

**California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Department of Architecture**

Visiting Team Report

Bachelor of Architecture (Five-year undergraduate degree; 246 quarter units)
Master of Architecture (Undergraduate degree + 160 graduate quarter units)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
12 February 2014

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

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
I.	Summary of Team Findings	
1.	Team Comments	1
2.	Conditions Not Met	2
3.	Causes of Concern	2
4.	Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	2
II.	Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation	
1.	Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	6
2.	Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	18
III.	Appendices:	
1.	Program Information	34
2.	Conditions Met with Distinction	35
3.	Visiting Team	36
IV.	Report Signatures	37
V.	Confidential Recommendation and Signatures	38

I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The team wishes to thank the students, faculty, staff, and administration of the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona for their hospitality during our visit. The generosity of the community around the Department of Architecture made the visit informative and pleasant.

The department is defined by an incredibly strong sense of community that is immediately apparent upon meeting students and faculty. There is a supportive relationship between the faculty and students in which each cohort feels equally engaged and responsible for the success of the other. The team was impressed with the collegiality and respect with which the students and faculty treated one another.

Students were clearly engaged in the educational process, as well as with the general community of the school. The team was impressed with the high level of participation in AIAS and the leadership provided by the AIAS for the department. The team also found a strong connection between undergraduates and graduates, which is unusual in many schools.

The faculty is a diverse group, both in terms of background and intellectual expertise, which provides for a dynamic and wide-ranging host of issues that are brought into the program. They are entrepreneurial and willing to embrace the inevitable and ongoing changes in the profession and the discipline as well as the university.

The involvement of the program is elevated by associations with studio sponsors for collaborative opportunities in health care, transit-oriented development, with NASA, Disney, AECOM, and the architecture profession in general.

For both students and faculty the leadership of the new chair Sarah Lorenzen has brought a renewed optimism to the department. She has sought new resources and opportunities to support the students, faculty, program and facilities. Her resourcefulness and tenacity were noted numerous times by faculty and students. Her open and positive demeanor is clearly a part of her success in bringing the department together with a shared sense of purpose and enthusiasm. In a short time, her impact can be seen, recognized even during our brief visit.

Of notable value to the program is the VDL Neutra Research House and the Neutra Archive. These resources are well utilized by the department for everything from school, university and cultural events to scholarly and creative activities, and they provide a focal point for student learning. The house connects the school to the history of architecture and to southern California and the region of Los Angeles. The stewardship of the house as an outreach component of the department contributes significantly to the culture of the region and presents a model of high-density living to promote the public good.

During the visit, discussions with alumni at the Neutra House reception elevated the profile of the program. Alumni were fully engaged, impressive in their outlook and relation to the school. Alumni support of the program is significant. In particular, the recent donation from Juliana Terian has provided the opportunity for the program to reconfigure the IDC lab and raise the image of the department and college through outreach publications.

The team was impressed to find that the university administration is especially interested in the value of the program and its success in contributing to the mission of the university.

2. Conditions Not Met

- B. 2. Accessibility (B. Arch and M. Arch)
- B.12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration B. Arch and M. Arch)

3. Causes of Concern

- A. Studio Culture Policy: There is concern that the Studio Culture Policy, though it exists, was not fully understood by the student population as indicated during our student meeting. It is recommended that the process for developing the policy is shared with students to invite comment and disseminate the policy in a more formal, direct manner.
- B. Writing Ability: For the B. Arch program, the ability to write effectively needs improvement. Though the majority of the work is acceptable, some samples of written work demonstrate writing skills in need of improvement. Examples of writing skills that suggest this as a concern can be found in the provided work in ARC 299/299A and ARC 464/464A.
- C. Realm A Criterion A.11 Applied Research: While undergraduate and graduate work exhibited indicates that students successfully complete a variety precedent and case study exercises, it is not clear students realize the role that this research offers a design investigation.
- D. Realm B Criterion B.6 Comprehensive Design: In finding that students were able to produce projects that demonstrated the breadth of comprehensive design decisions in the spring: Comprehensive Studio ARC 303/L (undergraduate) and 505/L (graduate), complete accessibility in projects exhibited was a concern. It was mentioned during team conversations with faculty that students would perhaps gain a better grasp of this material if the quarter-long studio were instead a two-quarter sequence or a semester-long offering.
- E. Strategic Planning – As stated in the APR and found in discussions with faculty and administration, the program is proactive through faculty meetings and the gathering of timely and pertinent data. However, the budget issues in the state linked with the high demand for the program and the planned shift in the university curricular organization from the quarter system to the semester system place create uncertainties of outlook and timing, adding to what is already a challenging process to strategically plan for the future.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2008)

2004 Condition 8, Physical Resources: *The accredited degree program must provide the physical resources appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class; lecture and seminar space to accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space. The facilities must also be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and applicable building codes.*

Previous Team Report (2008): This condition is not met. The lack of adequate physical space to support areas of the professional programs continues. The Interim Design Center (IDC) also known as Building #89, built in 1994 has become a permanent part of the Department of Architecture. It currently houses the second and third year undergraduate studios, a student lounge and a small seminar room. These last two spaces are poorly ventilated. First year undergraduates continue to share studio space in Building #1 with the Landscape Architecture students. They work on “hot desks,” and must take their work with them, as there is no storage space to house projects or equipment. They have little if any interaction with upper level architecture peers. The department continues to share a lecture hall in Building #1 that is overcrowded and has poor sight lines. A lecture hall in Building #3 also used by the department has been refurbished. The classroom in building #1 (1-109) has a capacity for 90 students, and room 3-217 in building #3 provides for 116. None of these spaces accommodate very large classes and guest lectures with audiences above 116. In addition, both of these lecture halls are difficult to schedule, and are not close to the IDC.

Nevertheless, the Visiting Team recognizes there have been a number of physical facilities' improvements since the last accreditation visit. The model shops were consolidated into Building 45, adjacent to the IDC. New tools, such as a CNC machine, have been added to support explorations in prototyping and construction. A Digital Support Lab to be located in the refurbished Building #3 will house new equipment for copying, scanning and plotting, as well as CNC tools. The acquisition of a portable building unit, which is being installed behind the IDC, will be used as a lecture hall and a seminar/classroom. Additionally, an elevator and a ramp were installed in the College of Environmental Design Building (Building #7) to meet ADA required access to the second floor, and accessible restrooms. The Visiting Team is also buoyed by the letter of support for a new environmental design building from President J. Michael Ortiz. We are hopeful effective action will finally take place regarding this much needed physical resource.

Because history has demonstrated that events may not unfold as envisioned, there must be more immediate steps taken to resolve pressing current physical resource issues. Foremost among them is the aptly named "Faculty Swamp," and more recently the "Faculty Shack." Formerly known as Building 89A, the building's condition, interior environment and conspicuous lack of maintenance, stand as testament to the institution's inability to meet minimum standards. Additionally, the images communicated by the "Faculty Shack," located behind the IDC, reflect poorly on the department, college and university.

In 1993 a new College of Environmental Arts Building was the first priority of the university. Since then a series of circumstances removed a new facility from the priority list, and then put it back, albeit behind the priority for a new business school. Our discussions with the president and faculty provided us with the knowledge that a new building for the College of Environmental Design is again the first or second priority of the university. However, there are 22 other state universities competing for funding, and there is no assurance that any new building will be on line before the year 2016, at the earliest.

Given the most optimistic time frames, concerted and continuing action needs to be taken to address space deficiencies. It is the perspective of this Visiting Team that the student experience would be improved if freshman studio locations were contiguous to each other, and most importantly to other studio year levels, rather than spread over campus. Additionally, the team believes it is important to identify space for the first-year students that permits access 24/7.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: The Focused Evaluation conducted in 2010 found this condition met.

The visiting team found that the department is making some progress with regard to the physical facilities even though economic forces outside its control are limiting future success in this regard. Modest renovations and new furniture in the IDC Building have increased the building capacity and provided reconfigured studio settings for almost all levels in the program. Renovations this spring to Building 89A adjacent to the IDC will convert the building into two spaces, a digital lab and testing and structures laboratory. These small changes are a clear benefit to the school.

Some in the program find value in having the various department locations dispersed across the campus, so that students feel a connection to the whole campus; others, however, see the benefit of a unified location offering the larger educational opportunity where having an identity of place contributes to a more intellectually vital and coherent education experience.

The school has recently gained access to a new large lecture space in the College of Business to bring the student and faculty body as a whole together. To have the potential for school-wide assemblies clearly explains this kind of programmatic need and the benefit granted to a program where larger school assemblies can occur. While the 2010 Focused Evaluation deemed the criterion for Physical Resources met, for the school, several challenges remain, including a continuing economic uncertainty.

2004 Condition 10, Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.*

Previous Team Report (2008): The Visiting Team acknowledges the gains that have been made to the facilities through the consolidation of the model shops, modular classroom, and other support areas such as additional space for the archives and a refurbished lecture hall. Additionally, the team is encouraged by the letter of support for a new Environmental Design College building from President J. Michael Ortiz. The correspondence is perceived as supportive of the ENV College and the Department of Architecture. The Visiting Team encourages the department to play an active role as a member of the "college neighborhood" as the project moves forward.

Though the institutional support for a new ENV building is very positive, there is continuing concern over the lack of financial resources to meet operating and other required expenses within the Department of Architecture. The inability for the department to have clear and open communication for budget planning and management at the college level seriously inhibits the program's ability to plan and manage its needed resources and establish priorities. We encourage the department to work with the college to access additional funding for lecture series, publications, equipment and faculty/student/staff support.

The California University System will be considering a request to authorize MBA programs to charge differential tuition. If approved, the Architecture Department chooses to follow this precedent. Based upon historical data and our informal meeting with students, it is possible the student body may support such an increase in fees, if used to improve the quality of education within the Department of Architecture.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: Further gains have been achieved since the 2008 Visit. Department leadership and faculty have been creative in locating financial resources, and strategic in the methods through which these resources have been utilized.

Although financial concerns are ongoing, a major donor gift of \$2.5 million to expand facilities was received in 2012. A small allocation from this donation has been used for custom desks for the IDC Building to better utilize and increase usable studio space. The remainder of this donation is being held for the construction of a future facility.

Financial resources at the university for the department have stabilized and are showing some improvement based on the forecast provided for the next two years. However, state support from the California State University system remains challenging. With the limited resources the department has had, it operates adequately for what it must accomplish and provide for students.

2004 Criterion 13.7, Collaborative Skills: *Ability to recognize the varied talent found in interdisciplinary design project teams in professional practice and work in collaboration with other students as members of a design team*

Previous Team Report (2008): Teamwork among the architectural studios occurs at numerous levels. Large-scale models constructed by teams of student are built within both the first and third year studios. Additionally, design students address problems as teams within urban design.

A number of the fourth year focus studios (Arch 401/2/3) were collaborative in nature and the evidence demonstrated cooperative integration with engineering, landscape design, urban planning and others.

However the Team could not find any evidence of interdisciplinary teaching/learning within the required studio sequence, or within the internship experience.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that interdisciplinary teaching and learning was occurring in the required undergraduate and graduate studios, and considered this SPC Met with Distinction for both programs. Refer to Criterion C-1 that follows in this report and in III. Appendices: 2. Met with Distinction.

2004 Criterion 13.14, Accessibility (B. Arch): *Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities*

Previous Team Report (2008): In the B. Arch. program the team found building design meets accessibility needs, but little or no evidence of site accessibility within any studio.

In the graduate program building accessibility was met in most design studios. Though not specifically noted by the Departmental SPC matrix, site accessibility was most clearly addressed in ARC 503.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: In the B Arch. program, the team continues to have concerns regarding the accessibility elements of SPC B 2. Refer to Criterion B 2 later in the report.

2009 Criterion 13.23, Building Systems Integration (B. Arch): *Ability to assess, select, and conceptually integrate structural systems, building envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design*

Previous Team Report (2008): This criterion is not met in the B. Arch program. The exposure of students to structural systems is extremely well demonstrated in the ARC 301 course, where students construct large-scale models. However, the integration of environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into the structural systems is not evident via the models, or in the project notebooks.

The criterion is met at the M. Arch level, and documented in the thesis research book.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: Since the last visit, the second year undergraduate design sequence has been restructured to provide a comprehensive design experience that features integration of building systems. ARC 201/201L focuses on site and environmental issues; ARC 202/202L focuses on program, circulation and design strategies; and ARC 203/203L is integrated with ARC 341 Building Construction, culminating in a project that integrates structural, environmental and design considerations. This integrative system is repeated at a more advanced level in the third year design sequence, ARC 301/301L, ARC 302/302L and ARC 303/303L, which are further integrated with ARC 342 Building Systems and the structures and codes courses to complete an integrative design methodology. M. Arch students continue to show building systems integration in the ARC 505/505L project and thesis project ARC 695.

II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

[X] The programs have fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2014 Team Assessment: The APR provided substantial evidence to detail the history, mission, and culture of the program articulated in a contemporary context. As the team studied the material provided, met with leaders across the campus, and interacted with faculty, staff, and students, it was apparent that all involved recognize the programs of this department as stand-out programs in the university with a long history of service and excellence in the local and regional setting. Throughout the visit, the team found evidence to confirm that the programs actively engage the professional community with regard to quality workforce development, collaborative studio opportunities, and active research and experimentation. Meetings with alumni and evidence presented in the student projects and reinforced through faculty discussions painted a picture of the active role that Cal Poly Architecture plays in the regional design community, and reinforced the program's identity with the reputation for providing a quality professional education at the lowest tuition rate in the state.

The organizational chart provided in the APR outlines the extensive framework of the university institution and the complex relationship the program has within this setting. The APR also indicates that the faculty and staff participate at many levels in the institution to provide a unique professional voice, particularly in regard to campus design and master planning, and often serving as experts for various facility and design-related academic activities.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

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

[X] The programs have demonstrated that they provide a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The programs have demonstrated that they provide a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2014 Team Assessment: While policies are found on the website at "Student Handbook/Studio Culture Policy," it is not clear where the student engagement occurs in making the policy, if at all. Students indicate that they have a very positive studio culture and faculty are concerned for their growth, well being, and overall development. The team found that the school's programs have created an environment of respect and mutual caring shared by students and faculty alike.

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

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: Through discussions with students, alumni, faculty, and administrators, the team found evidence that the programs are recognized across the campus for making unique contributions to the college and university. Faculty and students are regularly involved in many interdisciplinary activities. One important example is the Lyle Center for Regenerative Studies, an interdisciplinary center in the college, where students and faculty are actively engaged with others from across the university through a common research purpose. The Lyle Center provides a mission, location and opportunity for students from many disciplines to actively join in research and scholarly activities. Another example of how the school links to the greater academic community is the successful school effort to sustain and utilize the Neutra VDL Research House as a learning laboratory and center of cultural activity. The house provides an important link to the cultural history of the region and, through its prominence in architecture, brings stature to the university.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: The multiple branches of student leadership within the programs are active in elevating the needs of the student body, as well as in initiating a vibrant social and

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

collaborative setting for undergraduates and graduates. The students direct several organizations in which they are offered opportunities to develop leadership and networking skills. Both the architecture student body and faculty express deep respect and appreciation for each other. With strong department morale, the program operates at a level of enthusiasm and optimism that defies the current lack of resources and state of facilities.

The requirement to complete 500 internship hours by graduation ensures students are experienced and well prepared to live and work in the profession post-graduation, and that they have gained the experience to make thoughtful, deliberate, and informed choices.

With the apparent diversity of cultures and backgrounds of the student body and school faculty, interaction and collaboration in the school prepares undergraduates and graduates to work in and relate to a world where diversity is respected and nurtured.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: Based upon meetings with students and faculty, it was apparent that both undergraduate and graduate students are prepared for the transition to internship and the path to licensure. Students in both the undergraduate and graduate programs are required to complete 500 hours of internship before graduation. Further, the school requires that students begin an NCARB Council Record in order to track these hours. To facilitate this requirement, the faculty and department encourage, prepare, and assist students in finding employment opportunities. The college and university also provide additional ongoing career opportunities.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: The Department of Architecture prepares students in both programs to be well equipped for the architecture profession. The faculty is very active and involved with the professional community and organizations in southern California. A continuous stream of guest critics, lecturers, and alumni is invited to engage the students and bring a broad spectrum of the profession directly into the school setting.

On numerous occasions during the visit, when students were asked how they felt the programs prepared them for the profession, the response was consistently positive indicating that opportunities existed throughout their education to understand the diversity of the architecture profession. Interdisciplinary courses incorporated throughout the undergraduate and graduate programs show students how the profession fits into the larger picture of environmental design, community, and society. Discussions with alumni during the visit confirmed how well students are prepared to practice in the profession.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: The programs are responding appropriately to the role of architecture and the public good. There are instances in many required and elective courses in which the students as young, emerging architects engage communities directly. Through these courses, students are introduced to diverse public concerns and types of engagement. In addition, the school culture in general is one of inclusivity, which emphasizes respect for others and the community as well as civic responsibility within the school.

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

[X] The programs processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2014 Team Assessment: The APR provides extensive evidence that the school has studied and identified processes for improvement. The school has periodically held daylong discussions to address issues of concern and long-term growth. The school uses the results of these discussions, along with resources from alumni, students, faculty, and data collection, to inform decisions on institutional plans, including how their plans will relate to the NAAB Five Perspectives. Through the strategic planning process, the program has identified a concise list of strengths, challenges and opportunities that reflect the current situation. Three major objectives have been identified: space and growth, strategic alliances and collaborations, and differential fees. Given the current financial situation in the state, the school, while pursuing all three areas, to its credit has been most successful in developing the strategic alliances and collaborations objectives where success is somewhat reliant solely on their singular initiative and energies.

With the uncertain financial conditions and uncertainty in the timetable for transitioning from a quarter system to a semester system, the department finds itself in the position of not being able to fully plan for the future in regard to what will inevitably require major structural shifts as the school transitions. The department has indicated that it will undertake a major rethinking of the programs in response to this shift. Although they are engaging the strategic list mentioned above as best they can, they were unable to provide a clear plan of how and when the planning process would take place to restructure the program for this new university format.

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

- How the program is progressing towards its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.

- *Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:*
 - *Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.*
 - *Individual course evaluations.*
 - *Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.*
 - *Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.*

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

[X] The programs processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2014 Team Assessment: The programs' self-assessment is evident with annual faculty retreats, faculty and course evaluations, the quarterly Interim exhibit of student work, and constant progress toward department mission and objectives. As reported in the APR, part of the programs' self-assessment has been guided by the NAAB Perspectives. The programs have shown a progression of successful fund-raising efforts to support changes, development, and improvements. The department faculty's biweekly meetings, with a student representative, exemplify self-assessment in both the faculty and student body as a whole.

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

- An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions².
- Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.
- An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.
- An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.
- An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team reviewed the faculty and staff data provided in the APR, met with faculty and staff, and conducted meetings and interviews throughout the team visit. The team concluded that the department has had severe challenges in meeting human resource needs across the department, given the recent severe budget cuts in the California State University system. At the time of the visit, the department demonstrated a strong yet nimble faculty that had weathered the harsh fiscal climate and is now in a state of recovery. This is evidenced in the return to a healthier student-to-faculty ratio (16:1) in studios in the undergraduate program (graduate ratio remained at 12:1); the recent hire of a tenure-track faculty member and the addition of a full-time print staff member; and the planning for an additional new faculty member. Review of the faculty CVs indicates that collectively, the faculty and staff represent a wide range of talents and experiences and are excellent resources for the programs.

The program faculty and staff demonstrated a unified commitment to supporting professional development and encouraging faculty activities in many areas including those of professional experience and interaction with industry, collaborative and experimental projects, publishing and curating original and historic research, and exploration of technical advancements in building sciences, technology, and multimedia. The APR contains an extensive list of grants, university funding, and industry partnerships that provided a wide range of professional development opportunities. The university also offers a wide range of professional development courses for the staff through the campus Faculty Center for Professional Development (<http://www.csupomona.edu/~facultycenter/>).

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

The department has a documented and clear system for Retention/Tenure/Promotion (RTP) as evidenced in the university policy (http://academic.csupomona.edu/faculty/rtp_fac.aspx) and confirmed with interviews with the dean and discussions with the faculty. Department faculty has a committee structure and actively engages in dialogue in support of continued improvement and professional excellence. The dean of the college indicated support and respect for the department faculty and staff and for the process of RTP.

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: The department has documented policies for admissions for first-time freshman, transfer students (<http://www.csupomona.edu/~arc/barch.html#admissions>), and graduate students (<http://www.csupomona.edu/~arc/march1.html#admissions>). These policies are accessed through the university website and directed through department promotional materials. In addition, faculty committees in the department review transfer placement into the appropriate design studio for undergraduate and graduate admissions. The department receives over ten times the number of applicants it is able to accept for undergraduate and graduate positions. This creates an extremely competitive acceptance process resulting in students that represent the top 10% of applicants. The faculty indicated that the quality and eagerness of the students resulted in a positive and productive learning environment.

The list of visiting critics and field trips planned for 2012–2013 indicates that students are gaining a broad perspective on the profession and the region.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the programs

2014 Team Assessment: Organizational charts as well as interviews with faculty demonstrated the ability of the department to set curricular and programmatic policies and conditions that adhere to the expectations of accreditation. There is a clear delineation of responsibilities for the chair and the dean's office that provides structure as well as a role for faculty governance at the university level. The unit director works between the faculty and the dean's office to implement policies to achieve the mission of the department. There is a clear chain of command from the chancellor's office to the chair of the department.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the programs

2014 Team Assessment: The faculty seems extremely collegial and well organized for governance. They seem to be engaged in the running of the school with strong opinions that do not override the greater good. Biweekly faculty meetings are held throughout the year along, and individual or year-level meetings are held as needed. A student representative is included in faculty meetings. Finally, the chair holds "Chair Chats" each quarter, in which she designates one hour to attend each year-level studio and talk with the students.

The faculty and students appear to be a very well synchronized whole that works together to discuss, address, and solve areas of concern for all. As needed, they work together to move issues up the ladder to the administration at the college and university level.

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

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

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the programs

2014 Team Assessment: The department is able to provide adequate physical resources in a challenging fiscal environment. The school continues to be innovative in order to meet the educational mission and needs of the students. See notes above provided in 4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2008) - 2004 Condition 8, Physical Resources.

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

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the programs

2014 Team Assessment – Despite limited financial resources, the department, continues to operate well. The financial resources at the university have stabilized and are showing some improvement, based on the forecast provided for the next two years.

Although financial concerns are ongoing, a major donor gift of \$2.5 million to expand facilities was received in 2012. Part of that donation was used to purchase new, smaller desks for the IDC to make better use of space. The remainder of the donation is being held for future facility purposes.

Support specifically for research and continuing education is a challenge. In addition to seed grants awarded by the university, faculty must largely seek funding from grants and gifts by other means. A table of CSPUP funds and external grants received by faculty was provided in the APR, indicating the high degree of success the faculty has had. As faculty and students indicated, increased funding would be well utilized. The challenge of gaining additional means of support was not indicated as a detriment to the program.

Based on numerous conversations during the team's visit with faculty, students, and the administration, there is wide support for the initiation of supplemental fees to be allocated directly to the architecture programs. Much of this support is based on the fact that the differential in tuition is significant across the regional architecture programs. All others are substantially higher.

The proposed fee would be sought through the California University System and would take approximately one year to implement after initial approval by the university president. Though the fee

amount has yet to be determined, this funding source would certainly provide additional financial resources for the program, most notably for facility and other smaller capital needs. This proposal appears to be palatable and supported by students. A similar supplemental fee is presently in place at another CSU institution.

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

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

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the programs

2014 Team Assessment: The university and department provide a wide range of information resources for faculty, staff, and students. The university library provides digital, physical, and visual resources for the program. The library staff is knowledgeable and eager to assist students and faculty. With the library's initiative to provide the majority of its content digitally, information and research are becoming more readily available. The department's extensive archives are also available and easily accessible to all students and faculty.

In speaking with numerous students in the program, the team has found that the general student body greatly appreciates and values access to the online software tutorial resource, Lynda.com. This platform provides convenient assistance and information for students and faculty.

PART I: SECTION 3 –REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports³. Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found demographic, qualifications, and graduation statistics in the APR and reviewed the data provided and found it to accurately express the race, ethnicity, and gender information required along with outlining other specified program characteristics mentioned above.

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

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

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports

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

transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found the annual reports on the department website.

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

In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit⁴ that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

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

2014 Team Assessment – Information provided by the APR and the faculty exhibit in the team room indicates that faculty, both full-time and part-time, are adequately prepared to educate all of the students in the architecture program. With approximately half of the faculty licensed to practice, as well as involved in numerous professional societies and community efforts, there is a diverse skill set with knowledge and experience that can be conveyed to students.

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

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

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

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

2014 Team Assessment – Information regarding program policies provided in the team room indicates the program meets the requirements of Appendix 3. However, with the Studio Culture Policy, there is concern that though it exists, it is not fully understood as indicated by the student population during the student meeting. From discussion during the meeting, the team found the students are unaware of the process by which the Studio Culture Policy is framed to include their perspective on the studio culture and how the policy is formally shared with the student body.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 — STUDENT PERFORMANCE — EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

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

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:

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

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

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment: For this criterion in the B. Arch program, the team found the work acceptable. The ability to read, speak, and listen effectively is present throughout the undergraduate student body. Some samples of written work demonstrate writing skills in need of improvement. This raises a concern. Examples of writing skills that pose this question can be found in the provided work in ARC 299/299A and ARC 464/464A.

For the M. Arch program, the ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively is integrated within multiple courses. Proficient communication skills can be found in all graduate studios.

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment: Undergraduate course work from ARC 494/495, Project Programming, in a sequence beginning with ARC 491 and graduate work from ARC 694/695 demonstrated that students gained the ability to use evidence to question, compare, and reach conclusions. Research and evaluative skills are evident in the required courses ARC 299/299A for undergraduate students, and ARC 691 for graduate students.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence from ARC 201, ARC 202, and ARC 203 from the undergraduate program, and ARC 501, ARC 502 and ARC 503 from the graduate program, demonstrates that students have the ability to visually study and communicate design elements throughout the programming and design process.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: As evidenced in the drawings and models displayed in ARC 342, ARC 342/A, and the assignments in ARC 471, students demonstrate technical documentation abilities through drawings, exercises, quizzes, and in digital model images that integrate building materials, systems, and components in wall and building sections. Further integration of these skills is demonstrated in the design studio work of ARC 303, ARC 303/L (undergraduate) and ARC 505 / ARC 505/L (graduate).

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Courses in the undergraduate program, such as ARC 202, ARC 491, Senior Project Research, and ARC 494, demonstrate the use of strong investigative skills and provided work to show this as a clear ability. These skills can be found in a variety of subjects from critical thinking to architectural history. Several courses in the graduate program also demonstrate investigative skills such as in ARC 506/506L where in the context of an urban project, students use this ability throughout in the development of a large-scale design project.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Students effectively demonstrate the ability to use basic architectural and environmental principles in the design projects produced for ARC 201 and ARC 201/L, ARC 202 and ARC 202/L, and ARC 203 and ARC 203/L (undergraduate). Graduate students in ARC 501 and ARC 501/L and ARC 502 and ARC 502/L effectively demonstrate the ability to use basic architectural principles in the design exercises and projects provided. Environmental principles in the graduate program are demonstrated in the design projects produced in ARC 503 and ARC 503/L, ARC 504 and ARC 504/L and are further evidenced in ARC 506 and ARC 506/L.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: There is evidence from the undergraduate and graduate studio courses that the students can assess the formal and programmatic characteristics of a precedent through case studies and synthesize that within their own design projects. In general, the precedent studies are documentary rather than analytical.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The undergraduate required studio ARC 102/L demonstrates strong ordering systems skills; the work provided work in this course shows that students have a comprehensive understanding of the ordering systems in two- and three-dimensional design.

The required graduate studios ARC 501/L and ARC 502/L demonstrate the use of strong ordering systems skills. The provided work in these courses shows that students gain a deep understanding of the systems in two- and three-dimensional design.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence from ARC 361/361A, 362/362A, 464/464A demonstrates undergraduate and graduate students gain an understanding of studies of indigenous and vernacular

cultures along with comparative cultural studies of Western Europe and the Middle East in the medieval era, Mesoamerica and Asia in the contemporary era, and the evolution of the American cultural landscape. The shared student experiences from the international studios also contribute to this understanding.

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

B. Arch

[X] Met

M. Arch

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Undergraduate student work found in ARC302 and ARC299A Critical Thinking in Architecture examines the complex strategies for the making of social spaces and spatial patterns in architecture using case studies from differing cultures. Graduate student course work in 481/481A Behavioral Factors in Architecture demonstrates students gain an understanding of the range of cultural diversity and client roles in relation to the responsibilities of the architect.

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

B. Arch

[X] Met

M. Arch

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Undergraduate students make substantial efforts in using advanced knowledge and research skills in ARC 494 and 495. The materials presented demonstrate that the students learn research techniques as well as develop an understanding of the role of applied research through design projects of their own.

Graduate students develop this understanding through the thesis prep classes and with documents that must be prepared in anticipation of a thesis statement. In this regard, there is an uneven level of accomplishment throughout the examples provided. It is clear that students engage in research activities in the investigation of a problem.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The team found evidence throughout the program to support that criteria in Realm A have been met. The program comprehensively addresses the skills found in this realm and exhibit the ability to use a wide range of media to critically think about, develop, and present architecture.

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

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

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment: Undergraduate students demonstrate programming in ARC 494 and show the ability to integrate technical skills and knowledge into project design development, programming, and site planning for projects in ARC 202, and the ARC 301/301L, ARC 302/302L, and ARC 303/303L sequence of projects (B. Arch). Graduate students demonstrate programming in ARC 694 and show the ability to integrate technical skills and knowledge into project design development, programming, and site planning for projects in ARC 504/504L and ARC 505/505L.

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

B. Arch
 Not Met

M. Arch
 Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: In the B. Arch program, the team has concerns regarding the accessibility elements of this criterion. Based upon the review of the information provided in ARC 201 and ARC 303 it was evident that the concepts and requirements related to accessibility were covered extensively in the lecture series information, but the team found little evidence in the student studio work that students had developed the ability to incorporate the requirements of the site access and associated accessibility requirements into the building design.

The graduate program course work in ARC 591 met the requirements related to building code analysis related to life safety elements, but the student work was lacking in exhibiting a firm understanding of the accessibility requirements of this SPC. Some students showed an understanding of the internal building requirements but did not provide sufficient evidence to successfully express their ability in site accessibility.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Many undergraduate, upper-level studios emphasize sustainability. Different approaches to optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources are shown in the provided work of course ARC 203/203L and ARC 331/331L. The work also shows the ability to recognize issues of sustainability utilizing a research approach to engage these issues through the design project.

Graduate upper-level studios demonstrate this ability in the course work of ARC 503/503L and ARC 331/331L.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Site analysis and design projects in ARC 203, 203/L and in the senior projects ARC 495 (undergraduate) and ARC 503/L, 505, 505/L (graduate), and thesis projects in ARC 695 demonstrate student ability to respond to the range of site characteristics.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence contained in ARC 303, 303/L that the undergraduate program meets the requirements of this element of the SPC. The work shown in ARC 504 and ARC 592 exhibited evidence that the graduate program meets the requirements of this criterion.

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

A.2. Design Thinking Skills

B.2. Accessibility

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found that students were able to produce projects that demonstrated the breadth of comprehensive design decisions in the spring Comprehensive Studio ARC 303/L (undergraduate) and 505/L (graduate).

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment – There is evidence that this criterion is addressed through the required course ARC 471/471A for both undergraduate and graduate students. Presentations during the course discuss methods of cost analysis and cost modeling, which are also applied in a team assignment where students create a fee proposal for a project. These financial considerations are also applied as part of the 4th and 5th year studios, and graduate studio, when students review and analyze financial considerations for courses in urban design and housing and followed by cost estimates for their senior project and thesis work.

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment: Students from both the undergraduate and graduate programs demonstrate an understanding of the principles of environmental systems through an extensive series of lectures and assignments in ARC 331/331A and ARC 332/332A and the integrated sustainable and studio

course ARC 499 that include the technical data and assessment tools needed to select and design environmental and sustainable strategies.

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment: The undergraduate and graduate student work in the structures sequence, ARC 321/321A, ARC 322/322A, and ARC323/323A, and in ARC 424/424A demonstrate an understanding of the principles of structural design required for this SPC. This work is tied to studio projects in ARC 303 where individual student projects integrate this material.

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment – This criterion is met through several courses for both undergraduate and graduate students. Initially coursework begins with ARC 341A and 342A in Building Construction classes, and is followed up with ARC 332A, Environmental Controls, which shows evidence of students meeting this criterion through labs, drawing exercises, and examinations. In addition, undergraduate studio courses ARC 301L and ARC 303L, and graduate studio courses ARC 504L and ARC 505L, show this criterion being met.

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment: The required courses for graduate and undergraduate students, 331/331A, 332/332A, a two-course series on environmental building controls, provide evidence through student course work that students gain an understanding of energy and building service systems including basic theory, design principles, and safety requirements. Additionally, now for the undergraduates ARC 499, a new building systems integration course, is offered tied to ARC 303L, the comprehensive studio.

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

B. Arch
 Not Met

M. Arch
 Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: This criterion has not been met by undergraduates or graduates. Sufficient evidence to demonstrate that students meet this performance criterion was not found. Students demonstrate that they lack an understanding of the basic principles utilized in selecting materials, etc. Evidence was presented in ARC 341/A and ARC 342/A for the graduate and undergraduate programs, but neither set provided convincing demonstrations of this understanding. While the team found some examples of acceptable competency in studio projects across the years, there were not enough to be convincing in this area. There were numerous examples of an absence of this understanding throughout the exhibition.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: Student work found to support the criteria in this realm demonstrates the clear interest and enthusiasm the students have for the comprehensiveness of architecture.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:

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

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

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment: This criterion for the B. Arch program is met with distinction. Evidence of interdisciplinary teaching and learning within the required undergraduate studios was found, especially in courses ENV 101/101L and ARC 403/403L. Evidence of this skill and ability is displayed through in-depth site analysis, urban, landscape, and architecture designs.

Examples of this criterion for the graduate program can be found in ARC 506/506L. The ability to collaborate in teams with other disciplines is apparent in the provided student research site analysis and design work. This criterion (for the M. Arch) is met with distinction.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of an understanding of human behavior was found in the ARC 201 studio lecture course in the undergraduate program. Student work documents an understanding of the effects of human occupation in relation to the natural environment in order to produce a design for a built work. The lecture component definitively addresses this understanding.

Evidence of this understanding was found in the required graduate work in course ARC 481 Behavioral Factors in Architecture. Further, this understanding is called upon to use as a resource for the graduate research topics courses and thesis project.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Students in both programs show understanding of the responsibility of the architect in the Professional Practice course ARC 471/A from the lectures and assignments. Further evidence is found in the project development and research in ARC 494 (B. Arch) and ARC 694 (M. Arch) and in the urban design lectures and studios, undergraduate ARC403/L and graduate ARC 506/L.

While ARC 471/A is the key required course for undergraduates and graduates concerning this criterion, this perspective is truly interwoven by the faculty throughout the entire course load and the studio culture. From the very first studio, ENV 101 and ENV 101/L, the interdisciplinary nature of the profession begins the students' preparation for their role in the profession. ARC 403/L for undergraduates, and ARC 506/L for graduates, fully engage students with the profession's stakeholders and key constituents.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment – This criterion is met extensively through the required course ARC 471/471A for both undergraduate and graduate students. Presentations during the course thoroughly discuss details and case studies in practice including office organization, project team, marketing, project delivery methods, scope of services, cost estimating/containment, and fee structure. A team

assignment in which students create a qualifications package and fee proposal for a project provides evidence that students must identify these project management skills. Examination questions pertaining to these management issues are incorporated to ensure students recall the material.

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment – This criterion is met extensively through the required course ARC 471/471A for both undergraduate and graduate students. Presentations during the course thoroughly discuss details and case studies in practice covering the aspects of this criterion, including financial management and business planning, time management and risk, and issues that can affect a practice.

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment – Although this criterion is addressed technically throughout ARC 471/471A for undergraduate and graduate students, it is apparent from the involvement by the large majority of students in the AIAS chapter and Tau Sigma Delta (TSD) that leadership is woven throughout every design studio as part of the studio culture and atmosphere. This is especially evident in the third quarter of the 4th and 5th year studios (403/L, 506/L), where students make larger planning and community decisions through exploration of urban design followed by the development of their senior project. Of special note, credit is provided in ARC 471/471A for participation and leadership in AIAS.

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

B. Arch
 Met

M. Arch
 Met

2014 Team Assessment – This criterion is actually first introduced to students in ENV 101/101L when all first year ENV students work collaboratively to understand and investigate permitting, urban analysis issues, historical considerations, land use, and zoning ordinances. This early introduction allows students to better understand legal responsibilities before the required professional practice course ARC 471/471A for both undergraduate and graduate students. Extensive presentation material during the course compares ethics to legal responsibilities through numerous concepts, definitions and

examples. Examination questions pertaining to legal issues are incorporated to ensure students recall the material.

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

B. Arch

[X] Met

M. Arch

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment – This criterion is met through the required course ARC 471/471A for both undergraduate and graduate students. An extensive presentation during the course discusses definitions of ethics, examples of individual ethical views, AIA canons, and case studies. A team assignment in which students observe situations in a local community's design review meeting provides evidence that students must identify ethical behavior and judgment. Examination questions pertaining to ethics are incorporated to ensure students recall the material.

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

B. Arch

[X] Met

M. Arch

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment – This criterion is introduced to first-year students in the ARC 299 lecture course, which focuses on critical thinking in architecture. A variety of discussions with a diverse set of architects (faculty and lecturers from area practices) and assignments address multiple related disciplines and concerns in the profession. Undergraduates gain an understanding of community and social responsibility in required course ARC 302/L, which focuses on housing typologies, and ARC 403/L, focusing on the urban design typology.

Graduates gain an initial understanding of this criterion and engage in activities through required course ARC 481, Behavioral Factors in Architecture. Application of this understanding has been shown in work provided in urban design studio ARC 506/L, which is comparable to ARC 403/L noted above. ARC 471/471A for all students also engages participants in discussions regarding this criterion.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The team finds that the program's student achievement in all elements of Realm C is a strength of the program. As mentioned above, the involvement of many students in the AIAS chapter, the largest in the country, and TSD indicates this strength.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment - The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) reaffirmed accreditation of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, in 2012 for a ten-year term as indicated on the university web site.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program utilizes the degree titles associated with NAAB-accredited degree programs: Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.) and Master of Architecture (M. Arch.). The curricular requirements for the undergraduate program include professional core courses, general educational courses, and electives (<http://www.csupomona.edu/~arc/barch-courses.html>). The graduate curriculum requires that students have an undergraduate degree that includes general education, professional, and elective courses

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: A curriculum committee regularly reviews the curriculum for the program. The committee maintains the accommodation of the general education requirements of the university, as well as NAAB requirements for professional education. The committee has a process in place for reviewing the program, assessing necessary changes, and responding to mandates from the university. The structure of the process for determining how changes are made is available in the APR.

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

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Candidates meet university and department standards. A policy is stated for freshman, transfer, and change of major applicants. Faculty committees in the department review transfer placement into the appropriate design studio and graduate admissions. The program receives over ten times the number of applicants it is able to accept for undergraduate and graduate positions. This creates an extremely competitive acceptance process, resulting in students that represent the top 10% of applicants. In several meetings and in interviews with faculty, it was indicated that the quality and eagerness of the students resulted in a positive and productive learning environment.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION**II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees**

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that shows the program promotes itself with an understanding of the accredited professional degree and inclusion of the language of the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5, in appropriate catalogs and promotional media.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

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

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of public access to the NAAB Conditions and NAAB Procedures on the department website.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

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

www.ARCHCareers.org

The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects

Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture

The Emerging Professional's Companion

www.NCARB.org

www.aia.org

www.aias.org

www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of public access to career development information on the department website.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

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

All Annual Reports, including the narrative

All NAAB responses to the Annual Report

The final decision letter from the NAAB

The most recent APR

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of public access to APRs and VTRs on the department website.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The department website gives public access to the NCARB website, which provides the ARE pass rates.

III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

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

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

Reference California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, APR, p. 4

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

Reference California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, APR, pp. 5-10

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, APR, pp. 25-31

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, APR, pp. 32-51

2. Conditions Met with Distinction

I.1.3.B - Architecture Education and Students: Students gain a greater knowledge of architecture through programs and outreach that utilize impressive regional resources as well as international opportunities. The program provides many leadership opportunities for students. The students have an important place in the school as active leaders. With AIAS and the Tau Sigma Delta Architecture Honors Society, students gain from the reciprocals of mentorship and the opportunity to serve as mentors. The school has the largest AIAS chapter in the nation providing a unique and special opportunity for leadership development among the students. To the benefit of the school, the AIAS has forged a strong link with the profession in the region and beyond. The social component of the AIAS involvement has infused a sense of family within the department.

I.1.3.D - Architecture Education and the Profession: The graduation requirement of 500 internship hours documented through IDP truly sets the program apart from others across the country. As a result, students feel a part of the profession before they leave school. Since few schools have implemented this level of requirement, it provides an example others may wish to consider.

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria
Realm C: Leadership and Practice

C.1. Collaboration – With the team-based interdisciplinary course ENV101/L as a first-quarter experience, faculty teams representing the disciplines of the ENV teach interdisciplinary teams of first-year undergraduate students. Students collaborate on a team project in which they study urban conditions through documentation, analysis, and project proposal and development. Later in the curriculum, the required course ARC 403/L, taught by architecture and landscape architecture faculty, provides another collaborative experience.

For graduate students ARC 506/L, the urban lecture and studio, provides a framework for collaboration. Students work in collaboration in several courses throughout the program.

3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA

Donna Dunay, FAIA

G.T. Ward Professor of Architecture

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

School of Architecture & Design

College of Architecture and Urban Studies Virginia Tech

Blacksburg, Virginia 24060

(540) 231-5512

ddunay@vt.edu

Representing the AIA

F. Michael Ayles, AIA, NCARB

Principal, Business Development

Antinozzi Associates, PC

271 Fairfield Avenue

Bridgeport, CT 06604

(203) 377-1300

mayles@antinozzi.com

Non-voting member

Rose Anne Garcia Kings

Professor of Architecture/Architect

Orange Coast College

2701 Fairview Road

Costa Mesa, CA 92626

(714) 494-5020

rkings@occ.cccd.edu

Representing the AIAS

Ms. Taylor Chan

1720 S. Michigan Avenue, #1503

Chicago, IL 60616

(626) 535-3890

tchan3@hawk.iit.edu

Representing the NCARB

John P. Ehrig, FAIA, LEED

Vice President

Helman Hurley Charvat Peacock Architects, Inc.

222 West Maitland Boulevard

Maitland, Florida 32751

(407) 644-2656

(407) 628-3269 fax

jehrig@hhcp.com

Representing the ACSA

Jori Ann Erdman, AIA, NOMA, LEED®AP

Director

School of Architecture

Louisiana State University

136 Atkinson Hall

Baton Rouge, LA 70803

(225) 578-6885

(225) 578-2168 fax

jerdman@lsu.edu

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Visiting Team Report
8-12 February 2014

IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

