibilities, licensure management, and practice models.

The program reports regular student engagement with NCARB and the school's AXP coordinator, and notes graduate placement supported by alumni mentoring and networking. The team verified during the visit that students are aware of AXP requirements, ARE pathways, and the range of professional opportunities available to M.Arch. graduates.

The school describes an assessment process in which faculty use learning-outcome scorecards and review results each term. The program cites recent adjustments to ARCH 880 as an example of changes informed by this review.

Licensure preparation—including awareness of certification, ARE, and AXP requirements—is integrated into advanced coursework.

Through meetings with associate dean Anthony Caradonna, program director and AXP coordinator Robert Cody, and the students, the team confirmed that the curriculum, advising structures, and professional engagement activities effectively support understanding of career paths and licensure processes.

PC.2 Design
How the program instills in students the role of the design process in shaping the built environment and conveys the methods by which design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities. (p.10)

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The B.Arch. curriculum demonstrates a clear studio progression, moving from conceptual and representational work in the 100-level studios to increasingly complex, multi-scalar design challenges in the third and fourth year and meets the criteria for **PC.2 Design**. Students engage in design problems ranging from site studies and building systems integration to community-based projects, including the ARCH 402 Community Design Studio and thesis-level design-research investigations. The program describes opportunities for multi-scalar design thinking, team-based reviews, community interaction, and integrated workflows supported by seminars in systems, planning, and technical competencies.

The program reports the use of learning-outcome scorecards and end-of-term portfolio reviews to assess integrative design performance. Faculty review work for evidence of system coordination, code compliance, environmental performance, accessibility, constructability, and cost considerations. While benchmark definitions are general rather than criterion-specific, the program demonstrates recurring review of student performance and cites recent adjustments to studio sequencing and support seminars as results of these assessments.

The team visited studios in session, reviewed displayed student work, and spoke with faculty and students across multiple levels. Evidence demonstrated that students engage an integrative design process early in the studio sequence, addressing site, program, structure, envelope, environmental systems, codes, accessibility, and technical constraints at appropriate levels of complexity. Design studio review participation by faculty across disciplines was also confirmed.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The M.Arch. program documents the Track I/Track II sequences, which introduce students to integrative design beginning with ARCH 704/705, reinforced by systems, planning, and regulatory seminars. This course sequence meets the criteria for **PC.2 Design**. Advanced studios such as ARCH 801/802 require students to work across scales—from building-scale integration to urban and community contexts. The program also offers design-build opportunities through ARCH 724, partnering with nonprofit organizations and exposing students to material tectonics, constructability, and stakeholder engagement. Course modifications noted in the APR, including closer alignment between ARCH 705 and concurrent systems and construction documentation courses, strengthen integrative design learning.

The APR references compliance diagrams, performance metrics, portfolio reviews, and faculty scoring practices. While criterion-specific benchmarks are not extensively defined, the program demonstrates continuous assessment through term-by-term reviews of student work and adjustments to the assignments and content in the studio Examples of course improvements—such as the refocusing of ARCH 801 around urban housing—are cited as responses to assessment findings related to integrative design.

During the visit, the team reviewed work from ARCH 704/705, advanced studios, and the design-build course. Conversations with faculty and students, and direct review of studio pin-ups and projects, confirmed that students apply an integrative design process addressing site, program, structure, envelope, environmental performance, codes, accessibility, and constructability at an appropriate graduate level. Design studio review participation by faculty across disciplines was also confirmed.

PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility

How the program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities. (p.10)

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The school responds consistently through program development with a holistic ecological approach through Arch 324, Arch 325, Arch 413, and Arch 272 between the 3rd and 4th years of the curriculum. The course work depicts the analysis and synthesis of site and environmental factors in direct response to building development, energy efficiency, thermal comfort, conservation strategies, and reclamation resources to various degrees of competency between students and courses. Analysis of the environmental systems classes through coursework into studio work is applied in the final deliverables of the student's portfolio of studio work. The technical skills and software learned in the associated courses are used to assess **PC. 3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility** and this knowledge is further demonstrated in the subsequent studios through diagrams, massing, orientation, and design and system ideas for environmental stewardship.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum.

The evolution of student work and its address of **PC. 3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility** is noted in benchmarks which are further confirmed through scorecards, and the team's meetings with students and faculty.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The M.Arch. program utilizes a series of courses focused on technology sequences Arch 772, Arch 705, Arch 722, and Arch 713 to deliver holistic ecological thinking. The syllabi, schedules, rubrics, assignments, and readings establish a systematic synthesis of horizontal integration into projects. The teaching of several courses are concurrent, requiring the students to immediately implement strategies and learnings. The software and simulation exercises aid in the discovery of environmental strategies and usage into site specific context. Architectural simulation and fabrication optimization is listed as the primary vehicle to generate qualitative analyses to determine metricized performance.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. The efficacy of student skills and design thinking for **PC. 3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility** is demonstrated in the Arch 705 class. Scorecards from professionals at the studio review, faculty assessments and grades establish the feedback loop

required to determine competencies being implemented. Benchmarking is listed as being met within the APR.
The evolution of student work and its address of **PC. 3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility** is noted in benchmarks which are further confirmed through scorecards, and the team's meetings with students and faculty.

PC.4 History and Theory—How the program ensures that students understand the histories and theories of architecture and urbanism, framed by ***diverse*** social, cultural, economic, and political forces, nationally and globally.
A portion of this Condition is under a temporary stay.

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
A portion of this Condition is under a temporary stay.

NYIT's history and theory courses focus on architecture, urban design and art, and are organized to emphasize interconnectedness of local, national and global events and meet the criteria for **PC. 4 History and Theory.** The courses have four objectives: a comprehensive geographical and anthropological approach to history and theory, emphasis on relationships rather than artifacts, equity and inclusion and open-minded inquiry and criticality. The B.Arch. has a 3-course sequence that focuses on history and theory: the survey courses, Arch 161 Global History I and Arch 162 Global History 2, and Arch 362 History and Theory of the City.

Evidence was provided including course syllabi, assignments, lectures, readings. The course assessment is based on quizzes, essays and travelogues, an assignment that asks students to compare buildings and works of their own choosing, in the survey courses. Assessment in Arch 362 is made through a research presentation.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum.

Assessment is carried out for each section of a course. Course coordinators conduct a holistic assessment for multi-section courses and course sequences to provide continuous assessment and improvement, and course coordinators meet regularly. As part of the assessment process, faculty provide reflective feedback for each other's classes. At the end of the semester, each faculty member reflects on feedback from invited guests and students. The faculty work together to identify benchmarks and areas for course and curricular improvement.

The assessment process was confirmed in meetings with faculty and staff focused on institutional effectiveness from the provost's office. The development of a new and expanded history and theory sequence has been a program focus and outcomes are described throughout the APR and were discussed on site.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
A portion of this Condition is under a temporary stay.

NYIT's history and theory courses focus on architecture, urban design and art, and are organized to emphasize interconnectedness of local, national and global events and meet the criteria for **PC. 4 History and Theory.** The courses have four objectives: a comprehensive geographical and anthropological approach to history and theory, emphasis on relationships rather than artifacts, equity and inclusion and open-minded inquiry and criticality. The M.Arch. track I students have a 2-course sequence: Arch 661 Global History of Architecture I and Arch 662 Global History of Architecture II. Students in track II are expected to have completed architectural history courses as undergraduate students. All M.Arch. students continue in the history and theory sequence with history and theory options courses.

Evidence was provided including course syllabi, assignments, lectures, readings. The course assessment is based on quizzes, essays and travelogues, an assignment that asks students to compare buildings and works of their own choosing, in the survey courses. Assessment in Arch 862 and 362 is made through a research presentation.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum.

Assessment is carried out for each section of a course. Course coordinators conduct a holistic assessment for multi-section courses and course sequences to provide continuous assessment and improvement, and course coordinators meet regularly. As part of the assessment process, faculty provide reflective feedback for each other's classes. At the end of the semester, each faculty member reflects on feedback from invited guests and students. The faculty work together to identify benchmarks and areas for course and curricular improvement.

The assessment process was confirmed in meetings with faculty and staff focused on institutional effectiveness from the provost's office. The development of a new and expanded history and theory sequence has been a program focus and outcomes are described throughout the APR and were discussed on site.

PC.5 Research and Innovation
How the program prepares students to engage and participate in architectural research to test and evaluate innovations in the field. (p.10)

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
Research and innovation are central to the program's mission and the development of the B.Arch. curriculum. Research activities range from basic precedent, code, zoning, and material research to experimentation, simulation and testing of proposals using the same tools used in present-day practice. ARCH 413 Architectural Simulation and Fabrication Optimization emphasizes emerging technologies, building information modeling and performance simulation tools that are used in practice. Student work in this course demonstrated an iterative cycle of research, design and innovative outcomes. The school's digital fabrication facilities, staffed by professional design creatives are a hub of research and innovation supporting studios as well as developing new materials and methods.

Additionally, two 500-level thesis courses and student engagement with the library's databases and GIS mapping fosters research-based inquiry, independent experimentation, and innovation. For their thesis work, each student is responsible for producing a "research book" that succinctly documents the theoretical approach and selective design investigations related to the topic and site. The APR described a summary of curricular modifications as outcomes from the assessment process. Interaction during the visit with the librarian and Associate Dean Giovanni Santamaria along with the role research plays in the studio work confirmed our analysis.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. A three point assessment focused on Research, Process Outcomes defines the scorecard used at studio reviews and is evidenced by precedent analysis, program analysis diagrams, site analysis and mapping, along with a 250-word research abstract. Research methods are, however, not an SLO in the coursework reviewed by the team.

The team confirmed the evidence provided during onsite meetings with students and faculty. While on site, the team reviewed an expansive faculty exhibit of research and creative work including scholarly publications, exhibitions (2025 Architecture Venice Biennale), buildings and paintings.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
Research and innovation are central to the mission of New York Tech, the SoAD, and the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs. Research activities range from basic precedent, code, zoning, and material research to experimentation, simulation and testing of proposals using the same tools used in present-day practice M.Arch. coursework at the 800-level are each focused on independent experimentation, research and innovation,

ARCH 713 Architectural Simulation and Fabrication Optimization emphasizes emerging technologies, building information modeling and performance simulation tools that are used in practice. Student work in this course demonstrated an iterative cycle of research, design and innovative outcomes. The school's digital fabrication facilities, staffed by professional design creatives are a hub of research and innovation supporting studios as well as developing new materials and methods.

Innovative design solutions, supported by research are the outcome of two upper level courses in the M.Arch. curriculum M.Arch. 724 Material Tectonics II, is a competitive design competition with clients, and in ARCH 802 M.Arch. Studio 7 students develop independent paths of research-based design projects.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. A three point assessment focused on Research, Process Outcomes defines the scorecard used at studio reviews and is evidenced by precedent analysis, program analysis diagrams, site analysis and mapping, along with a 250-word research abstract. Research methods are, however, not an SLO in the coursework reviewed by the team.

The team confirmed the evidence provided during onsite meetings with students and faculty. While on site, the team reviewed an expansive faculty exhibit of research and creative work including scholarly publications, exhibitions (2025 Architecture Venice Biennale), buildings and paintings.

PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration
How the program ensures that students understand approaches to leadership in multidisciplinary teams, ***diverse stakeholder constituents***, and dynamic physical and social contexts, and learn how to apply effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems.
A portion of this Condition **is under a temporary stay.**

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
A portion of this Condition is under a temporary stay.

The APR notes that the B.Arch. program addresses collaborative work in upper-level design studios and seminars. Through semester long small group projects in the 4th year of the curriculum, joint leadership is established. ARCH 272 Environmental Site Planning, and ARCH 402 Architecture Design 6 are the complementary course and studio that fosters the intended collaboration. The readings and assignments develop students' understanding of engagement of context in physical and other modes. The course syllabi and rubrics, reiterate a need to self - document through a sense of independence and autonomy, but to collectively weigh in on forming a team of co-leaders. The joint final grades aid in creating understanding of mutual success and failure among the team M.Arch. 402 is noted as having stakeholders and collaborators such as community leaders, members of planning departments, and architects deepening the student's experience with multi-disciplinary exploration and problem solving.

Community involvement in Arch 402 and site planning of Arch 272 is culminated with Arch 481 oral and visual presentations to assist in the benchmarking of leadership skills within collaborative and community-driven projects. The benchmarks are noted in the APR as having been met.

This evidence was confirmed through syllabi, coursework, assessments and grades reviewed by the team virtually and on site. Visits to the classroom in session and student conversations aided the team in this determination.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
A portion of this Condition is under a temporary stay.

The M.Arch. Description of the APR notes that nearly all of the studio coursework includes team projects, each semester. Each student is generally made responsible for a portion of the preliminary development and research of the project which instills collaboration yet leadership is representation of context and knowledge utilized by the entire studio. In Arch 724, student teams work directly with not-for-profit sponsors to identify design/build opportunities. Students eventually collaborate through the community driven project to jointly design, document, fabricate, and construct the select project. Through a combination of material tectonics,

construction drawings, and site planning courses, the school continues to generally evolve the coursework to further leadership and collaboration per the APR, although benchmarks are met. Through the course syllabi, assignments, readings, assessments, and grades, the team confirmed the reporting.

This evidence was confirmed through syllabi, coursework, assessments and grades reviewed by the team virtually and on site. Visits to the classroom in session and student conversations aided the team in this determination.

PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture
How the program fosters and ensures a positive and respectful environment that encourages optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation among its faculty, students, administration, and staff. (p.10)

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
With a significant number of students and faculty who are commuters, and many students who work in addition to their academic activities, NYIT optimizes engagement when students are on campus with studio days and special events and lectures. The programs also emphasize student led initiatives, clubs and student groups which include participation by faculty. The school leaders also look for opportunities for mentoring in the community. The SoAD Learning and Teaching Culture Policy was developed to represent the shared values and voices of students, faculty and administrators.

The course, AAID 101 Fundamentals of Design I establishes the studio culture and values for a learning and sharing culture. ARCH 402 Architectural Design 6 is a community design studio that requires students to work in teams and focuses on sharing, engagement, and community stakeholder input.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. The course assessment for AAID 101 is based on weekly assignments, studio reviews and a design portfolio. Course assessment for ARCH 402 is shaped by assignments of individual instructors in accordance with common learning outcomes across sections. Course coordinators conduct a holistic assessment for multi-section courses and course sequences to provide continuous assessment and improvement, and course coordinators meet regularly. As part of the assessment process, faculty provide reflective feedback for each other's classes. At the end of the semester, each faculty member reflects on feedback from invited guests and students. The faculty work together to identify benchmarks and areas for course and curricular improvement.

While on site, the team met with students and faculty and confirmed a healthy and positive learning culture. The SoAD has strong relationships with alumni and many return to the school as adjuncts and guests, In addition, graduates are sought after for their ability to share and teach digital technology skills to the practice community.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
With a significant number of students and faculty who are commuters, and a number of students who work in addition to their academic activities, NYIT optimizes engagement when students are on campus on studio days and for special events and lectures. The programs also emphasize student led initiatives, clubs and student groups which include participation by faculty. The school leaders also look for opportunities for mentoring in the community. The Learning and Teaching Culture Policy was developed to represent the shared values and voices of students, faculty and administrators.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. The course ARCH 704 Studio 4 focuses on design of a public building and requires students to work collaboratively. ARCH 862 Architecture and Standardization is a history and theory elective topical seminar where students debate, share and engage with each other and the faculty. Course coordinators conduct a holistic assessment for multi-section courses and course sequences to provide continuous assessment and improvement, and course coordinators meet regularly. As part of the assessment process, faculty provide reflective feedback for each other's classes. At the end of the semester, each faculty member reflects on feedback from invited guests and students. The faculty work together to identify benchmarks and areas for course and curricular improvement.

While on site, the team met with students and faculty and confirmed a healthy and positive learning culture. The SoAD has strong relationships with alumni and many return to the school as adjuncts and guests, In addition, graduates are sought after for their ability to share and teach digital technology skills to the practice community.

PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion*—How the program furthers and deepens students' understanding of diverse cultural and social contexts and helps them translate that understanding into built environments that equitably support and include people of different backgrounds, resources, and abilities.*
This Condition is under a temporary stay.

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met/ Not Met

2025 Team Analysis:
This Condition *is under a temporary stay.*

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met/ Not Met

2025 Team Analysis:
This Condition *is under a temporary stay.*

3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes (Guidelines, p. 11)
A program must demonstrate how it addresses the following criteria through program curricula and other experiences, with an emphasis on the articulation of learning objectives and assessment.

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment

How the program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities. (p.12)

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The school's APR documents that the B.Arch. introduction to health, safety and welfare begins in the second year curriculum with a curated design process, studio projects and courses building content and skills. This model continues as students matriculate through the remainder of studio and coursework. While this introduction begins in the second year, the primary vehicles used to solidify **SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment** within the curriculum in the ARCH 301 integrated studio, later reinforced with Environmental System I & II and Professional Practice. ARCH 301 delivered Health, Safety, and Welfare content and ARCH 324 Systems I, leads most of the students to focus on structural systems, light and air as the HSW requirements for the project. Egress travel paths and egress stairs in combination with the placement of windows within a residential infill lot provide a limited sampling of considerations of safety and health. While egress development is executed to various degrees of competency in the student projects, welfare considerations for engagement, quality of life, and access through environmental factors are provided throughout the studio coursework. Health, safety and welfare tend to be built upon throughout all the studio sequences. Accessible and ADA design is dictated within the course syllabi and rubrics. Arch 481 Professional Practice through coursework and exposure to building codes, zoning, documentation, contracts, and ethics exemplify the basics of establishing HSW.

While on site, the team met with students and faculty and reviewed work in the team room and studios to confirm our analysis.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
Health Safety and Welfare content is well established through the progression of coursework and complementing in sequential studios beginning in the first-year 600 level courses. The cumulative coursework is identified as being primarily established by Arch 611and Arch 621 in Track I. HSW in the built environment for Track II is established through Arch 705, Arch 772, Arch 801, and Arch 880. The matrix for Track I students committed to 3 years in the M.Arch. program allows for the fundamental development of HSW competency in Building Systems I, prior to the upper-level classes. The advanced classes Arch 705 - M.Arch. Studio 5, Arch 801 - M.Arch. Studio 6, and Arch 880 - Practice Models and Strategies properly elaborate upon HSW requirements more thoroughly in the curriculum within studio projects and their delivery. The course materials for these courses including readings, references, and a plethora of resources on building codes, ADA, environmental considerations, standards, energy and climate, structures, precedents, egress, ventilation, ethics, and AIA documents.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum.

The team's review of the rubric, faculty and student assessments, final grades, readings, lectures, and on-site student work confirm our analysis.

SC.2 Professional Practice
How the program ensures that students understand professional ethics, the regulatory requirements, the fundamental business processes relevant to architecture practice in the United States, and the forces influencing change in these subjects. (p.12)

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The program demonstrates that students develop an understanding of professional ethics, regulatory requirements, business processes, and evolving forces within the profession through required coursework, practicing faculty, and professional engagement opportunities. Courses such as ARCH 327 CAD Construction Drawings and ARCH 481Professional Practice I address responsibilities related to ethics, compliance, project management, and documentation. The team reviewed coursework and syllabi for ARCH 327 and ARCH 481. The program benefits from its proximity to New York City firms, with many adjunct faculty being licensed architects who incorporate practice-based examples, participate in mid- and final reviews, and host students in their offices. Students also reported additional exposure through internships, externships, shadowing opportunities, and visits to faculty workplaces.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. The APR provides evidence that the program assesses student learning related to professional practice through assignments, project manuals, contract document sets, readings, and video-based assessments. ARCH 327 and ARCH 481 are reported to "meet benchmarks," with learning evaluated using scorecards and supplemental metrics from externships, Career Services data, and alumni/licensure surveys. The program documents recurring review and improvement processes. Examples included:

-ARCH 327 CAD Construction Drawings, adding new lectures clarifying BIM/VDC workflows as part of contract-document production and project management;

-ARCH 481 Professional Practice I enhancing its content to integrate climate change and sustainability practices;

-Course content adjustments based on registration/licensure tracking and student performance data and a regular review of student work demonstrated structured assessment tied to professional competencies.

During the visit, the team met with faculty including Giovanni Santamaria, Anthony Caradonna, Robert Cody, Dongsei Kim among others, and students across multiple years. Conversations confirmed strong engagement with practicing architects, consistent coverage of ethics, regulatory frameworks, and professional responsibilities, and active participation in internships, externships, and office visits.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The M.Arch. curriculum addresses professional practice through required courses such as ARCH 727 Construction Documents (tools, coordination, documentation) and ARCH 880 Practice

Models and Strategies (ethics, legal responsibilities, compliance, finances, and practice management). The program reports that ARCH 880 was recently adjusted to strengthen content related to licensure, practice management, and contemporary changes affecting the profession. Students also gain exposure to professional obligations through faculty interaction, advanced studio expectations, and ongoing liaison with NCARB and the AXP coordinator.

The program reports the use of weekly assignments, topical projects, and updated software instruction in ARCH 727, along with expanded content in ARCH 880. Evidence of assessment includes rubrics linked to **SC.2 Professional Practice,** benchmark criteria, and examples of syllabus revisions made in response to student performance and industry developments. The adjustments to ARCH 880 and the technical enhancements to ARCH 727 are cited as direct responses to recurring assessment findings.

The team was able to verify at the Manhattan campus through student meetings, faculty interviews, and review of assignments that the M.Arch. program and studio projects assigned consistently addressed ethical responsibilities, QA/QC processes, risk management, and code compliance. Materials reviewed during the visit—including assessment rubrics, assignments, and student work—confirmed that all components of this criterion are being met.

SC.3 Regulatory Context
How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project. (p.12)

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The student's understanding of **SC. 3 Regulatory Context** is furthered with a sequential three course offering starting in the fourth year. The combination of ARCH 413 Arch Simulation, ARCH 272 Environmental Site Planning, and ARCH 481 Professional Practice round out the delivery of the current laws and regulations surrounding the practice of architecture. ARCH 272 and ARCH 413 provide a mixture of assignments, readings, lectures, and references that are both knowledge and tactical based learning exercises. ARCH 481 primarily focuses on the regulations of architectural businesses through an exploration of the Architect's Handbook of Professional Practice. The combination of classes adequately assess the student's comprehension of the framework that allows architects to practice. Students were also mostly aware of the requirements and collateral organizations required for licensure.

Grades, student assessments, faculty assessments, and coordinator assessments summarize that while there is a plethora of topics to address within any single semester, they are covered, but could easily spill over and use more time. Nonetheless, the coursework and methods of assessment inform that the condition is met.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
ARCH 705 M.Arch. Studio 5, ARCH 772 Site Planning, and ARCH 880 Practice Models and Strategies holistically mirror the arrangement of the B.Arch. coursework in reinforcing life safety and regulatory requirements. ARCH 705 and ARCH 772, provide precedent and project in

conjunction with readings, lectures, and resources to aid in the understanding of regulatory requirements. The course schedule, syllabus, assignments, readings, and lectures mainly deal in a studio manner in practicing the life safety and health requirements required in buildings. They are also augmented by municipal, building, and code requirements that allow the manifestation of design. ARCH 880 takes the primary seat in delivering the full array of regulatory requirements through review and exposure to the Architect's Handbook of Professional Practice.

Grades, student assessments, faculty assessments, and coordinator assessments summarize that while there is a plethora of topics to address within any single semester, they are covered, but could easily spill over and use more time. Nonetheless, the coursework and methods of assessment confirm that the condition is met.

SC.4 Technical Knowledge
How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects. (p.12)

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The B.Arch. program presents a clear technical sequence that addresses established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction. The APR lists eight required technical courses spanning structures (ARCH 310), environmental systems (ARCH 325), BIM/contract document production (ARCH 327), building performance simulation (ARCH 413)—coordinated with an integrated studio—and professional practice (ARCH 481), which introduces specifications, shop drawings, and division organization. The program also notes a BIM/worksharing environment and interim reviews with practicing guests, helping students connect technical decision-making to design intent, economics, and performance expectations. The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. The program reports a range of assessment methods for technical knowledge, including exams, weekly assignments, BPS (building performance simulation) files, and assembled CD sets. The APR documents course-level adjustments informed by these assessments, such as:

- additional weekly problem sets in ARCH 310 to reinforce structural understanding;
- added digital platforms, measurement exercises, and shared Canvas resources in ARCH 325;
- upgraded templates and tutorials in ARCH 327 to reflect current BIM workflows;
- an expressed intent to further strengthen cross-course integration around ARCH 413 and the coordinated studio.

While **SC.4 Technical Knowledge** specific benchmark definitions and aggregated results are not extensively disaggregated by criterion, the evidence shows recurring assessment of students' ability to apply technical systems and assemblies to design, cost, and performance objectives, and ongoing course refinements in response.

During the visit, the team observed B.Arch. studios and technical courses in session, reviewed coordinated drawing sets, BPS outputs, and BIM models, and spoke with students and technical

faculty (structures, systems, and digital practice). Students demonstrated familiarity with BIM, Rhino, performance simulation tools, and the coordination of structure, enclosure, and systems within their design projects. Although the technical analysis is not always isolated in separate diagrams, the expectations embedded in assignments, reviews, and pin-ups clearly require students to consider technical criteria alongside design, economics, and performance, confirming that **SC.4 Technical Knowledge** is being met.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The M.Arch. program builds on prior technical preparation and reinforces technical knowledge through required courses and integrative design studios. The APR indicates that the M.Arch. technical content aligns with structures, environmental systems, construction, and simulation/BIM, and that this material is coordinated with design studios. Courses such as ARCH 727 Construction Documents (tools, coordination, and documentation) and integrative studios (e.g., ARCH 704/705) ask students to develop and coordinate architectural assemblies, environmental performance strategies, and documentation workflows at a graduate level. These requirements ensure that students engage both established and emerging technologies and assess their choices against design intent and project objectives.

The program reports weekly assignments, topical projects, and updated software platforms in ARCH 727, along with integrative studio deliverables that require coordinated models, drawing sets, and performance analyses. These assignments function as recurring assessments of students' technical knowledge and their ability to relate technologies to design and performance criteria. The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. The APR notes ongoing updates to software and workflows in ARCH 727 and refinements to the studios, indicating that faculty adjust course content based on observed student performance and evolving practice standards.

Although **SC.4 Technical Knowledge** specific benchmark language is not extensively separated from other criteria, the combination of course deliverables and studio expectations demonstrates that technical learning outcomes are being assessed and used to guide improvements.

On site, the team reviewed M.Arch. studio work and technical course assignments, including coordinated BIM models, drawing sets, and performance/simulation outputs. In conversations with graduate students and faculty teaching integrative design and documentation, students were able to articulate how structural systems, environmental strategies, envelope assemblies, and construction methods informed their design decisions and project feasibility. Reviews observed by the team showed faculty actively questioning technical choices, performance implications, and constructability, confirming that the program's expectations and student work meet the criteria for **SC.4 Technical Knowledge.**

SC.5 Design Synthesis
How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions. (p.13)

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The APR and matrix identify a sequence of design studios as evidence of **SC.5 Design Synthesis**. A multi-story apartment building in ARCH 301Architectural Design III is followed by studios defined by public buildings and all are situated in dense urban sites. The complexity of the program requires user analysis, and the design response demonstrates increasing awareness and knowledge of environmental systems, and measurable environmental impact. The awareness of site conditions is defined by the urban site itself, and as a result the skills of design response to a broad variety of site conditions is therefore limited. The team saw other student design projects situated in Central Park, however the site for this criterion are urban. ADA and accessibility content is additionally limited in some of the reviewed work, but noted present in subsequent studios. ARCH 302 Architectural Studio Design IV focuses on a medium-scale public building with integrated systems where requirements for regulatory context and environmental impacts are furthered. The implementation of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design considerations are sequentially developed through the successive studios as the student's understanding of design synthesis evolves. The program integrates the requirements within their base resources, syllabi, and assignments.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. Recent modifications from the assessment cycle include collaboration between ARCH 401 studio and the recently introduced ARCH 413 Architectural Simulation and Fabrication Optimization. Feedback from the assessment scorecards by invited critics at the final review include noting the strength of the ARCH 401 syllabi as strong and aligned with NAAB criteria. The critics appreciated the robust role of simulation and digital techniques in analyzing building and environmental performances. Coordinator assessments note generally 75% to 80% of students meeting the benchmarks set for the classes mapped to **SC.5 Design Synthesis.**
The team reviewed student work in the digital team room and a large amount of work displayed on site. In addition, the selected design projects are accompanied by "compliance portfolios" to highlight the multiple criteria of SC.5. The compliance portfolios were highly effective in illuminating the work's adherence to the components of SC.5. It should be noted that some of the portfolios provided representative work for user and regulatory requirements that were not the best depiction of compliance. Accessible design and site conditions / analysis were also represented to different levels of efficacy within the compliance portfolios. While there were slight deviations to the interpretation of what represented compliance within these portfolios, a more thorough review of the on-site work, full studio reviews, and the full 3-course offerings verified that the components of **SC.5 Design Synthesis** were reinforced over the sequence of design studios.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The APR and matrix identify a sequence of design studios as evidence of **SC.5 Design Synthesis**, namely ARCH 704 Studio IV and ARCH 705 Studio V - Integrative Design. The M.Arch. level studios show a deep wealth of knowledge and exploration into Design Synthesis. ARCH 704 tasks students with the design and synthesis of a medium-scale institution building of moderate spatial complexity for a local urban site. The studio focuses on architectural anatomy, structure, organization, materiality, program, building envelope & skin, thermal transfer, light, and air.

ARCH 705 is a semester-long comprehensive design of a building of moderate complexity with at least one space requiring long-span structural components. The synthesis scope includes an outdoor space, structure, building enclosure, systems, materiality, and sustainability to a level of plausible detailing and specificity. Generally a semi-public aquatic center served as the design for students to synthesize around.

ARCH 704 & ARCH 705 assignments on site arrangements, water & bioswales, NYC native plants, concrete rules of thumb, mass timber rules of thumb, classroom design, structure and envelope materials, and orientation options are strong measures to reinforce design thinking and synthesis into a concept. Lectures and readings on climate, wind, solar, diagrams, building lighting and daylighting, building codes, green building, HVAC, roof construction, pool standards, ADA, green building, and numerous others are representative of practice in the analysis of intricate pieces of information to foster safe and harmonious design.

Recent modifications in the APR include the new ARCH 713 Architectural Simulation and fabrication Optimization now running concurrently with ARCH 704 to aid students in using quantitative assessments in design decisions in advancing their project synthesis and schemes. ARCH 704 has introduced a series of technical assignments, listed above, which provide micro-learning moments for better understanding methods on implementation in their design. This was accomplished by abbreviating the analysis phase of the design process, which will continue to be refined and studied per the APR response. The updates to ARCH 704 per the APR has yielded stronger student outcomes than in the prior delivery iterations of this course. The update for Arch 705 notes that the benchmarks for this class have been met, and suggest additional ways to build tighter ties to ARCH 722 Building Systems II and ARCH 727 Construction Documents are being considered.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. Instruments of assessment included performance and topical assignments as well as process, mid-semester, and final reviews including an end-of semester portfolio. Faculty assessments note the curriculum covers appropriate scope, generates great collaboration between all parties, is fast-paced, challenging, and effective for teamwork, group discussions, and critiques. It is additionally noted that the rigor can be challenging for some. Nonetheless, grades in ARCH 704 on average are well above passing with a B average, and for ARCH 705 an A- average.

While on site, the team viewed student work, final portfolios, and "compliance portfolios" to validate **SC 5 Design Synthesis** was met. The compliance portfolios often fail to represent the depth of the site conditions and analysis demonstrated in the full digital file of the students' work. The abbreviated formatting of the site conditions within the compliance portfolios are an injustice to the rigor displayed elsewhere. The general files of student work were extremely effective in conveying the design synthesis condition. Additional live on-site review of student work pinned up in studios ratify the APR and digital work, complementing the findings.

SC.6 Building Integration
How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance. (p.13)

B.Arch.

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
ARCH 302 Architecture Design IV and ARCH 401 Architecture Design V present an integration sequence supported by ARCH 413 for building performance and simulation and ARCH 327 for coordinated CDs. The documents convey a design process, addressing precedents, systems and design outcomes. The narrative claims progressive emphasis on **SC.6 Building Integration** and lists recent scope/schedule adjustments to focus on integration and measurable outcomes.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. Course modifications are described. The program cites studio phases and products (research models, system proposals, envelope/energy tasks) and states that rubrics "progressively emphasize SC.6." **SC.6 Building Integration** -aligned rubrics, benchmark definitions, scored samples, and trend data were provided. Assessment evidence included aggregated assessment results and evidence of recurring measurement cycles with follow-up actions.

During the site visit, the team reviewed ARCH 302/401 student portfolios and met with both students and faculty. We observed a solid foundation of integrated coordination work, including envelope/structure/MEP sectional studies, life-safety and egress diagrams with narratives, HVAC zoning and load considerations, and building envelope performance calculations. The team reviewed all of the additional "compliance portfolios" of student work demonstrating coordinated building sections/details tying envelope/structure/MEP to code/egress and quantified performance, however stronger evidence was typically found in the project digital files.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
ARCH 704 M.Arch. studio 4 and ARCH 705 M.Arch. Studio 5 demonstrate the criteria for **SC. 6 Building Integration** with a stated five-part pedagogical method and link to course content and skill development in ARCH 741 Architectural Visual Communication III (simulation) and ARCH 722 Building Systems II, ARCH 727 Construction Documents (systems). The program reports refinements to the assignment schedule and new technical assignments further expand the building systems integration and building performance assessments.

The School of Architecture and Design has a comprehensive system of assessment that builds on the Institute's Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) initiative. NAAB PCs and SCs are coordinated with program goals and student learning outcomes and integrated across the whole curriculum. Reported instruments of assessment include performance on topical assignments, reviews, and portfolios; the narrative references "compliance" and performance metrics. **SC. 6 Building Integration**-specific rubrics, benchmark definitions, aggregated results, and clear ties from measured gaps in achievement to course changes were somewhat limited.

The team reviewed a large number of relevant design studio portfolios of student work demonstrating coordinated building sections/details tying envelope/structure/MEP to code/egress and quantified performance. The team met with faculty/students and reviewed selected ARCH 704/705/713 work. We confirmed robust discussions of envelope/structure/MEP

and some performance outputs. The work in these portfolios and our conversations demonstrate that this criteria for **SC. 6 Building Integration** is being achieved.

4—Curricular Framework (Guidelines, p. 15)
This condition addresses the institution's regional accreditation and the program's degree nomenclature, credit-hour and curricular requirements, and the process used to evaluate student preparatory work.

4.1 Institutional Accreditation (Guidelines, p. 15)
For the NAAB to accredit a professional degree program in architecture, the program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education:

- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
- Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)
- New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE)
- Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)
- WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC)

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The program lists the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) on the New York Tech accreditation page and an entry was found for NYIT in the MSCHE Directory. The letter is included in the APR on page 66.

4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum (Guidelines, p. 15)
The NAAB accredits professional degree programs with the following titles: the Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M.Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and optional studies.

4.2.1 **Professional Studies**. Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program are the core of a professional degree program that leads to licensure. Knowledge from these courses is used to satisfy Condition 3—Program and Student Criteria. The degree program has the flexibility to add additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. In its documentation, the program must clearly indicate which professional courses are required for all students. (p.15)

4.2.2 **General Studies**. An important component of architecture education, general studies provide basic knowledge and methodologies of the humanities, fine arts, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences. Programs must document how students earning an accredited degree achieve a broad, interdisciplinary understanding of human knowledge.

In most cases**,** the general studies requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution's baccalaureate degree. Graduate programs must describe and document the criteria and process used to evaluate applicants' prior academic experience relative to this requirement. Programs accepting transfers from other institutions must document the criteria and process used to ensure that the general education requirement was covered at another institution. (p.16)

4.2.3 **Optional Studies.** All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum to allow students to develop additional expertise, either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking courses offered within the department offering the accredited program but outside the required professional studies curriculum. These courses may be configured in a variety of curricular structures, including elective offerings, concentrations, certificate programs, and minors. (p.16)

For many decades, the terms B.Arch., M.Arch., and/or D.Arch. have been recognized as referring to NAAB-accredited professional degree programs that are accepted by several states as a requirement for state licensure or that facilitate obtaining state licensure. Using those terms for unaccredited programs may result in confusion on the part of the public and may be misleading to students, to prospective students, to the profession, and to other educational institutions. To mitigate that possibility, the terms B.Arch., M.Arch., and D.Arch. are reserved for use by the institutional sponsor's NAAB-accredited architecture degree programs, except in the case where compliance with this requirement would violate state, federal, or national law. Additionally, the institutional sponsor's unaccredited architecture degree programs must place clear statements in all relevant publications and marketing materials, electronic as well as print, that the programs are not NAAB-accredited and may not be accepted as meeting licensure requirements in many U.S. states.

The number of credit hours for each degree is outlined below. All accredited programs must conform to minimum credit-hour requirements established by the institution's regional accreditor.

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

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

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

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The degree requirements and curriculum of the B.Arch. is well described in a table and narratively beginning on pg.68 in the APR. 160 credits define the B.Arch. degree with 110 required professional courses. Twelve credits are designated non-architectural to allow students to develop additional expertise.

The School is currently developing a 12 credit minor in Artificial Intelligence and B.Arch. students could add this program to their degree or other minors/certificates offered in the school. We did not however see any evidence that these paths, or options were taken up by the students.

Forty-seven credits are in the university's General Education program with required and elective course options. The general Education curriculum is designed to foster broad understanding of essential areas of knowledge including math, humanities, behavioral science and social science. The university's Gen Ed program contains 12 credits of open electives. The curricular map shows these elective credits taken at odd and intermittent times. Having an articulated path and schedule to a minor, certificate or expertise would confirm the opportunities that are present in the school or university.

At NYIT, the professional degree curriculum is front loaded in that professional content is in the first two years resulting in the General Education courses being completed in later years.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The degree requirements and curriculum of the M.Arch. is well described in a table and narratively beginning on pg.70 in the APR. M.Arch. 1 track is 90 credits with 81 credits of required professional courses and 9 credits in electives. The M.Arch. II track is 60 credits, with 51 credits of professional courses and 9 credits of electives.

4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education (Guidelines, p. 19)
The NAAB recognizes that students transferring to an undergraduate accredited program or entering a graduate accredited program come from different types of programs and have different needs, aptitudes, and knowledge bases. In this condition, a program must demonstrate that it utilizes a thorough and equitable process to evaluate incoming students and that it documents the accreditation criteria it expects students to have met in their education experiences in non-accredited programs.

- 4.3.1 A program must document its process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria when it admits a student to the professional degree program.
- 4.3.2 In the event a program relies on the preparatory education experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain accreditation criteria, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these accreditation criteria are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- 4.3.3 A program must demonstrate that it has clearly articulated the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content in the admissions process, and that a candidate understands the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program before accepting an offer of admission.

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
4.3.1: First year undergraduate students are admitted directly to the B.Arch. program. Students who transfer into the B.Arch. from other academic institutions, have any architecture courses evaluated by the program for course equivalencies. As part of the admissions process, students are advised that they will need to submit full documentation for course evaluation. For studio courses, a portfolio review is required to determine course equivalencies. The program indicates the process for application to the B.Arch. program on their website, and the process was verified in meetings with program administrators.

4.3.2: For the B.Arch. program, the school provided materials to demonstrate that they ensure that admitted transfer students whose courses transfer have met the associated NAAB accreditation criteria. This was confirmed in meetings with program administrators.

4.3.3: For the B.Arch. program, the process for evaluation of baccalaureate and associate degree content for transfer students is clearly articulated on their website. This was confirmed in meetings with program administrators.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
4.3.1: Students who apply for the shorter two-year 60 credit M.Arch. II track submit course work and a portfolio for evaluation. Applicants must fulfill prerequisite courses, specifically four design studios at a variety of scales and programs, and coursework in architectural design, architectural structures, building construction, visualization and technical drawings and architectural history that fulfills the majority of required courses included in the first two years of the NYIT B.S.A.T. or B.Arch. programs. The program indicates the process for application to the M.Arch. program on their website, and the process was verified in meetings with program administrators.

4.3.2: For the M.Arch. program, the school provided materials to demonstrate that they ensure that admitted students who enter the M.Arch. II program have fulfilled prerequisite coursework that met certain accreditation criteria. This was confirmed in meetings with program administrators.

4.3.3: For the M.Arch. program, the process for evaluation of baccalaureate degree content is clearly articulated on their website. This was confirmed in meetings with program administrators.

5—Resources

5.1 Structure and Governance (Guidelines, p. 20)
The program must describe the administrative and governance processes that provide for organizational continuity, clarity, and fairness and allow for improvement and change.

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

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

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:

5.1.1: The APR included a listing of the Institute and School's personnel that was clearly marked and also hierarchically ordered in the SoAD organizational chart. The clarity is depicted with a detailed breakdown of the roles from NYIT President Dr. Hank Foley and Provost Dr. Jerry Balentine (at the time of the APR submission) and NYIT President Dr. Jerry Balentine and Interim Provost Dr. Francine Glazer (at the time of the visit) through the Academic Senate, with SoAD representation on several committees, and the Student Government Association. At the SoAD level, Dean Perbellini, who is well respected and steering the ship, is assisted by Associate Dean for Academic Operations Giovanni Santamaria and Associate Dean for Students Success & Engagement Anthony Caradonna. Gabriella Pace the Administrative Assistant to the Dean provides intuitive and logistical assistance at various levels. The Associate Deans coordinate and supervise the two architecture departments chairs, Chair Gertrudis Brens (NYC Campus) and Chair Dongsei Kim (LI Campus). They are each locally responsible for the NAAB accredited 5-year B.Arch., the 4-year BSAT, and 4-year BSAT with Concentration in Construction. Program Director Robert Cody leads the M.Arch. All the parties were additionally clearly listed and demarcated in the NAAB team room during the visit and were highly visible and available throughout our time there. The descriptions from the APR, charts, and title breakdowns were reinforced during our meetings separately with the various cohorts.

5.1.2: The SoAD boasts 13+ school level committees including but not limited to the following:

- School Personnel Committees
- Curriculum Committee
- B.Arch. and M.Arch. Committee
- AI Minor Committee
- Strategic Planning Committee
- Student Affairs Committee
- Adjunct Faculty Affair Committee
- Technology and Facility Committee
- Scholarships, Awards, and Competitions Committee
- Research, Grants, and External Funding Committee
- Lectures and Events Committee

The APR describes the tasks and goals of each committee in convening to advance the School. The hierarchy of the governance structure is well depicted in the organizational chart and the respect exhibited between parties from the Dean down to the students. The committees and the number of coordination meetings expressed during our reviews with the different groups. This helps improve the feedback loop for continual progress. SoAD Directors, who are in collegial collaboration with Associate Deans and department Chairs are responsible for specific academic programs. They serve as the program's representatives on collegiate SoAD and University committees, communicate relevant matters to the program faculty and its committees, and inform the faculty on education-related activities. Chairpersons, directors, and coordinators confirmed that they meet regularly with one another to verify, assess, and align learning outcomes and timing of skills learning, and scheduling of reviews. Dean Perbellini is also involved in several Institutional and External Committees including NYIT Deans' Council, NYIT Senate Curriculum Committee, NYIT Strategic Action Plan, NYIT Space Utilization Committee, and Curricular Improvements and Evolution to name a few. Ultimately, these various structures reinforce the efficacy of the SoAD B.Arch. and M.Arch. sphere of influence and development.

5.2 Planning and Assessment (Guidelines, p. 20)

The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies:

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

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

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:

5.2.1: Planning for the school of architecture and design and its programs is guided by the institute's 2020 Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) plan. The CPI is focused on improvement of students' learning, college experiences and achievement. The university's CPI committee has representation from all of the university's schools and also some departments. The committee is charged with aligning departmental goals with the NY Tech mission and strategic goals and identifying KPIs for the academic units. Each department is charged with annual department review and planning. KPIs include: course and program level student learning outcomes, student success, student engagement and satisfaction, faculty performance, cost efficiency (use of space, equipment and technology, and review and update of departmental policies and procedures. Strategic actions have been identified for each objective.

5.2.3: The SoAD has been tracking program assessment and improvement in relation to their objectives and KPIs since 2022. The programs have seen increased enrollment and with it an increase in student diversity on both the Long Island and New York City campuses. This is considered a strength of the institution. The average persistence rate for B.Arch.(93.95%) and M.Arch. (88.13%) students is above the NYITs benchmark of 86. Results from a 2024 survey of alumni had 91% of respondents indicating they felt prepared for their first jobs. The survey also tracks other professional information such as AXP and path to licensure progress. The programs plan on continuing to expand the reach of the survey in future years. At the university level, the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey is administered every three years. The programs see an increase in student satisfaction from 2018- 2022 and will continue to use the survey to track student satisfaction related to advising, teaching and student support.

5.2.2: The B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs developed four objectives which are aligned with NYITs strategic action plan, New York Tech: Innovation in Action, and KPIs. In summary, these are 1) recruit and support students of all cultures and backgrounds, 2) continuously improve the quality of the B.Arch. and M Arch programs and align the programs with NAAB priorities, 3) maintain and recruit a diverse range of FT and adjunct faculty, and 4) take a lead in innovation and architectural technology research applications to benefit underserved communities.

Objective 1: A diverse and inclusive student body is one of the strengths of SoAD and the B. Arch. and M.Arch. programs. Enrollment data shows that 34% of the B.Arch. program enrollment is Hispanic or Latino with 28% enrollment by white students and the reminder defined by a mix of races and ethnicities. International students define the graduate M.Arch. program at 44% of the

enrollment and the remainder are defined by a mix races and ethnicities. The school and NYIT have an expressed commitment to accessible education so that underrepresented communities experience student success in both fulltime and part-time status. The team heard of several university wide student success initiatives and SoAD is a model for the institute; support at the program level includes scholarships as well as coaching. The undergraduate year-to-year persistence rate is very high, averaging 95% and part time student persistence averages 82%. The B.Arch. graduation rate (150% time) is also impressive averaging 96% for cohorts beginning in 2016. The M.Arch. graduation rates are improving, with 100% graduation rate for both the M.Arch. I and M.Arch. II cohorts (2019)in 100% of time.

Objective 2: The assessment of curriculum has led to improvements in the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs. For the B.Arch., this includes updating course content, course sequence and course catalogue descriptions based on alignments across the programs, updating prerequisites, updating admissions requirements to better serve students, creating courses, Tech Boot Camp and Tech Integration Workshop for first year students. Creating tech-focused workshops for all students, changes to the core curriculum, creating practicum options and minors. For the M.Arch. curriculum improvements include monitoring horizontal integration of courses, adjusting formats, faculty rotations through courses, offering relevant new electives under the special studies course number, offering special studies electives focused on the transition from the academic to practice context.

Objective 3: The programs use the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) to improve teaching effectiveness, including the CTL's Community of Practice initiative where interdisciplinary projects targeting specific changes in practice are explored. The programs use student evaluation feedback and studio productivity measures to assess teaching effectiveness.

Objective 4: For the B.Arch., all students take a community focused studio Arch 402-Des V, in their 4th year. B.Arch. electives include courses that focus on global perspectives. M.Arch. students take Arch 724 Material Tectonics II, where they work in teams on service learning projects, with a designated not for profit sponsor to identify design-build opportunities.

5.2.4: Strengths identified in the APR include a strong faculty (full time and adjunct), a dedicated administrative leadership team and excellent staff support, institute support for faculty research and creative work, an active and supportive professional and alumni community, and successful fundraising to support the school. Challenges identified by the programs include a decrease in international graduate students. Opportunities- program growth for the B.Arch. and M.Arch., due to a direct pathway to the B.Arch. for the BSAT students and an accelerated pathway to the M.Arch. II track for BSAT students, growing reputation and improved visibility, especially in the international context, allied MS programs that focus on research, and connections with architecture firms.

5.2.5: The programs benefit from outside input through the Advisory Board and SoAD Friends and Alumni. The Assoc Dean for Student Success and Engagement works closely with students and faculty in a number of capacities. He initiated a student advisory committee and an alumni advisory committee to provide opportunities for feedback, collaboration and community building. The IDC Foundation endowed chair was hired to provide an outside perspective and to expand the reach and capacity of the school. For the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs, external reviewers for studios and other courses provide important feedback about student work that is regularly considered as a part of course assessment and continuous improvement.

5.3 Curricular Development (Guidelines, p. 21)

The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for assessing its curriculum and making adjustments based on the outcome of the assessment. The program must identify:

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

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

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:

5.3.1: A three level assessment process is described in the APR (pg. 105) to include course assessment, coordinator meetings monitoring progress in the topical areas, and a third vertically correlated review that includes the school curriculum committee and NAAB B.Arch. and M.Arch. program committee. In addition, there are open studio reviews across campuses that are accessible to students and faculty. Meetings are frequent in each of these levels and include additional discussion between Chairs and the M.Arch. director. A focused workflow of assessment for curricular development including NAAB begins with the Program's Mission and NAAB Conditions, the NAAB Matrix, Course level Learning Outcomes (LO), the aggregated Rubric data, identification of success and concerns, inclusive review of recommendation for revisions, formats, methods. Most recently (2023) this process has been coordinated by the NAAB Committee composed of faculty and students.

A listing of major curricular changes for both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs responding to continuous assessment outcomes are described in the APR section 5.2 (pg. 96 - 99). This table documents a history of changes over seven years for the B.Arch.; three years for the M.Arch.

While on site, the chairs and director proudly discussed with the team their coordination of course sections and the curriculum; their assessment process and the modifications. Additionally older students reflected upon the changes made to preceding studios and courses.

5.3.2: The roles and responsibilities of personnel and committees are well described in the APR (pg. 107). There are two B.Arch. Chairs (one for each campus) and one M.Arch. Program Director. This group works with the Associate Deans and Dean forming the school-wide leadership team; and the group of three also works with faculty coordinators for curricular topic areas. Direct assessment outcomes related to SLOS and rubrics are complemented by indirect assessment of student course evaluations, and surveys from faculty, students and alumni.

While on site, the chairs and director proudly discussed with the team their coordination of the curriculum; their assessment process and modifications.

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development (Guidelines, p. 21)

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

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

5.4.2 Demonstrate that it has an Architect Licensing Advisor who is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. These duties include attending the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay

up-to-date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.

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

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

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:

5.4.1: NYIT balances faculty with a combination of those situated on one campus and those traveling between the two locations. With 41 full-time faculty and 97 adjunct faculty across all the School's departments, the APR notes that studios average a 1:13 ratio and a 1:23 ratio for seminar and technology courses. On site, through the meetings and studio walkthroughs, these averages were generally observed. Faculty are required to have experience in two of the following: in-depth experience in professional practice, architectural design and research, theory, history, computational design, and digital fabrication. The balance allows both student exposure and diversified faculty exploration. To stimulate faculty research and scholarly activity, full-time tenured and tenured-track teaching loads were reduced from 21 to 18 ELH and faculty in the first two years of their appointment were granted a teaching load reduction to 12 ELH. A mixture of full-time and part-time faculty adjunct faculty. Although it was noted that adjunct turnover was likely a percentage that needed review, the School noted the richness of local practitioners in the surrounding communities on the Manhattan campus more so than the Long Island campus. Offices for faculty were noted, but generally shared, which was voiced as not problematic by faculty on the Long Island campus. The shared offices on the Manhattan are seen as an integral part of the culture of ''the city'' where students and faculty take the ''everywhere is an office'' approach by leveraging studio spaces, coffee shops, labs, etc. to provide moments to coordinate when an office is not required.

5.4.2: The licensing advisor Robert Cody is generally well-known by the students on both campuses. More than 70% of the students were aware of NCARB, ARE's, AXP, and NAAB when polled at the campuses respective meetings. Organizations like NOMAS and AIAS also bring professionals throughout the year for their lecture series. Students recalled that NY licensing board member Robert Lopez and NCARB representative Martin Smith were recently at the school delivering one of such lectures. In combination with the Licensing Advisor Cody, the student's professional practice course also teaches them about the pathway to licensure in Arch 481 and Arch 881. While not explicitly noted within the APR that the licensing advisor attends the NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and other training opportunities, when polled by administration and faculty on site, it was noted that the school supports conference and summit attendance generally for both faculty and students.

5.4.3: Faculty at both campuses highlighted the institution-wide Faculty Development Day, with a few of the school's faculty leading some of the initiatives and training therein. Financial support for Faculty Development Day is offered to all SoAD full-time faculty. The institution also programs Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) Day, providing a self-assessment process fostering awareness of programs and strategies for improvement across the Schools. Generally the school and the Dean support conference attendance as well as lectures, exhibitions, and events internationally. Faculty noted that grants were available in-person, a confirmation of APR citing Institute and SoAD research grants available for development and growth. The list of NYIT internal grants from the Institute Support of Research and Creativity (ISRC) is impressive. Internally grants are also complemented by external grants such as the IDC Foundation grant

secured by Dean Perbellini in 2018. This grant, matched by the school, provided the first and only Endowed Chair position at both the Institute and School levels. Other funds from the IDC Foundation have expanded the FABLab, Bio-Tech Research Lab, and the HIVE digital room between the two campuses. Outside grants from the NSF and Italian Ministry of Culture aid in the expansion and collaboration of work and initiatives outside of the NYC area, globally, also contributing to the program's improvement. Each faculty is allocated up to $1,700 per year for development of their choice, where higher amounts may be requested. The table of the amount awarded per faculty member, is a clear sign that the funds are available and being utilized by faculty to further their delivery in their areas of expertise.

5.4.4: At the Institution level, NYIT offers a range of academic advising including full-time advising staff, the NYIT Advising Enrichment Center, and online degree maps. Additional advising includes financial aid and planning, campus selection, and peer success guides. Peer Success Guides (PSG) is a one-on-one pairing of upper and under classmen to aid students in adjusting to university life. Students are supported institution-wide advising the first two years of their undergraduate degree with some coordination from the School and transition to SoAD advising beginning in year 3. Advising holds are generally placed on students prior to their ability to register to initiate a conversation. Merit based scholarships are available beyond Pell and State grants. The ACE program, ''Achieving Collegiate Excellence'', allows students who enroll in the program a grace period before losing scholarships if their grades are on the verge of slipping. Faculty have created a student questionnaire which allows student feedback and interaction. The Student Affairs Committee is a collective of student leaders representing each class, and organization. Students note that the leader meets with the Dean every month, to inquire about needs and planning, which is attended by the Dean and Chairs. Generally students note that they feel there are adequate counselors and advisors. The Associate Dean for Student Success and Engagement plays a critical role in assisting and mentoring in collaboration with the Chairs, Directors, and Advising staff. The Associate Dean and NYIT's CSEE (Career Services and Experiential Education) plan and organize training workshops, job and career fairs, job, volunteer, and career opportunities. Many students noted that they had at least one internship opportunity and one with an externship. The list of student awards is lengthy and all encompassing for student success recognition. Counseling, wellness, accessibility services, and health information are provided predominantly at the Institute level.

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (Guidelines, p. 22) XXX

The program must demonstrate its commitment to diversity and inclusion among current and prospective faculty, staff, and students. The program must:

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

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

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

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

5.5.5 - Describe the resources and procedures in place to provide adaptive environments

and effective strategies to support faculty, staff, and students with different physical and/or mental abilities.

This Condition *is under a temporary stay.*

Team Findings: Met/ Not Met

2025 Team Analysis:
5.5.1:
This Condition is under a temporary stay.

5.5.2:
This Condition is under a temporary stay.

5.5.3:
This Condition is under a temporary stay.

5.5.4:
This Condition is under a temporary stay.

5.5.5:
This Condition is under a temporary stay.

5.6 Physical Resources (Guidelines, p. 23)

The program must describe its physical resources and demonstrate how they safely and equitably support the program's pedagogical approach and student and faculty achievement. Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

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

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

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
5.6.1: This condition was met. The students have access to studio spaces on both campuses including desks and storage. We observed the spaces during our site visit.

5.6.2: This condition was met. We saw a number of supporting fabrication facilities, as well as lecture rooms, shared facilities with other programs, and libraries on both campuses.

5.6.3: This condition was met. On the Long Island campus there were faculty offices, and on the Manhattan campus there were faculty offices and flex spaces and they could meet through zoom.

5.6.4: This condition was met. The program has a strong technology emphasis and has many spaces that provide resources and support this including fabrication spaces, robotics labs, workshop spaces. Students noted some crowding, particularly in the Manhattan campus.

5.6.5: This condition was met. These processes are detailed on page 142 of the APR.

5.7 Financial Resources (Guidelines, p. 24)
The program must demonstrate that it has the appropriate institutional support and financial resources to support student learning and achievement during the next term of accreditation.

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The operational budgeting process is well described in the APR (pg. 144) and includes how requests from faculty may move forward to the dean and become part of the School's budget. The School is funded by an annual budget provided from the university's central administration. There is a university capital budget and the SoAD has benefitted with upgraded classroom, and remote learning modalities. A link to the SoAD capital expenditures 2018 - 2024 : https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LrQmJtMhE2L3oVhYljhrJbTxjQ_S1w7E7BCGZIxD4Uo/edit?gid=4776422 09#gid=477642209

SoAD Operational Expenditures 2018-24
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LrQmJtMhE2L3oVhYljhrJbTxjQ_S1w7E7BCGZIxD4Uo/edit?gid=1969434 575#gid=1969434575

Faculty Personnel budgets are not described, however with retirements, resignations and leaves four new tenure track or teaching faculty will be added in the next two years to meet the needs in the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs. Faculty compensation is set through the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Close to 50% of students at NYIT are Pell eligible, in addition, students are able to qualify for need based scholarships from the institution and school. The school makes extraordinary efforts to make learning affordable, including printing, plotting and material expenses. Funding for course support such as field trips is well supported. Funding from the institute and school supports student organizations and has allowed new student organizations (SARA and Arquitectos) to take hold. Funding for faculty applied research extends to support for adjunct faculty projects. Students benefit from participating in applied research and fabrication on sites, work which is carried out with organizations in New York.

Dean Perbellini has been successful in finding funding sources of income to support the school. Funding from the IDC foundation has supported an endowed chair as well as fabrication equipment and facilities on both campuses. Dean Perbellini has garnered support through alumni and professional partnerships. Support to house studio reviews, visits and other student engagement in professional offices includes the Atelier Studio that was housed in the New York studio of BIG. A yearly fundraising event focused on bringing together the SoAD Friends and Alumni and the Institute for Design and Construction (IDC) grants have served as a major source of funding for the school.

5.8 Information Resources (Guidelines, p. 24)

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

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

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The program demonstrates convenient access to architecture literature and digital/visual resources through two campus libraries (Art & Architecture Library in Education Hall; Manhattan Campus Library), robust architecture-specific print/e-collections (including AASL-recognized databases such as Avery, Art & Architecture Source, Artstor/JSTOR, RIBA, Detail Inspiration), interlibrary delivery between campuses, 24/7 remote access to e-resources, course reserves, research/course guides, and librarian-led instruction (in studio/class, Canvas modules, workshops).

Facilities include innovation labs (group rooms, wide-format scanners, VR, 3D printers), loaner laptops/desktops on a three-year refresh, and specialized software stacks (Revit/Rhino, Climate Studio, Karamba, V-Ray, ArcGIS, etc.). The libraries operate under a published Strategic Action Plan (2023–2028) and a documented collection development policy; budget lines, holdings, hours, staffing, and consortial memberships were provided. During the visit, the team toured both libraries, verified proximity to studios, inspected equipment and software lists, checked e-resource access (off-campus authentication), reviewed reserves/guides, and interviewed librarians and students about availability, turnaround for interlibrary requests, and instruction support.

While we saw planning artifacts and resource breadth, recurring assessment data focused on usage/learning outcomes (e.g., instruction impact measures, database/use analytics by site, turnaround KPIs, equity of access hours across campuses, assistive tech utilization) were not consistently packaged; we encourage formalizing those dashboards and linking them to periodic service adjustments

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

2025 Team Analysis

OVERALL
The program provides the required public information on their website. The NAAB accreditation information is listed on the B.Arch.'s website and can be found here. For the M.Arch., it can be found here. Information about admission and advising is provided on the website. They provide information for the BSAT and B.Arch. tracks, with deadlines and application requirements on their website. Information about the two M.Arch. tracks are available here. The advising page is

thorough and includes a virtual help desk, descriptions on how to find an advisor, peer advising resources, semester maps, and advising how-to's and other resources. A page on career and salary outlook including job growth, employers and internships, career options and salary projections can be found on the main page of both the B.Arch. and the M.Arch. programs. The program makes explicit that the BSAT and B.Arch. are distinct degrees, and that the B.Arch. degree is professional and accredited. They also allow for students to transition from the BSAT to the B.Arch. within the second year, and this information is clear from the B.Arch. mainpage, where most of the information is located.

6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees (Guidelines, p. 25)
All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*, Appendix 2, in catalogs and promotional media, including the program's website.

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The School of Architecture and Design website includes the NAAB language for accredited degrees for the B.Arch. and M.Arch. degrees. Since initial accreditation for the M.Arch. degree was granted in 2022, the website also includes a statement about initial candidacy. The NAAB accreditation information is listed on the B.Arch.'s website and can be found here. For the M.Arch., it can be found here.

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures (Guidelines, p. 25)
The program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program's website:

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

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
On the accreditation page on NYIT's website, they provide links to both the updated 2020 procedures and conditions for accreditation and the 2014 conditions and 2015 procedures for accreditation which were in effect during their last visit in 2017. They provide all required documents and excerpts on this page. This page is linked and described in the APR on page 159.

6.3 Access to Career Development Information (Guidelines, p. 25)
The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that help them develop, evaluate, and implement career, education, and employment plans.

Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
NYIT's Career Success & Experiential Education (CSEE) page describes services available to all students and graduates: 1:1 advising, resume and portfolio reviews, workshops, job and internship search support, employer outreach, events, and fairs. In terms of career fairs, they advertise

recurring all-majors career fairs and targeted recruiting, including architecture-focused events. They also provide a portal for scheduling, advising, uploading materials, applying to jobs/internships, and registering for events; access is also available for alumni. The B.Arch. and M.Arch. public pages include "Career & Salary Outlook," citing BLS projections, typical roles, and example employers; related architecture degrees show similar outcomes sections. The admissions, advising, and staff made several comments during our visit that provided evidence of career development and placement support. Staff also mentioned extra-curricular events around job placement, and there were two dedicated staff members who worked with architecture students on job placement. Throughout the visit career-readiness was emphasized by nearly all students. NYIT also provided extensive reporting on their internship/externship programs, including detailed outlines and protocols, including a list of 25 B.Arch./M.Arch. students who participated last year.

6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents (Guidelines, p. 25)
To promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program's website:

a) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB awarding accreditation or candidacy
b) The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit
c) NCARB ARE pass rates

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The School of Architecture and Design website includes the most recent decision letters and APRs for the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs. A link to NCARB pass rates is also included.

6.5 Admissions and Advising (Guidelines, p. 26)
The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern the evaluation of applicants for admission to the accredited program. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers from within and outside the institution. This documentation must include the following:

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

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The program has documented processes and policies for admissions through webpages and the APR provides the links to this information by topic, such as Application instructions, application submission, portfolio submission and the evaluation of transfer credits. All other reviews of student's transcripts are by admission or through a transfer credit request. The program makes

explicit that the BSAT and B.Arch. are distinct degrees, and that the B.Arch. degree is professional and accredited. Students may transition from the BSAT to the B.Arch. within the second year, and this information is clear from the B.Arch. mainpage, where most of the information is located.

All links are active including the link to Financial Aid for both domestic and international students. The advising page is thorough and includes a virtual help desk, descriptions on how to find an advisor, peer advising resources, semester maps, and advising how-to's and other resources. A page on career and salary outlook including job growth, employers and internships, career options and salary projections can be found on the main page of both the B.Arch. program.

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The evaluation of non-accredited degrees/pre-professional degree courses for the M.Arch. is associated with a link to transfer credits, but not to a process for advanced standing or the M.Arch. II, except if students come from the BSAT program at NYIT. For example, when applying to the M.Arch. II program, pre-professional education is defined by an equivalency of the NYIT BSAT degree curriculum. This criteria sets the ground for an accelerated degree path from the BSAT to the M.Arch. and this opportunity was discussed with the team. As external applicants for the M.Arch. II program increase, the criteria and evaluation of preparatory education will also evolve.

The advising page is thorough and includes a virtual help desk, descriptions on how to find an advisor, peer advising resources, semester maps, and advising how-to's and other resources. A page on career and salary outlook including job growth, employers and internships, career options and salary projections can be found on the main page of the M.Arch. programs.

6.6 Student Financial Information (Guidelines, p. 26)

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

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

B.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

M.Arch.
Team Findings: Met

2025 Team Analysis:
The program lists a number of resources on their student services page, which includes contact and location information for the office of admission, the office of financial aid, the office of the bursar, and the office of the registrar. They provide a portal to these resources and how-to videos and information for applying for financial aid, as well as an "understanding financial aid" glossary. The Financial Aid site provides process guidance, calculators, and ROI framing. There is also a page where students can book appointments. NYIT also provides a cost estimator, and they state that any student may request an adjustment to the cost of attendance that meets

federal Title IV regulations issued by the Department of Education. This page also itemizes the cost of attendance, adjusting projected transportation and housing costs for both the Long Island and Manhattan campuses. This page also includes books, materials, personal expenses, food, and loan fees. They also provide a net price calculator.

On our visit to the school mentioned that technology costs for architecture, including software and a laptop were factored into financial aid, and this was confirmed on their website on the laptop policy page. This is important because the recommended software list includes 29 programs (although some of these are free.) On our visit, multiple groups talked about the fact that nearly half of the B.Arch. students were recipients of PELL grants, and that they also provide merit-based funding on top of that. They mentioned that for students who may be struggling with the GPA requirements to keep their scholarships they provide an Achievement Excellence (ACE) coach program, where if they participate with a faculty mentor they are paired with they can keep their scholarships. Some faculty in the school of architecture are part of this program. Admissions and advising staff also spoke about talking through the difference in terms of cost for living at each of the campuses. Comments during the visit verified that Students receive direct financial-aid advising through centralized and departmental staff, they are informed about federal, state, and institutional aid programs, the cost of attendance explicitly includes required equipment and software for the architecture program, and the advising offices provide personalized cost comparisons and appeal options.

E. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator Representative
Patricia Kucker, RA, EdD
PhD Program Manager & Adjunct Faculty
Drexel University
Philadelphia, PA
pkucker124@google.com; pk652@drexel.edu

Educator Representative
Kate Wingert-Playdon
Senior Associate Dean, Director of Architecture
Tyler School of Art and Architecture, Temple University
Philadelphia, PA
mwingert@temple.edu

Practitioner Representative
Juan Javier Riestra, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP BD+C
Architect, Project Manager
E4H Architecture, a MOREgroup brand
Chantilly, Virginia 20151
jj.riestra@e4harchitecture.com

Regulator Representative
Ralph Raymond, AIA, NOMA, NCARB
Board Member
Georgia State Board of Registered Architects & Interior Designers
HOK
Atlanta, Georgia
ralph.raymond@hok.com

Student Representative
Paul DeFazio, AIA
Architectural Designer
Institute for Human Centered Design
Boston, MA
paul.andrew.defazio@gmail.com

F. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Patricia Kucker Ed.D. RA.

Patricia Kucker, EdD, RA
Team Chair

Ralph Raymond

Ralph Raymond, AIA, NOMA, NCARB
Team Member

Kate Wingent-Playdon

Kate Wingert-Playdon
Team Member

Juan Riestra, AIA, NCARB, WELL AP
Team Meber

Paul DeFazio, M.Arch, AIA
Team Member