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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments

The team observed the Department of Architecture at Woodbury University to be centered in the context of a well-established institution of more than 100 years of tradition as an excellent and rapidly emerging professional program in architectural education.

The School of Architecture and Design constitutes more than half of the student body of the university. The Department of Architecture with more than one-quarter of the population has the potential to become an even larger and more central component of the institution. The Strategic Plan of the university seeks to maintain a balance with its traditional programs in Business and Liberal Studies.

The president and vice-president of Academic Affairs are well aware of the potential for the development of the program and have supported the development of the San Diego Campus, which is functioning in parallel with the program based on the main campus. The opportunities for engaging the cross-cultural aspects of the region are exceptional.

The Dean of the School of Architecture and Design also recognizes the excellent quality, opportunities, and potential of the program and is committed to their development and integration of the design programs of the school and the traditional programs of the university.

The Department of Architecture at Woodbury University is located within the dynamic architectural urban design and planning context of Southern California and has engaged a substantial number of active, talented, and dedicated faculty and adjunct faculty members to serve all programs.

The current departmental leadership is very strong and dedicated to the full integration of all programs into a dynamic educational model to serve the region through design excellence and active engagement within the Burbank, Hollywood, and San Diego programs.

There have been recent and significant changes in the leadership of the program since the previous accreditation visit and it is evident that there is a need to clarify the administrative and academic processes of the multiple programs in order to ensure long-term academic and resource development.

2. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

Criterion 4: Be aware of the diversity of architectural history and traditions throughout the world. Previous Team Report: The structural presentation of non-western architecture is nowhere evident. Given the diverse nature of the student population, this omission is inconsistent with the otherwise broad-based intentions of the program.

The visiting team believes that this criterion has been met at the awareness level, although there is still need for further development as discussed in criterion 12.11
Criterion 23: Understand the basic theories of lighting, acoustics, environmental control, and building systems and energy management. Previous Team Report: Clear evidence of the basic theories of environmental controls was provided, but insufficient evidence of the understanding of lighting, acoustics, and energy management was provided.

This criterion is now met. Refer to criterion 12.18

Criterion 27: Understand the problems related to the use of hazardous and toxic materials in new and existing buildings. Previous Team Report: While awareness of hazardous and toxic materials was included as part of code review in the Architectural Practice course, no evidence of understanding this material was provided.

This criterion is no longer a requirement. However, this criterion has been subsumed in the NAAB 1998 Conditions and Procedures under criteria 12.19, 12.24, 12.25, and 12.27.

Criterion 35: Be able to assess, select, and integrate structural and environmental systems into building design. Previous Team Report: The integration of environmental systems into building design is not clearly evident in the exhibited samples of work, even though there is ample evidence of the integration of structures.

The visiting team believes that this criterion is met, although further development is recommended. Refer to comments for criteria 12.22 and 12.29.

3. Conditions Well Met

Woodbury University possesses a strong program with many unique components that contribute to a high-quality education in architecture. The spirit of the faculty is only rivaled by the enthusiasm and hard work of its students. The collegial attitude that penetrates all aspects of the Architecture program is generative of a competent and viable learning environment.

Special acknowledgment should be given for the preparation of a well-written, thoroughly detailed Architecture Program Report (APR); extraordinary site preparation of the Team Room; and a special exhibition of student, faculty, and alumni/ae work as well as examples of student work at every student’s desk. In addition, the exhibition of student, faculty, and alumni/ae work was of a character, quality, and sensitivity rarely seen in any university setting.

4. Conditions Not Met

Whereas all conditions were met based on the observations of the team, it is clear that several conditions were only minimally met. Please refer to the commentary provided in detail within the report for further explanation of these concerns. There is the concern that the program is outperforming its resource support based on an exceptional commitment by the full- and part-time faculty as well as administration and that there is the potential risk of burnout over the long term.

5. Causes of Concern

The following needs are causes of concern to the visiting team:

To clarify the role of the School of Architecture and Design within the context of the Woodbury University as to the aspirations of the institution with regard to enrollment goals and resource and development potential.
To recognize that the Department of Architecture must have clear lines of academic and administrative responsibility. As stated by the President, the Dean and Department Chair must be fully responsible for their respective programs including academic and administrative issues.

To incorporate the resource potential of the architectural profession and related professions the design, planning, construction, product design, and digital communications industries within the leadership structure of Woodbury University through active participation on the Board of Trustees.

To explicitly include the faculty and projects of the program as important components of the community development and fund-raising and resource development efforts of the institution.

To fully recognize the current energy and dedication of the students and faculty and to ensure that adequate support is provided to maintain the exceptional level of performance over the long-term development of the program.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

Programs must respond to the relevant interests of the five constituencies that make up the NAAB: education (ACSA), members of the practicing profession (AIA), students (AIAS), registration board members (NCARB), and public members.

1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context

The program must demonstrate that it both benefits from and contributes to its institutional context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program has clearly demonstrated that it is central to the mission of the institutional context of Woodbury University not just through having a significant proportion of the student population and its mission of professional education. It has also clearly demonstrated its potential for becoming an even greater force within the institution by addressing the diverse and dynamic cross-cultural issues of the urban area and Southern California region.

1.2 Architecture Education and Students

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the location of the Burbank–LA and San Diego campuses within the context of Southern California, the school is particularly well situated to embrace the cultural differences inherent in a diverse social fabric. The opportunities to experience diverse settings is expanded upon for those students who attend the summer sessions in Barcelona and Paris as well as the fourth-year studies in Hollywood. The infusion of transfer students from surrounding community colleges further adds to the spectrum of backgrounds and experiences of the student body. There is a sense of excitement, especially at the San Diego campus, of being a part of the formation of something truly new, energetic, and positive. Students have a strong and unique sense of ownership in the program.

The faculty and university have demonstrated a strong commitment to student leadership and involvement through the support of branch entities in San Diego and Hollywood, which offer incredible opportunities for student growth. Although both the Woodbury student chapters of the AIAS and ARC have shown incredible strength in past years, their activity and membership have lost pace. Careful attention should be taken to ensure that San Diego students are encouraged to participate in the events and opportunities available through these student organizations.
Access to faculty members is very good despite the dependence on adjuncts who often go out of their way to provide additional instruction and support. The faculty and their involvement in national and internationally prominent endeavors is a strong link for the students to the broader context of the profession.

1.3 Architecture Education and Registration

*The program must demonstrate that it provides students with a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program at Woodbury has attracted students with a high degree of motivation and focus toward licensure and traditional practice. The curriculum develops the students from an initial elementary degree of understanding of the profession to a strong sense of the practice of architecture and architects’ responsibilities to their clients and the public as a whole. Dialogue with the faculty and the students provided evidence that the requirement of knowledge of technical matters and of the professional conduct of a practicing architect was being achieved.

1.4 Architecture Education and the Profession

*The program must demonstrate how it prepares students to practice and assume new roles within a context of increasing cultural diversity, changing client and regulatory demands, and an expanding knowledge base.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the Los Angeles and San Diego campuses have strong connections with their respective architectural communities. Essentially most faculty members are involved in practice, and a very active adjunct faculty brings to the students a high level of understanding of their roles and responsibilities in the profession.

1.5 Architecture Education and Society

*The program must demonstrate that it not only equips students with an informed understanding of social and environmental problems but that it also develops their capacity to help address these problems with sound architecture and urban design decisions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program demonstrates a thorough commitment to the role of the architect in society. There is ample evidence throughout the design studios that the social, cultural, environmental, and economic forces are thoughtfully considered. The cities of Los Angeles and San Diego are laboratories for many of the studio projects. The Hollywood Center for Community Research and Design (CCRD) is a required part of the curriculum (fourth year) for the Burbank students. All of the projects undertaken within the CCRD are done in collaboration with a diverse set of community partners and work is developed in response to specific social issues and needs.
Studio work at the San Diego campus is also involved with the city as a laboratory of cultural, physical, and environmental issues. Border issues are particularly important and some impressive partnerships are being developed with public officials from the city of Tijuana.

Environmental concerns are represented in the program and in the work of the faculty. The recent construction of studio spaces for other departments within the school represents an excellent demonstration project for principles of passive design strategies. The AR 384 studio involves one faculty member who works with each of the studio sections to integrate principles of sustainability into the studio projects.

It is clear that the informally adopted motto of "build the right thing" has been incorporated into the mission, curriculum, and actions of the program.

2. Program Self-Assessment

The program must provide an assessment of the degree to which it is fulfilling its mission and achieving its strategic plan.

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

The program assessment provided in the APR is an accurate reflection of the issues identified in the course of the team visit. In addition, the on-site interviews and meetings demonstrated an exceptional willingness to communicate the details of the issues and the ability to provide appropriate positive responses.

3. Public Information

The program must provide clear, complete, and accurate information to the public by including in its catalog and promotional literature the exact language found in Appendix A-2 [of the NAAB 1998 Conditions and Procedures], which explains the parameters of an accredited professional degree program.

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

The Woodbury University catalog and Web site include the statement required (Appendix A-2). The Guide to Student Performance Criteria is provided on the Web site and in the syllabus provided for each class offered by the department.

4. Social Equity

The program must provide all faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with equitable access to a caring and supportive educational environment in which to learn, teach, and work.

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

Woodbury University has a stated policy of not providing tenure. This is clearly understood by the faculty and staff. All compensation is regarded as low compared to national, regional, or competitive institutions. The intangible benefits at Woodbury have been seen to offset financial remuneration. Most faculty members state the spirit and true appreciation of the students as their
reason for involvement with the Woodbury program. The institution also benefits from the wealth of high-quality professionals in the area wishing to teach. As a result the institution, the students, and the professionals benefit. In addition, the support of the faculty with technology, office space, assistants, and travel allowances to attend conferences is virtually nonexistent. The concern is the strong commitment to the program could deteriorate with relatively short notice and faculty members could choose to teach elsewhere. This would severely damage the program. A detailed study of appropriate support and financial remuneration of all faculty should be undertaken. Of particular concern is that the adjunct faculty members, which Woodbury depends on to a high degree, could with relatively short notice switch their loyalties.

5. Human Resources

The program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, administrative and technical support staff, and faculty support staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum condition is met at the present time as the program is the beneficiary of a unique and dynamic architectural professional environment within the region. At present, there is a small full-time faculty and a high dependence on an adjunct faculty. This environment creates an interactive student-faculty relationship that enhances the quality of the professional and academic goals.

The faculty is very excited about its participation in the evolution of this program. They are very dedicated; however, it is recognized that the compensation levels, especially for adjunct faculty, are significantly below the national standards in which most institutions strive for equity in compensation relative to experience and expertise. The concern is that this dedication be recognized and sustained through appropriate compensation and support for technology and enrichment programs.

The requirements for human resources have been met but some aspects are clearly stretched. The chair of the program, Norman Millar, is a very effective administrator and he benefits greatly from the Assistant Chair, Vic Liptak, and the San Diego Director, Jay Nickels. Heather Kurze works effectively with this team and she is responsible for four other departments in the school. Support staff is comparatively low and each of the administrators has heavy administrative responsibilities. Each of the department administrators also teaches. All full-time faculty members are expected and encouraged to publish and/or pursue professional practice and they are very productive. The program includes a large number of adjunct faculty members who are active professionals. The emphasis on practice is recognized and appreciated by the students.

6. Human Resource Development

Programs must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth within and outside the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opportunities for the development of the program’s human resources are clearly outlined in the APR and have been verified to be adequate through the site visit by the team. There are several issues, however, regarding the clarity and distribution of resources given the multiple-
campus operations of the program. This lack of clarity is based on the historical evolution of the programs; the individuals involved; the previous agreements regarding position, title, and academic responsibility; and fiscal management.

Every effort must be made to balance the resources for the parallel programs on the multiple campuses especially with regard to the issues of human resources development. The fact must be clear that although there are differential resource investments, such as the new facilities in San Diego, these must be balanced with the facility investments throughout the program.

The focus must be on the equitable distribution of resources for both institutional and individual programs to support their development both as basic needs and in special recognition of exceptional achievement. Given the quality of the program, there should be numerous opportunities for the enrichment of resources for students, faculty, and staff.

7. Physical Resources

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Woodbury architectural program is located in facilities at three locations:

1. The Burbank–Los Angeles campus
2. The San Diego campus
3. The Center for Community Research and Design (CCRD)

Within the three locations, space is currently sufficient to accommodate all program activities, although faculty offices at the Burbank campus are located in temporary quarters that are cramped, requiring faculty members to share offices. These offices are relatively remote from the architecture studios, are of poor quality, and are not conducive to student advising. In addition, many design studios at the Burbank campus would benefit from alterations providing for cross-ventilation.

The San Diego campus occupies a leased downtown office building including space for considerable expansion. Likewise, the three-story CCRD located on Hollywood Boulevard in Los Angeles (where design studios are taught) has additional expansion space.

The facilities in Burbank and San Diego are fully accessible. The Hollywood Studio, a special program as well as a somewhat temporary facility, is accessible only on the first floor; the offices and design studios at the upper floors are not. Accommodation in the past has been accomplished by rearranging program space. This does not fully meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

The minimum standard of all educational spaces regardless of their special circumstances should be in compliance to afford every opportunity to staff, students, and visitors.
8. Information Resources

The architecture librarian and, if appropriate, the staff member in charge of visual resource or other non-book collections must prepare a self-assessment demonstrating the adequacy of the architecture library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In proximity to the architecture students on the Burbank campus, the architectural collection is located within the LA Times University library and meets the requirements for quantity, scope, and media. In addition to the volumes available here, students may obtain access to the holdings of a network of institutions across the state through the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC). Online databases including the Avery Architecture Index may also be accessed through the school's network or remotely from the Woodbury University Web site. The architectural collection serving the students of the San Diego campus is housed in and reinforced by the main campus library of Mesa College, which is a 20-minute drive from the Woodbury San Diego facilities. While this is not an inordinate distance and many of the San Diego students are familiar with the Mesa campus, having transferred from this program, these students may be better served by moving Woodbury's titles to the new San Diego building, which has ample space to house such a collection. Precise definition of the budget and development policy of the San Diego collection needs to be communicated with the library staff in Burbank in order to maintain the integrity of both collections.

9. Financial Resources

Programs must have access to institutional support and financial resources comparable to those made available to the other relevant professional programs within the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information provided within the APR does not provide for a definitive comparison of expenditures within the two architectural programs (Burbank and San Diego) or the professional programs within the university. Therefore, a detailed and direct comparison cannot be determined as was discussed with the central administration. The issues outlined are fully understood as needing clarification and development by all administrators involved. Endowments are held only at the university level. The board has established a goal to expand the endowment to twice the university's annual operating budget (an endorsement of approximately $50 million). The current level is reported to be $7 million and no disbursement is planned until at least $25 million has been accumulated. It is recommended that a collaborative effort with the department be instituted to achieve more aggressive fund-raising by utilizing the exceptional outreach potential of the program to reach critical institutional and community needs as well as private sector corporate industries.

10. Administrative Structure

The program must be a part of, or be, an institution accredited by a recognized accrediting agency for higher education. The program must have a degree of autonomy that is both
comparable to that afforded to the other relevant professional programs in the institution and sufficient to assure conformance with all the conditions for accreditation.

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

The issues concerning the need for clarification are outlined in Section 5, Causes of Concern.

11. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

The NAAB only accredits professional programs offering the Bachelor of Architecture and the Master of Architecture degrees. The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include three components—general studies, professional studies, and electives—which respond to the needs of the institution, the architecture profession, and the students respectively.

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

The team is satisfied that this requirement is met at the Burbank and San Diego campuses. The APR does not provide a comprehensive description of the combined Mesa College–Woodbury curriculum and should provide this in the future. A review of the Mesa catalog confirms that the criterion is met.

12. Student Performance Criteria

The program must ensure that all its graduates possess the skills and knowledge defined by the performance criteria set out below, which constitute the minimum requirements for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice.

12.1 Verbal and Writing Skills

Ability to speak and write effectively on subject matter contained in the professional curriculum

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

There is evidence of the ability to succinctly convey complex analysis and concepts about the built environment in the studio assignments. This is nowhere more apparent than in the comprehensive degree project proposal and final presentation. Elsewhere in the curriculum, the emphasis on effective and professional communication could be taken a step further. Theory and History courses could be taken beyond short-answer analysis and reading response towards a deeper and more protracted mode of synthesis in written communication. Logic, syntax, and grammar errors are evident at all levels of the curriculum, giving rise to a concern that this is a skill set to be carefully examined and fostered in every student.

12.2 Graphic Skills

Ability to employ appropriate representational media, including computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]
Graphic skills are superior and should be commended. Grasp of the importance and interdependence of various media including computer technology, hand drafting, rendering, and modeling is excellent. By the end of the fifth year, students are at an advanced capacity to generate highly effective visual compositions, which are as compelling as they are informative and logical.

12.3 Research Skills

Ability to employ basic methods of data collection and analysis to inform all aspects of the programming and design process

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

Throughout the curriculum, the importance of research and well-considered analysis is clear and present. In-depth consideration of building systems and formal precedent is carried on in many of the upper-level studios and technical courses. By the commencement of the comprehensive degree studio, students have evolved a professional and thorough manner of investigation. Proper documentation of resources, however, is of some concern as many assignments are deficient in adequate acknowledgment of the data sources. This is not only relevant to maintaining standards of honesty but, more important, to ensuring the accurate and efficient retrieval of necessary data should the need arise to replicate the analysis.

12.4 Critical Thinking Skills

Ability to make a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of a building, building complex, or urban space

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

Students are capable of adapting and applying analysis techniques to various scales and conditions of the built environment. The investigation of building systems brings these techniques to the forefront. Skills are further evolved in the complex context of the urban fabrics of Los Angeles, Burbank, Hollywood, and San Diego.

12.5 Fundamental Design Skills

Ability to apply basic organizational, spatial, structural, and constructional principles to the conception and development of interior and exterior spaces, building elements, and components

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

Students are endowed with a phenomenal capacity for spatial configuration and articulation. The resolution and interrelationship of interior, exterior, and intermediary spaces are excellent. It is apparent that the curriculum emphasizes a simultaneous consideration of plan and section conditions, thereby inspiring a wealth of innovative solutions to design problems. Students are capable of incorporating intensive applications of a wide array of structural systems to accomplish their conceptual and formal intents.
12.6 Collaborative Skills

Ability to identify and assume divergent roles that maximize individual talents, and to cooperate with other students when working as members of a design team and in other settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team was very impressed with the collaborative nature of the student work as well as the exceptional collaborative effort required to prepare the school for the site visit.

12.7 Human Behavior

Awareness of the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationships between human behavior and the physical environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The social issues of human behavior and the physical environment are clearly addressed in many of the studios at Burbank, Hollywood, and San Diego. HI 207 and HI 208 provide a broad understanding of civilization, but it is not evident that the issues of these courses are related to the design of the physical environment. Given the importance of human behavior issues throughout the curriculum, the program would benefit from core readings, presented in the appropriate course, on issues related to human behavior and the physical environment. The APR does not provide evidence of any readings that provide this basic awareness.

12.8 Human Diversity

Awareness of the diversity of needs, values, behavioral norms, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures, and the implications of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The context and program provide an excellent environment for the understanding and exploration of human diversity.

12.9 Use of Precedents

Ability to provide a coherent rationale for the programmatic and formal precedents employed in the conceptualization and development of architecture and urban design projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.10 Western Traditions

Understanding of the Western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape, and urban design, as well as the climatic, technological, socioeconomic, and other cultural factors that have shaped and sustained them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.11 Non-Western Traditions

Awareness of the parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress has been made on this criterion since the last visit. The awareness of non-Western traditions is being met at a minimum level, and continued progress should be encouraged. Awareness of non-Western architecture is primarily addressed in AR 257, World Architecture 1. The course requires a five-page essay on a non-Western building. Evidence of these papers was not presented in the team room (one paper on a Catholic cathedral in Mexico was presented) but it was observed in student presentations. The syllabus for the course does not indicate any lectures on non-Western architectural history and traditions. The textbook (Kostof) acknowledges a preoccupation with the Western tradition but "we have created gains in understanding when it is assessed in the light of alternate orders." The response in the APR identifies a number of special events and lectures but these are not part of the core curriculum. The APR notes the challenge to identify qualified faculty but this challenge is not an unusual one. It should be possible for current faculty to gradually develop additional lectures, particularly in AR 257, to "enhance the awareness of parallel and divergent canons."

12.12 National and Regional Traditions

Understanding of the national traditions and the local regional heritage in architecture, landscape, and urban design, including vernacular traditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.13 Environmental Conservation

Understanding of the basic principles of ecology and architects’ responsibilities with respect to environmental and resource conservation in architecture and urban design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.14 Accessibility

Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

Students receive instruction and are examined on the accessibility requirements for buildings both externally and internally, although certain graduation-level projects do not clearly delineate accommodation for the disabled.

12.15 Site Conditions

Ability to respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and design of a project

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.16 Formal Ordering Systems

Understanding of the fundamentals of visual perception and the principles and systems of order that inform two- and three-dimensional design, architectural composition, and urban design

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.17 Structural Systems

Understanding of the principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces, and the evolution, range, and appropriate applications of contemporary structural systems

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.18 Environmental Systems

Understanding of the basic principles that inform the design of environmental systems, including acoustics, lighting and climate modification systems, and energy use

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.19 Life-Safety Systems

Understanding of the basic principles that inform the design and selection of life-safety systems in buildings and their subsystems

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]
12.20 Building Envelope Systems

Understanding of the basic principles that inform the design of building envelope systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.21 Building Service Systems

Understanding of the basic principles that inform the design of building service systems, including plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.22 Building Systems Integration

Ability to assess, select, and integrate structural systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, building envelope systems, and building service systems into building design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although a variety of courses teaches students the systems that make up a building and the importance of coordinated system integration, individual degree projects vary in exhibiting the consideration of environmental systems and life safety systems in the framework of the building design. This condition is met at a minimum and needs further development within the program.

12.23 Legal Responsibilities

Understanding of architects’ legal responsibilities with respect to public health, safety, and welfare; property rights, zoning and subdivision ordinances; building codes; accessibility and other factors affecting building design, construction, and architecture practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.24 Building Code Compliance

Understanding of the codes, regulations, and standards applicable to a given site and building design, including occupancy classifications, allowable building heights and areas, allowable construction types, separation requirements, means of egress, fire protection, and structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.25 Building Materials and Assemblies

Understanding of the principles, conventions, standards, applications, and restrictions pertaining to the manufacture and use of construction materials, components, and assemblies

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.26 Building Economics and Cost Control

Awareness of the fundamentals of development financing, building economics, and construction cost control within the framework of a design project

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.27 Detailed Design Development

Ability to assess, select, configure, and detail as an integral part of the design appropriate combinations of building materials, components, and assemblies to satisfy the requirements of building programs

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.28 Technical Documentation

Ability to make technically precise descriptions and documentation of a proposed design for purposes of review and construction

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.29 Comprehensive Design

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

Students are capable of disciplined and thorough investigation and presentation of projects that vary in approach from ordered and sublime to novel and frenetic. The coursework shows a path of evolution towards the final comprehensive degree project in which students employ a range of systems and urban considerations in addressing the spatial resolution of programmatic needs. While the selection of materials and assemblies is evident, the resolution of wall sections is lacking and needs to be addressed with the inclusion of large-scale wall sections as a studio project requirement.
12.30 Program Preparation

Ability to assemble a comprehensive program for an architecture project, including an assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and an assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is evidence that the students have the ability to develop the programmatic requirements for a comprehensive project.

12.31 The Legal Context of Architectural Practice

Awareness of the evolving legal context within which architects practice and of the laws pertaining to professional registration, professional service contracts, and the formation of design firms and related legal entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.32 Practice Organization and Management

Awareness of the basic principles of office organization, business planning, marketing, negotiation, financial management, and leadership as they apply to the practice of architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.33 Contracts and Documentation

Awareness of the different methods of project delivery, the corresponding forms of service contracts, and the types of documentation required to render competent and responsible professional service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.34 Professional Internship

Understanding of the role of internship in professional development and the reciprocal rights and responsibilities of interns and employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.35 Architects' Leadership Roles

Awareness of architects' leadership roles from project inception, design, and design development to contract administration, including the selection and coordination of allied disciplines, post-occupancy evaluation, and facility management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.36 The Context of Architecture

Understanding of the shifts which occur—and have occurred—in the social, political, technological, ecological, and economic factors that shape the practice of architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.37 Ethics and Professional Judgment

Awareness of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgments in architecture design and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Program Information

1. History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2001 Woodbury University Architecture Program Report.

In 1884, Los Angeles was a rapidly growing city with a population of approximately 11,000. New business enterprises were being established and community leaders looked forward to expansion and growth. Woodbury College was established by educator and entrepreneur F.C. Woodbury to service the needs of this growing business community. The historic link between Woodbury and the world of business has been maintained throughout the years.

In 1925, Woodbury was chartered by the State of California as a Collegiate Educational Institution of higher learning to confer both graduate and undergraduate degrees. In 1938, the Division of Professional Arts was established to focus on three fields of design that are closely allied to business. With the addition of interior design, fashion design, and graphic design majors, Woodbury became a college of business administration and design.

Woodbury College was accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in 1961. In 1969 the school changed its charter with the addition of a graduate program leading to a Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.). In 1972, Woodbury College became a nonprofit institution of higher learning. In 1974, it became Woodbury University. Computer Information Systems was added as a major in 1982. In 1984 the university added a major in Architecture, which has become its largest single program today. That program received NAAB accreditation in 1994. Also in 1994, three new Arts and Sciences majors were added: Psychology and Management, Politics and History, and Liberal Arts and Business.

In 1996, in a joint effort with Mesa Community College, Woodbury opened an additional campus in San Diego to provide access to an accredited architecture program. Also in 1998, the major in Interior Design was changed to a major in Interior Architecture, and the university changed from a quarter system to a semester system. In the year 2000, the university added majors in Communications and Animation Arts, followed by an E-Commerce major in 2001.

Since 1996, the federal government has defined Woodbury University as a Hispanic Serving Institution, and in 2001, Woodbury University received a $2.2 million Title V grant from the federal government to fund several important projects. These include a complete renovation of the institution's management information system, funding for improvement in the teaching of basic skills and foundation courses, and support for faculty development and technology in the classrooms.

The university is currently organized into three schools: the School of Architecture and Design, which has departments of Animation Arts, Architecture, Fashion Design, Graphic Design, and Interior Architecture; the School of Business and Management, which has departments of Accounting, Business and Management, Computer Information Systems, and Marketing; and the School of Arts and Sciences, which has a department of Humanities and a department of Natural and Social Sciences and provides all university departments a full range of general education courses.
For the first 103 years, Woodbury was located in central Los Angeles. In 1937, new facilities at 1027 Wilshire Boulevard were occupied, and for 50 years that location served as the classroom and administrative building. In 1985, Woodbury acquired a [9-hectare] 22.4-acre campus (the former home of one of the nation’s oldest convents) that straddles the border of Burbank and Los Angeles. New classroom and administration buildings were added in 1986 and the university moved in 1987. The North Hall residence hall was completed in 1990 and new architecture studios were completed in 1996. In 2001 the University Board of Trustees approved a 10-year Master Plan for campus development that includes a new Design Center, a new campus cafe, a new amphitheater (all to be completed by fall 2001), a new architecture studio building, new classroom buildings, an expansion to the library, a new faculty center, a new student services and fitness center, and a new residence hall. Also in 2001 the San Diego Campus moved to a new larger facility, centrally located in the city’s downtown business district.

Woodbury has a current graduate and undergraduate enrollment of 1,450 students with more than 50 percent of those in the five Architecture and Design majors and more than 25 percent in the Department of Architecture. The university, responding to its mission of professional education, now anticipates growth to 2,000 students in the coming decade.

2. Institutional Mission

The following text is taken from the 2001 Woodbury University Architecture Program Report.

Woodbury University is committed to providing the highest level of professional education in its undergraduate and graduate programs. Our goal is to prepare graduates who are articulate, ethical, and innovative life-long learners.

Woodbury University has a vision to be a leading professional university, distinguished by its graduates who are skilled in their chosen fields, well grounded in liberal studies, effective facilitators of change, and strong ethical leaders.

Woodbury University values a liberal arts-based, professional education that effectively prepares students for their careers. Woodbury University values being student-centered in all aspects of its operations, and it values empowering students to determine and manage their own destinies. Woodbury University values diversity, integrity, ethical behavior, and academic rigor.

3. Program History

The following text is taken from the 2001 Woodbury University Architecture Program Report.

Woodbury’s architecture major began in 1984 under the direction of Don Conway. Beginning with 10 students in modest facilities at the downtown location, the program expanded both facilities and enrollment with the move to the Burbank campus and the acquisition of NAAB candidacy status.

With the appointment of Louis Naidorf as department chair in 1990, the program took further important steps toward accreditation. Studio space was greatly enlarged and shop and review space created. The library collection was expanded to satisfy NAAB criteria and additional full-time faculty members were appointed. The curriculum was strengthened, a study-abroad program in Paris was introduced, and the computer capabilities were enhanced and integrated into the design process.
In 1994, Woodbury’s architecture program achieved NAAB accreditation. Louis Naidorf was promoted to dean of the School of Architecture and Design and Geraldine Forbes became the chair of the Department of Architecture. Under her direction, the program continued to grow in enrollment and stature. The curriculum was refined, additional full-time faculty members joined the program and important connections were forged with Union de Escuelas y Facultades de Arquitectura Latinoamericanas (UDEFA) and Conferencia Latinoamericana de Escuelas y Facultades de Arquitectura (CLEFA), the academic associations of the faculty and students of Latin American schools of architecture. In 1996, additional architecture studio space was added to accommodate the growing enrollment. After the 1997 NAAB visit, Woodbury’s accreditation was extended through 2002.

In 1997 the university decided to expand the architecture program to a campus located in San Diego, in a joint effort with Mesa Community College. Geraldine Forbes was promoted to assistant dean of Architecture and Design and director of the newly forming San Diego campus. Stan Bertheaud assumed the position of interim chair and Jay Nickels was hired to fill the newly created administrative position of assistant chair for the department. The architecture library holdings were greatly increased for the new San Diego location. The department opened up the Hollywood Community Design and Urban Research Center (CD+URC) on Hollywood Boulevard under the direction of Peter DiSabatino. The study-abroad program was expanded to include Barcelona and Paris, and a metal shop was constructed adjacent to the wood shop. Two new full-time faculty positions were added to the program in the 1997–98 academic year.

In fall of 1998, approximately 30 transfer students became the first to enroll in the third year of Woodbury’s architecture program at its new San Diego campus on the former Point Loma Naval Training Center. The campus was outfitted with a new shop and computer lab, seminar rooms, and studio space. After a team visit in the spring of 1999, Woodbury’s NAAB accreditation was extended to include the San Diego branch of the department. Norman Millar became the chair of the Department of Architecture in the fall of 1999 and filled a newly added full-time faculty position. Under his direction, the full-time faculty further refined the curriculum and began to develop a new program mission and strategic plan. To more fully ensure the successful implementation of the new curriculum, a full-time faculty member was assigned the responsibility to teach in and coordinate each of the 10 studio semesters of the program. First-year students were given dedicated studio space for the first time. Additional equipment was added to shops and computer labs at both locations and their hours of operation were greatly increased. A new 3-year “green” lecture series funded by a grant from Toyota Motor Sales was instituted. The name of the Hollywood program was changed to the Center for Community Research and Design (CCRD), it was moved to an improved larger location, and Jeanine Centuori took over as director. Since 1999 Woodbury students working under the direction of faculty members Stan Bertheaud, Teddy Cruz, Jennifer Siegal, and Gerry Smulevich have won national, regional, and local design awards.

In 2000, after 10 years of building up Woodbury’s Department of Architecture and School of Architecture and Design, Dean Louis Naidorf retired and Heather Kurze was appointed the new dean. Geraldine Forbes was promoted to dean of the San Diego campus, and she was elected secretary of the ACSA. Leasing a storefront for three sections of studio increased San Diego’s space. The department gained two new full-time faculty positions, bringing the total to three in San Diego and six in Burbank–LA. The Woodbury faculty and students began winning national, regional, and local design awards at an increasing rate, and our graduates have entered leading graduate programs and professional offices.
In 2001, after the graduation of San Diego's inaugural class of students, Geraldine Forbes took a leave of absence from the position as San Diego's program director. Jay Nickels was appointed San Diego's interim director and Victoria Liptak assumed the position of interim assistant chair of the department. During the summer of 2001, the San Diego program was moved to a new, larger location in the central downtown business district. A search to permanently fill the position of director of the San Diego program was initiated in the summer of 2001, and the position is expected to be filled by the summer of 2002.

Architecture students now play an active role in national and international student organizations. Woodbury is the U.S. representative institution of CLEFA and hosted CLEFA's international conference in Los Angeles in October 2000. The Woodbury branch of AIAS hosted a national conference in Los Angeles in December 2000.

Jeanine Centuori, director of the CCRD, and Paulette Singley, coordinator of history and theory, organized a new program called the Hollywood Urban Studies Collaborative. The program will be a joint effort between Woodbury University and other institutions such as Iowa State, which plans to send students and faculty from its College of Art and Design in spring 2002. Students in the program will take one or two 3-unit courses at Woodbury and a design studio with their own Iowa faculty at the CCRD. The department sees this as an opportunity to further enhance the architectural education of its students through the exposure to students and faculty from sister institutions.

The department currently enjoys the position of being the largest department in the university. Its faculty members are well known in academe and in the professional community of greater Los Angeles and San Diego.

4. Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2001 Woodbury University Architecture Program Report.

Current Mission Statement
Revised, Spring 2000
University endorsement, Fall 2000

The department's mission is to provide an excellent architectural education in an open, creative, and spirited environment that recognizes and promotes the potential of its students and faculty.

Specific Scholastic Identity

The Department of Architecture offers a 5-year, nationally accredited, professional Bachelor of Architecture degree. Located on the Pacific Rim, the Southern California region and its megalopolis, stretching from Los Angeles through San Diego to Tijuana, present a vital and diverse context within which to examine architecture, urbanism, culture, and the natural environment. The department sees its student population, which reflects this same vitality and diversity, as its greatest asset.

The Architecture program at Woodbury University combines architectural education with a comprehensive foundation of humanist scholarship preparing students intellectually to perform effectively and ethically in an ever-changing global society. The Department of Architecture emphasizes, analyzes, and debates the role of the architect-citizen as cultural communicator and builder responsive to societal, cultural, and environmental
challenges. We integrate into the design curriculum recent innovations in computer-aided design, multimedia, and sustainable technologies.

Students within the department are expected to master five areas of study pertinent to all architecture:

- Critical thinking—the ability to build relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple cultural and theoretical contexts
- Design—the inventive and reflective conception, development, and production of architecture
- Building—the technical aspects, systems, and materials and their role in the implementation of design
- Representation—the wide range of media used to communicate design ideas including writing, speaking, drawing, and model making
- Professionalism—the ability to manage, argue, and act legally, ethically, and critically in society and the environment.

With campuses located in Burbank-Los Angeles, Hollywood and San Diego, and a summer program in Barcelona and Paris, Woodbury University offers students a variety of urban experiences that enhance their architectural education.

5. Program Strategic Plan

The following text is taken from the 2001 Woodbury University Architecture Program Report.

The initial development of the Program Strategic Plan started in the fall semester 1999 at a series of full-time faculty meetings that were held on a weekly basis to rewrite the curriculum, update the program mission, and develop a strategic plan. Regular faculty meetings continue on a monthly or twice-monthly basis as needed and include full-time faculty members from both locations. The final form of the Program Strategic Plan was adopted by the architecture faculty, followed by the School of Architecture and Design, and the university administration in the summer of 2001. It directly parallels the university's Strategic Plan that was adopted a year earlier in 2000.

An 8-year timeline for implementation of the plan divided into four phases of 2 academic years each is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>1999-00</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>2004-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complete strategic plan is available in the 2001 Woodbury University APR.
Appendix B:  The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
R. Wayne Drummond, FAIA
University of Nebraska
College of Architecture
210 Architecture Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0106
(402) 472-9212
(402) 472-3806 fax
wdrummond2@unl.edu

Observer
Ron McCoy, AIA
Director, School of Architecture
College of Architecture and
Environmental Design
Arizona State University
P.O. Box 871605
Tempe, AZ 85287-1605
(480) 965-3536
(480) 965-0968 fax
ron.mccoy@asu.edu

Representing the AIA
Ronald L. Skaggs, FAIA
HKS Architects
1919 McKinney Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201-1753
(214) 969-3370
(214) 969-3397 fax
rskaggs@hksinc.com

Representing the AIAS
Christopher S. Reynolds
1914 Murray Avenue, Apt. 38
Pittsburgh, PA 15217
(412) 656-8568
reynolds@andrew.cmu.edu

Representing the NCARB
Lee P. Bearsch, FAIA, AICP
Bearsch Compeau Knudson
Architects & Engineers, PC
41 Chenango Street
Binghamton, NY 13901
(607) 722-0007
(607) 723-4121 fax
Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Saturday, March 9

Afternoon
Team members arrive. Individual transportation (student greeters) to the hotel
Team chair picks up rental SUV

7:00 p.m.
Meeting of team and School of Architecture and Design dean and department chair dinner and program orientation

Sunday, March 10

9:00–10:30 a.m.
Team-only breakfast at the hotel

10:30 a.m.–1:00 p.m.
Team meeting in the Team Room. APR review and assembly of issues and questions. Overview of Team Room with chair, assistant chair, and the dean. Initial review of exhibits

1:00–2:00 p.m.
Lunch with program administrators on the Woodbury Quadrangle Lawn. University representatives are as follows:
Heather Kurze Dean, School of Architecture and Design
Norman Miller Chair, Department of Architecture
Jay Nickels Director, San Diego Campus
Vic Liptak Assistant Chair, Department of Architecture

2:00–3:00 p.m.
Tour of the Burbank–Los Angeles campus

3:00–5:00 p.m.
Review of student work in the Team Room

5:00–6:00 p.m.
Enterance meeting with faculty in the lecture classroom, Architecture complex

6:00–7:30 p.m.
Woodbury Architecture exhibit and team welcome reception with alumni/ae, consulting board, local professionals, administration, faculty, and students in the New Design Center central gallery

7:30–9:00 p.m.
Catered dinner with the president, dean, chair, students, faculty, and alumni/ae guests in the Cabrini ballroom

9:30–10:00 p.m.
Team debriefing in the Team Room followed by return to the hotel

Monday, March 11

7:00–8:00 a.m.
Breakfast with the team and then meeting for travel with the dean, chair, and assistant chair

8:00–11:00 a.m.
Drive to San Diego and team meeting

11:00–11:45 a.m.
Tour of the library at Mesa College

12:00–1:00 p.m.
Welcoming reception and lunch at SD campus with faculty, students, alumni/ae, and consulting board
1:00–2:00 p.m. Entrance meeting with students only (no faculty)
2:00–3:00 p.m. Meeting with Jay Nickels, SD director, and a tour of the SD campus
3:30–6:00 p.m. Observation of studios and exit meeting with the SD director
6:30–8:00 p.m. Dinner with program administrators and selected faculty members at a San Diego restaurant
8:00–10:30 p.m. Drive back to the hotel, team meeting and discussion en route

Tuesday, March 12
7:00–8:00 a.m. Breakfast with the chair
8:00–8:30 a.m. Travel to the CCRD in Hollywood
8:30–9:30 a.m. Meeting with Jeanine Centuori, CCRD director, and faculty and a tour of the facilities and work
9:30–10:00 a.m. Return to Burbank–Los Angeles campus
10:00–11:00 a.m. Entrance meeting with University President Ken Nielsen and Vice-President for Academic Affairs Zelda Gilbert in the president’s conference room
11:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m. Entrance meeting with Dean of Architecture and Design Heather Kurze in the dean’s conference room
12:00–1:00 p.m. Lunch with the faculty in the Hensel Hall Board Room
1:00 p.m.–2:00 p.m. Entrance meeting with students only (no faculty) on the main deck
2:00–4:30 p.m. Studio observation and Team Room review
4:30–6:30 p.m. Continued review of student work in the Team Room
7:00–9:00 p.m. Team dinner at the restaurant
9:00–10:00 p.m. Team debriefing and return to the hotel

Wednesday, March 13
8:00–9:00 a.m. Breakfast with the chair at the hotel
9:00–11:30 a.m. Continued review of exhibits and records, meeting with the library director, Barbara Bowley, and seminar observation (World Arch. 1, Design Comm. 2)
11:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m. Meeting with faculty members only (no program administrators) in the Hensel Board Room
12:30–1:30 p.m. Lunch with student representatives in the Cabrini Ballroom
1:30–6:00 p.m. Seminar observation (Pro Prac 1, Environmental Systems) Complete review of exhibits and records
6:30–8:00 p.m. Team only dinner at a restaurant
8:00–11:00 p.m. Accreditation deliberations and drafting of the Visiting Team Report (VTR)

Thursday, March 14
8:00–9:00 a.m. Breakfast with the dean and chair and check-out of the hotel
9:15–10:15 a.m. Department-wide exit meeting with faculty and students in the Cabrini Ballroom
10:15–11:00 a.m. Exit meeting with the university president and vice-president for Academic Affairs in the president’s conference room
11:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m. Exit meeting with the dean of Architecture and Design in the dean’s conference room
12:00 p.m. Lunch and team member departures
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully submitted,

R. Wayne Drummond, FAIA
Team Chair

R. Wayne Drummond, FAIA
Team Chair

Representing the ACSA

Ronald L. Skaggs, FAIA
Team member

Representing the AIA

Christopher S. Reynolds
Team member

Representing the AIAS

Lee P. Bearsch, FAIA, AICP
Team member

Representing the NCARB

Ron McCoy, AIA
Observer