1. Please enter the name of your institution

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

2. What impact did the change to remote teaching have on student ability to successfully progress through the program and meet student criteria, including challenges to ensure all students had an equitable and accessible experience?

The challenges students encountered were a mixture of those due to the pandemic, and others due to online learning.
- unreliable internet access
- some students had to move back home and attend classes from a different time zone
- some students had to share computing resources with family members
- many students did not have dedicated work space free from interruptions
- students could not build physical models

Remote learning in general worked better for most students. By having courses untethered from physical spaces, a few courses that ran a portion of the content asynchronously allowed more flexibility for students to manage their time. The perpetual problem of parking and the time lost to driving and searching for a parking space was eliminated.

It took some time to master how to run a studio but once it was figured out using software like Conceptboard, teaching became fairly similar to the studio experience.

Large lectures were a bit more troubling, while efficient and easier to schedule (given there wasn't a need for space) in the online mode it is more difficult to register student response to material. Students continue to participate in class and prepare in alignment with their inclinations.

3. What did the program learn from this process; what was valuable; what were the new ways of thinking; and what changes does the program plan to make to improve the process and/or change the curriculum based on what was learned?

We discovered that many courses can be taught online successfully.
- students pay more attention
- more attendance / no tardiness
- saves a lot of time (no commute, no waiting)
- direct access to digital data (drawings / images) via screenshare is an advantage
- we are in the process of re-thinking how to strategically mix remote and in-person teaching, to combine the best of both for greater efficiency while also building a learning community.

Online was not the catastrophe that many had speculated. Perhaps the gravity of the situation caused students and faculty to step up to the challenge, in a way we would not have done, if not for the

pandemic. We will be identifying what course material must be addressed in person verses what can be done effectively online. Students lament the loss of social time with their classmates, however before CPPARC had permanent work stations, students discovered opportunities to meet with peers. For example, public lectures were more of a social opportunity and less of an obligation. The profession has had to make similar adjustments and may not return to previous work behaviors. This period has compelled faculty and students to work in modalities more in alignment with practice, likely a benefit for students stepping out into practice. Moving to an all-digital medium upsets many traditionalists but it is actually more in line with the professional skill set the students will face. The absence of physical models is a concern but virtual reality looks primed to fill in, saving time and materials, with fewer hazards to fingers. The future will continue to use new techniques and modalities for exploring design and communicating outcomes. Physical models have always cultivated an appreciation of craft but a digital model has the capacity to measure or quantify form and materials. This may actually prove to foster new curricular areas in construction management and documentation that was never within our grasp.

4. What has been the economic impact to the program in terms of lost revenue and additional cost incurred to teach virtually?

The university is a trickle-down process and as the university lost revenue due to an investment in on-campus housing, this revenue was lost and that gap was passed on to departments. The extra cost of making the conversion was offset in a small way but more importantly we are now discovering the need for technology that allows analog input via touch screen that is an additional cost to faculty and/or the Department that the university is not covering. Large format tablets for more hands-on input and class management would also be a help. On the other side, the time saved and gas not purchased instructors have reinvested in their teaching.

5. Please indicate any areas the NAAB should be aware of, or issues that might need to be addressed in the Conditions or Procedures, based on the changes that have occurred in the program?

The principle changes that have impacted our students have been the conversion to the semester system. The university failed to recognize that campus facilities were designed to support a 30-student class size. The shift to the semesters increased class size and left the administration scrambling to schedule classes with insufficient classrooms to accommodate 45 to 50 students. More students and less constant contact time with the students only served to degrade the learning experience. The administration has after many years of apathy, recognized that Architecture students admitted to the university are of the highest caliber in the California State University system, due to limited affordable alternatives CPPARC is the best deal in the state, with a tuition cost 1/10th of some of our private school neighbors, adding to the long line of very qualified and gifted applicants. The latent demand has led administration to expand enrollment, which statistically looks favorable given the quality of incoming students, but the resources needed to teach the extra students has not materialized. The quality of the students remains high but clearly there are some admitted students that would not have been admitted in past years.