CANDIDACY ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REPORT

MASTER OF ARCHITECTURE 1

(PRE-PROFESSIONAL DEGREE + 66-72 GRADUATE CREDITS)

WOODBURY UNIVERSITY

DR. KENNETH R. NIELSEN, PRESIDENT
president@woodbury.edu
818.252.5101

DR. DAVID ROSEN, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
david.rosen@woodbury.edu
818.252.5116

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

NORMAN MILLAR, AIA, DEAN
norman.millar@woodbury.edu
818.252.5130

BARBARA BESTOR, GRADUATE PROGRAM CHAIR
barbara.bestor@woodbury.edu
818.767.0888

Burbank/LA
7500 Glenoaks Boulevard, Burbank/LA, CA 91510
818.252.5121
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Woodbury University School of Architecture thanks the many members of the university community who contributed to this report. In particular we acknowledge the contributions of Nedra Peterson, Director of Library Services, Tamara Blok, Registrar’s Office, Kenneth Jones, Vice President of Finance and Administration, Steve Dyer, Vice President of Information Technology and Planning, Celeastia (Cleo) Williams, Director of Enrollment Services, Richard Nordin, Vice President of University Advancement, Don St. Clair, Vice President of Enrollment Management and University Marketing, and Phyllis Cremer, Associate Vice President of Student Development. We also thank the many staff members who work in these offices.

We gratefully acknowledge the moral and intellectual support of David Rosen, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs. Your leadership continually affirms our vision for the School of Architecture.

Many members of our faculty contributed directly to this report; we thank you for your time and thoughtful assessments. We extend our gratitude to Galina Kraus, Terry LaSource, Nelly Paz, and the School of Architecture work-study assistants for assembling, organizing and formatting data for the report. We are grateful for the precise and speedy expertise of Institutional Researcher Nathan Garrett, and the support of Randy Stauffer and Yvette Escalante for supplying space information and plans. Special thanks go to Andrea Dietz, whose fluency in desktop publishing, excellent eye for composition, and unflappable composure helped bring this effort to completion.

This candidacy report owes a great deal to the reports, proposals, and multiple drafts produced in the School of Architecture over the past three years by Hadley Arnold. The graduate program itself owes its existence to the vision and perseverance of our dedicated faculty, in particular to Paulette Singley, inaugural chair of the program.

We are deeply grateful for the continued support of the Raymond and Maxine Frankel family.

We dedicate this report to the memory of Julius Shulman (1910-2009), pre-eminent architectural photographer of the 20th century, and friend of the Woodbury School of Architecture.

Norman Millar, AIA
Dean, Woodbury School of Architecture

Vic Liptak
Associate Dean, Woodbury School of Architecture
1. Part One – Introduction to the Program ................................................................. 5
  1.0 Who We Are ................................................................................................. 5
    1.0.1 Dean’s Vision ......................................................................................... 6
  1.1 History and Description of the Institution ............................................... 7
  1.2 Institutional Mission .................................................................................. 9
  1.3 Program History ......................................................................................... 10
  1.4 Program Mission ......................................................................................... 14
  1.5 Program Self-Assessment ......................................................................... 15
    1.5.1 Strengths ............................................................................................... 15
    1.5.2 Challenges ............................................................................................. 17
[2. Part Two – Progress Since the Last Site Visit] .......................................... 21 [blank]
3. Part Three – Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation ............... 22
  3.1 Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives ........................................ 22
    3.1.1 Architectural Education and the Academic Context ....................... 22
    3.1.2 Architectural Education and the Students ........................................ 31
    3.1.3 Architectural Education and Registration .......................................... 34
    3.1.4 Architectural Education and the Profession ..................................... 36
    3.1.5 Architectural Education and Society ................................................ 40
  3.2 Program Self-Assessment Procedures ..................................................... 43
  3.3 Public Information ..................................................................................... 48
  3.4 Social Equity .............................................................................................. 48
  3.5 Studio Culture ........................................................................................... 50
  3.6 Human Resources ..................................................................................... 51
  3.7 Human Resource Development .............................................................. 58
  3.8 Physical Resources ................................................................................... 63
  3.9 Information Resources ............................................................................. 70
  3.10 Financial Resources ................................................................................ 85
  3.11 Administrative Structure ....................................................................... 95
  3.12 Professional Degrees and Curriculum .................................................. 104
  3.13 Student Performance Criteria ................................................................. 114

4. Part Four – Supplemental Information
  4.1 Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation .................................................. 4.1-1
  4.2 Student Progress Evaluation Procedure ................................................ 4.2-89
  4.3 Studio Culture Policy ............................................................................... 4.3-96
  4.4 Course Descriptions ............................................................................... 4.4-102
  4.5 Faculty Resumes ...................................................................................... 4.5-168
  4.6 URL for Catalog and Student Handbook ................................................ 4.6-229
[4.7 Assessment from the eligibility visit.] ...................................................... 4.7-230 [blank]
  4.8 Appendices
    A. Lectures, exhibits and visiting critics ...................................................... 4.8A-231
    B. Architecture faculty development ......................................................... 4.8B-242
    C. August 2009 Faculty development workshop schedule .................. 4.8C-246
    D. Faculty Handbook URL .......................................................................... 4.8D-248
    E. School of Architecture faculty search guidelines (draft) .................. 4.8E-251
    F. School of Architecture facilities ........................................................... 4.8F-254
    G. Library Appendix ................................................................................... 4.8G-288
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROGRAM

1.0 Woodbury School of Architecture: Who We Are

With facilities located in Burbank/Los Angeles and San Diego, Woodbury School of Architecture offers a five-year, nationally accredited, professional Bachelor of Architecture degree, a nationally accredited pre-professional Bachelor of Fine Arts in Interior Architecture, and a one-year post-professional Master of Architecture degree in Real Estate Development. In Fall 2009 the School of Architecture admitted its first students to a new two-year professional Master of Architecture program, which became eligible for candidacy for accreditation in July 2009.

Southern California and its megalopolis, stretching from Los Angeles through San Diego to Tijuana, present a vital and diverse context within which to examine architecture, culture and the natural environment, particularly through the lenses of landscape urbanism, emergent building technologies, and entrepreneurship. The school sees its student population, which reflects the region’s vitality and diversity, as its greatest asset.

Woodbury University’s School of Architecture is committed to investigating and extending the social, urban, economic, environmental, technological, and formal dimensions of architecture. The school emphasizes, analyzes, and debates the role of the architect/citizen as cultural communicator and builder responsive to societal and environmental challenges. We integrate into the design curriculum recent innovations in computer-aided design, multi-media, and sustainable technologies. We provide students with a strong skill base, rich interdisciplinary dialog, and generous support resources.

We are an intensely urban school that at the same time recognizes and explores its deep embeddedness in the surrounding landscapes. We focus acutely on the distinct problems and opportunities of socially, culturally, and environmentally sustainable space-making in Los Angeles, San Diego, and Southern California. At the same time, we offer extensive opportunities for international study in Latin America, Asia, and Europe.

We maintain a critical, inventive, resourceful, and exceptionally dedicated faculty representing diverse interests and strengths. We train our students, who are ethnically, economically, and academically diverse, as articulate critical thinkers and highly capable practitioners, confident in local as well as global discourse. Issues of sustainability, responsible advocacy, and appropriate and innovative use of materials and manufacturing processes are raised throughout our programs, and an entrepreneurial spirit of agility and risk-taking is a hallmark of our faculty’s approach.

Woodbury students distinguish themselves in local, regional, and national design competitions and scholarship awards; are valued in the workplace; and often go on to elite graduate schools. Woodbury School of Architecture delivers a strong and effective education that has garnered much regional attention and is poised to gain national prominence. Under Dean Norman Millar’s leadership, enrollment in the school has doubled since 2000.

In response to regional accreditation requirements, Woodbury University as a whole has undergone an immense shift toward embracing a culture of planning. As evidenced by our history below, the School of Architecture has built on its accomplishments and developed new strengths, including constructing a strategic academic plan. This strategic plan outlines the main reasons for establishing a professional graduate program:

(1) We increase opportunities for faculty development with the introduction of graduate students and graduate level courses.
(2) We enrich our student body and the overall student experience across School of Architecture programs by adding a graduate student cohort made up of accomplished design students from diverse pre-professional architectural design education backgrounds.
(3) We raise the profile of the school by introducing a graduate program.
(4) We raise the bar for learning outcomes at the graduate level, giving our best undergraduates a new goal to strive for in vertical classes.

1.0.1 Dean’s Vision

The School of Architecture is poised to emerge as a strong international leader in architectural education. Our vision for the next five-year cycle for the school is to solidify our commitment to critically effective architecture and urbanism, by focusing on issue-oriented problems, challenges and opportunities within the contested landscapes of the American West. Specifically these include:

• The influences associated with the Pacific Rim and our direct connections with Latin America and Asia;
• The challenges associated with sprawl and the growth of our cities such as water supply, energy, transit infrastructure, affordable housing, border issues, climate change, and natural disasters;
• Emerging ideas about building technology, alternative practices, policy, and forms of entrepreneurship;
• The opportunities identified with Southern California as a multi-cultural center of innovative contemporary design and lifestyle.

With this vision for the future in mind, as well as the needs of a growing student body and expanding faculty, Woodbury School of Architecture has recently undertaken the following major initiatives:

• The construction of a new 19,000-square-foot studio and classroom building in Burbank/LA designed by Rios Hale Clementi Architects and occupied in Spring 2008.
• Construction of new 27,000-square-foot facilities in the Barrio Logan district of downtown San Diego, occupied in Fall 2008.
• Creation of a Director of Communications and a Communications Office for a rich calendar of exhibitions, publications, and public programs featuring the work of Woodbury students, faculty, and contemporary discourse, expected Fall 2010.
• Fulltime faculty searches in core studios, urban design/landscape urbanism, and emerging technologies, building technology, interior architecture, representation and history/theory.
• Development of emerging technology tools, resources, and programs in San Diego and Burbank/LA, including appointment of a Program Head in Technology in Fall 2009.
• The establishment of a two-year MArch graduate program, with admission of its first class in Fall 2009 and a NAAB candidacy visit planned for Spring 2010.
• Pursuit of a five-year $2.875 million Department of Education grant available to Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) to Promote Post-Baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans (PPOHA). The PPOHA grant will support planning and establishing a new three-year MLArch graduate program at our San Diego facility, with admission of its first class planned for Fall 2010 and a plan for accreditation by Spring 2015. The PPOHA grant will also support faculty development, new technology and graduate student assistance for the School of Architecture.
1.1 History and Description of the Institution

In the late 19th century, 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 driven by a real estate boom. In 1884, responding to the needs of the city’s growing business community, F.C. Woodbury, an educator and entrepreneur from San Francisco, arrived and founded Woodbury Business College, as it was initially named. The link between Woodbury and the economic infrastructure of Southern California began from a historic storefront on North Main Street in the center of the local business community. By World War I, Woodbury had established a solid reputation for individual instruction - an approach that continues today.

In 1926, Woodbury was chartered by the State of California as a Collegiate Educational Institution of higher learning to confer both graduate and undergraduate degrees. In 1931, the Division of Professional Arts was established at the college to focus on three fields of design closely allied to business. With the addition of programs in Interior Design, Fashion Design, and Graphic Design, Woodbury became a college of business administration and design.

In 1937, despite a worldwide recession, legendary President R.H. “Pop” Whitten led the effort to build new facilities at 1027 Wilshire Boulevard. For 50 years that location served as the classroom and administrative building.

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 (MBA). In 1972, Woodbury College became a non-profit institution of higher learning. In 1974, Woodbury College became Woodbury University. Computer Information Systems was added as a major in 1982. In 1984 the university added a major in Architecture.

In 1985, after 103 years in central downtown Los Angeles, Woodbury acquired a 22.4 acre campus (the former home of one of the nation’s oldest convents) that straddles the border of Burbank and Los Angeles in the San Fernando Valley. New classroom and administration buildings were added in 1986 and in 1987 the university moved in.

In 1987, the Weekend College program for working adults was established with the aid of grants from The Fletcher Jones Foundation and The William Randolph Hearst Foundation.

The North Hall residence hall was completed in 1990.

In 1994 the architecture program received its initial three-year NAAB accreditation term. That same year, the university formally organized its undergraduate and graduate programs into three schools: the School of Architecture and Design, with departments of Architecture, Fashion Design, Graphic Design, and Interior Design; the School of Business and Management, with departments of Accounting, Business and Management, Computer Information Systems, and Marketing; and the School of Arts and Sciences, with departments of Humanities and of Natural and Social Sciences to provide a full range of general education courses. Also in that same year, three new Arts and Sciences majors were added: Psychology and Management, Politics and History, and Liberal Arts and Business. New architecture studios were completed in 1996. In 1997 the architecture program was reaccredited by NAAB for a five-year term.

In 1998, in a joint effort with Mesa Community College, Woodbury opened a facility at the Point Loma Naval Training Center in San Diego to expand access to an accredited architecture program.
to students in that border region. 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. The growing San Diego architecture program was moved to a larger facility centrally located in the city’s downtown business district in the summer of 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 included 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.

In 2001 the University Board of Trustees approved a 10-year Master Plan for campus development prepared by Louis Naidorf, then Dean of the School of Architecture and Design. The old basketball gymnasium was converted into the new Design Center in 2001. The new Woody’s Cafe and auditorium with a capacity of 300 was completed in 2002.

In 2002, programs in Organizational Leadership were initiated in the Weekend College at the graduate and undergraduate level. In 2004, the Faculty Association adopted a Faculty Senate mode of governance. In 2005, the department of Architecture initiated a 12-month post-professional master’s degree in Real Estate Development for architects at its facility in San Diego, the department of Interior Architecture was accredited by FIDER (now CIDA), and anticipating a bid for accreditation by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the School of Business and Management refined its name to the School of Business, which included the departments of Accounting, Business & Management, and Marketing. Kirby Hall, a new tension structure studio building, was completed adjacent to North Hall in the summer of 2005.

In 2005, a major gift from the renowned architectural photographer made it possible for Woodbury to establish the Julius Shulman Institute, housed in the architecture program.

In 2006, the School of Arts and Sciences was reorganized into the Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies (ITS), housing the departments of Math and Natural Science, Art History, Academic Writing, Politics and History, and Interdisciplinary Studies. A continued surge in enrollment justified the decision to build a new 20,000-square-foot School of Business building and a 250-seat auditorium on the main quad, a new 15,000-square-foot architecture studio building parallel to Glenoaks Boulevard in the architecture complex, and a new 200-car parking lot on the upper campus. The parking lot was completed in the summer of 2006 and the two new buildings were occupied in Spring 2008.

In January 2007, the School of Architecture and Design was reorganized into two new schools: the School of Architecture and the School of Media, Culture & Design, which included the Animation, Communication, Fashion Design, Graphic Design, Interior Architecture and Psychology departments.

In 2008, the School of Business satisfied the requirements to become a candidate for AACSB accreditation. Their accreditation from the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) was renewed for a 10-year term in 2009. In September 2008, the San Diego architecture faculty and students moved to a new 27,000-square-foot facility in the Barrio Logan district of southeast downtown San Diego. In November 2008, Woodbury University achieved National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) accreditation in the departments of Interior Architecture, Graphic Design, Fashion Design and Animation.
Modifications to the former Wilshire Hall to house a new faculty center were completed in February 2009. The new Isaacs Faculty Center provides enough space that, for the first time, each fulltime faculty member has a private office. In July 2009, the department of Interior Architecture joined the School of Architecture.

Woodbury has been immersed in an extensive process in preparation for reaffirmation of its 10-year accreditation by the regional accrediting body, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). WASC’s Capacity and Preparatory Review team visit was in Spring 2008; the Educational Effectiveness Review team will visit in Spring 2010.

Woodbury has a current graduate and undergraduate enrollment of over 1,500 students, with a third of those in the School of Architecture, about a third in the School of Business, and a third in the School of Media, Culture & Design and ITS. The university, responding to its mission of professional and liberal arts education, now anticipates growth to 2,000 students in the coming decade.

1.2 Institutional Mission Adopted 2006

Woodbury University is committed to providing the highest level of professional and liberal arts education. The integrated nature of our educational environment cultivates successful students with a strong and enduring sense of personal and social responsibility. We prepare innovative learners who are adept at communicating and willing to cross the boundaries of knowledge in a rapidly changing and complex world.

Ideals
• Integrity and ethical behavior
• Diversity
• Empowering students to determine and manage their own destinies
• Academic rigor
• Liberal arts-based professional education that effectively prepares students for careers
• Student focus in all aspects of its operations

Educational Goals
The members of the Woodbury community have identified six principles that articulate more precisely what is necessary for the university to achieve its mission:

Academic Quality
In times of great change, standards can change. The university seeks, as it has always done, to add value to the lives of its students through the educational experiences it provides. At the same time, the course and outcomes of learning must adhere to the highest principles and goals. This provides assurance to the students and to the community that the learning at Woodbury University is not only significant but of significant quality.

Innovation and Creativity:
Creativity suggests that one is a maker of knowledge, goods, concepts and not just a receiver of them. Innovation suggests that what one makes is new and forward-looking. We foster the values of innovation and creativity in all members of our community.

Communication
The diversity of forms in which communications take place has swelled, as have the people and places that one must communicate with. In addition to the expanding media, the types of communication have expanded and given heightened importance to visual and physical as well as written and oral communication. We strive to produce good communication and excellent communicators across diverse media and audiences.

Transdisciplinarity
Transdisciplinarity embraces the interdependence of all knowledge and widens the forms of knowing to include emotional intelligences, intuition, and physical knowing. It recognizes the importance of collaboration among the disciplines to solve complex problems. We believe that collaboration of people each able to make a unique contribution is important.

**Social Responsibility**

Social responsibility no longer is merely an option for the educated. At base, social responsibility implies a respect for the planet, a respect for its people and the environment. It asserts that all action has impact on the planet and that understanding that impact and accepting responsibility for one’s actions is the moral and ethical condition for the educated global citizen. Civic engagement has come to embrace principles of sustainability as well as social justice. Members of our community will be socially responsible.

**The Integrated Student**

Because of the principles above, Woodbury University finds it more important than ever to assure that the aspects of a student’s personal and professional life are fully integrated. What one will do as a professional is an outgrowth of what one will become as a person. All parts of the university will work on producing this integrated student.

### 1.3 Program History

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

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 fulltime faculty were appointed. In 1992 the curriculum was strengthened into a B.Arch program and received NAAB candidacy status. A study-abroad program in Paris was introduced, and computer capabilities were enhanced and integrated into the design process.

In 1994, Woodbury’s architecture program achieved NAAB accreditation for a three-year term. 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 fulltime faculty joined the program and important connections were forged with UDEFAL and CLEA, 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 to a five-year term through 2002.

In 1997 the university decided to expand the architecture program to include facilities 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 program. Stan Bertheaud became interim chair and Jay Nickels was hired to fill the newly created administrative position of assistant chair for the department. The library’s architecture 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 coordination 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 fulltime 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 facility on the former Point Loma Naval Training Center. The facility 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 program.

Norman Millar became chair of the Department of Architecture in Fall 1999 and filled a newly added fulltime faculty position. Under his direction, the fulltime faculty further refined the curriculum and began to develop a new program mission and strategic plan. To more fully assure the successful implementation of the new curriculum, a fulltime faculty member was assigned the responsibility to teach in and coordinate each of the ten 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 three-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 next door on Hollywood Boulevard, and Jeanine Centuori took over as its coordinator. In 1999, Woodbury architecture students placed first in the ACSA steel competition and have continued to win national, regional and local design awards regularly since then.

In 2000, after ten years 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 was elected secretary of the ACSA (and later became its president). The San Diego space was increased by leasing a storefront for three sections of studio. The department gained two new fulltime faculty positions, bringing the total to three in San Diego and six in Burbank/LA. Woodbury faculty and students won national, regional and local design awards in growing numbers, and our graduates entered leading graduate programs and professional offices at an increasing rate.

In 2001, after the graduation of San Diego’s inaugural class of students, Geraldine Forbes stepped down as San Diego’s program director. Jay Nickels was appointed San Diego’s interim director and Victoria Liptak became interim assistant chair of the department. During the summer of 2001, the San Diego program was moved to a new, larger facility in the central downtown business district.

The NAAB re-accredited the architecture program in the summer of 2002 with a six-year term.

In the summer of 2002, Dean Heather Kurze and Chair Norman Millar traveled to Korea to sign a memorandum of understanding with Woosong University in Daejeon, establishing an exchange program for design and architecture students. Also during the summer of 2002 tenant improvements were made to the studio spaces on the second and third floors of the San Diego facility, resulting in spaces that more efficiently accommodated student and faculty needs.

Based on the concerns for the clarity of the administrative structure of the program in the 2002 NAAB VTR, Norman Millar spent four days a month in San Diego during Fall 2002 and three days a month during Spring 2003 to oversee the transition to the administrative re-organization at that location. With the re-organization, San Diego Interim Director Jay Nickels returned to the main campus to his previous position as assistant chair. Catherine Herbst was appointed associate chair of the department responsible for administering the curriculum in San Diego, under the direction of the department chair and the dean. Debra Abel was hired as administrative director of the San Diego Campus responsible for all non-academic issues associated with that location, working under the direction of the vice president of Finance and Administration.
Also in Fall 2002, a new administrative assistant position was established in the Faculty Center at Burbank/LA for direct support of the architecture program, and the computer labs in San Diego and LA were expanded to have 17 and 20 stations each. In the spring and summer of 2003, further tenant improvements were made to the San Diego facility, increasing faculty office space and the receptionist area.

During Spring 2004 architecture students organized a series of demonstrations to voice their concerns to the university that adjunct architecture faculty who played important roles in their education were leaving the program because they were underpaid and received no benefits. President Nielsen responded by establishing a new fulltime position for the department in LA, which began the following fall.

In the summer of 2004, the architecture study away programs open to both San Diego and Los Angeles students expanded dramatically. Sixteen students accompanied Chair Millar and Associate Chair Herbst on a six-week program in Korea. The visit included time in Seoul, Daejeon, towns near the DMZ, Busan and Fukuoka, Japan. The Europe study abroad program was expanded to two sections of students with both sections starting in Barcelona and then one moving on to Paris and the other to Berlin. Also in Summer 2004, 20 students and two faculty in a sustainable topic studio traveled to Chile for ten days. In another sustainable topic studio, 20 students and two faculty traveled throughout the American West for ten days. In the fall of 2004 a group of 15 students and two faculty traveled to Rome for ten days.

In Fall 2004, Woodbury ended its agreement with Mesa College to teach the first two years of the architecture curriculum in San Diego and began to offer all five years at that facility. Still, Mesa continued to be the primary feeder school of transfer students into the third year. Following the recommendation of the 2002 NAAB VTR, Woodbury’s San Diego library holdings were moved from Mesa College to the second floor of the downtown architecture facility. The newly remodeled teaching computer lab was introduced to SD faculty and students. A second architecture computer lab with 20 stations for student use was added adjacent to the existing teaching lab in LA.

In 2004 with an initial gift from the Jeanne Woodbury estate, the university established a portion of its endowment to be earmarked specifically for the architecture program. The gift, which is equivalent to 3.5% of the current university endowment, was dedicated to scholarships for architecture students.

During the 2004-05 academic year, the architecture enrollment in San Diego surpassed all other undergraduate programs except the architecture enrollment in LA, making it conceptually the second largest undergraduate program at the university.

During that year the architecture faculty approved the curriculum for a new Master of Architecture in Real Estate Development for Architects (MArch RED) program to be offered at the San Diego facility. The 3-semester, 12-month post-professional program, under the co-direction of Ted Smith and Jonathan Segal, was opened to individuals with a professional degree in architecture. During the summer of 2005, improvements were made to the third floor in the San Diego facility to accommodate the needs of the new program, which began in Fall 2005 with a cohort of 8 students.

In 2005 the architecture program received a one million dollar gift from Julius Shulman. Half of that was used to initiate a capital campaign for a new architecture studio building. The other half-million was used to establish the Julius Shulman Institute and endowment in the architecture program, with a goal of focusing on his enduring involvement in issues of
modernism including efficiency, environmental sensitivity, social responsibility and client/architect relationships.

Also in 2005 Raymond and Maxine Frankel established the annual Frankel Foundation Award Program to benefit students, faculty and academic initiatives in the architecture and fashion programs at Woodbury. From 2005 on, $50,000 each year has been awarded: $20,000 in faculty development grants, $20,000 in student funding initiatives and $10,000 for special events.

In early 2006, to address the classroom space shortage due to increasing enrollment, design work commenced on the new 15,000 sq ft two-story building at the Los Angeles facility. This highly anticipated and much needed studio space was completed in January 2008.

Jay Nickels stepped down from his position as assistant chair of architecture in July 2006 and Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter was appointed his replacement. Also in the summer of 2006, Dean Heather Kurze took permanent leave from Woodbury when the position of dean of the School of Architecture and Design was discontinued.

During the ensuing months, chairs of the five departments of the school and the architecture faculty came to an agreement that the department of architecture (now 500 strong) should break away to establish a separate school of architecture. Following a fall semester of vigorous debate, the architecture faculty agreed upon a newly reorganized structure for their program and in January 2007 the new School of Architecture at Woodbury University was established, with Norman Millar serving as its director and Catherine Herbst and Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter as its associate directors. In addition to our cyclical NAAB reaccreditation report and visit, academic year 2007-08 was one of intense planning and revisioning in the School of Architecture, including curricular assessment and the identification of long-range goals. In 2008 the architecture faculty approved a re-structuring of its administration, and in the spring of 2009 Norman Millar became the dean of the School of Architecture, with Catherine Herbst chairing the program in San Diego, Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter chairing the program in LA, and Ted Smith chairing the MArchRED program. With the addition of the Interior Architecture department and the creation of the new Master in Architecture program in LA in summer 2009, the structure of chairs leading their departments and programs under the direction of the dean of the School of Architecture has been fully implemented.

In 2007 the Frankel Foundation donated a large collection of the paintings of Jan Stussy to the School of Architecture, with the anticipation that the eventual sale of the collection will establish an endowment to fund the Raymond Frankel and Maxine Stussy Frankel Chair in Architecture by the year 2010.

The NAAB reaccredited the BArch program in 2008 with a full 6-year term and a 3-year focused evaluation to look at progress in Human Resources and Financial Resources. In the summer of 2008 the School of Architecture began to implement its plan for a professional 2-year MArch 1 degree program. The faculty completed a careful and intentional proposal, submitting it to internal vetting through the Educational Planning Committee and the Curriculum Committee in Fall 2008, where it was approved in October. President Nielsen endorsed the proposal and secured the approval of the Board of Trustees in November. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges approved the proposal as a substantive change in February 2009. Dr. Paulette Singley was appointed inaugural chair of the graduate program, and A Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation was filed with the NAAB in May 2009. In June 2009, a new position for accreditation and assessment support in the School of Architecture, associate dean, was created and Associate Professor Vic Liptak took on that role. Students began enrolling in the first cohort of the 2-year MArch 1 program in the summer for courses beginning in Fall 2009. With a full cohort set to register, Dr. Singley stepped down from the chair role in August. The dean saw an
opportunity to engage an important architectural practitioner and educator on a visiting basis, and Barbara Bestor accepted the role of interim chair of the graduate program in September 2009.

Since Fall 2007, the architecture programs have added four additional fulltime faculty: San Diego now has four fulltime faculty and Burbank/LA has eleven, including the first two faculty appointed to the graduate program. With the three fulltime members of the Interior Architecture faculty, the School of Architecture has the greatest number of fulltime faculty in any of the university’s academic divisions (School of Architecture 18, School of MCD 15, School of Business 9, ITS 12, Library 3).

1.4 Program Mission

WOODBURY : ARCHITECTURE : TRANSFORMS

We believe in architectural education as transformative.
We believe in the radical possibilities and relevance of architecture, interior architecture, and landscape architecture – socially, environmentally, and formally.
We are designers of the built environment and critical thinkers who foster the development of other designers of the built environment and critical thinkers.
Woodbury’s students, faculty, and graduates are committed to design that is:

• intelligent – articulates a critical position;
• effective – addresses the challenges of contemporary life; and
• beautiful – fully vested in the transformative power of beauty.

Consistent with the university’s mission, the School of Architecture is committed to the training and education of articulate and innovative design professionals. The curriculum prepares our students to balance the need to work competitively in the marketplace with the equally important concerns of ethical conduct and social responsibility.

1.5 Program Self-Assessment

In addition to the customary procedures for self-assessment the faculty of the School of Architecture has conducted an intensive formal self-assessment over the last 3-year cycle in connection with establishing our new organizational independence, preparing for our 2008 accreditation visit, writing our section of a university Master Academic Plan and developing a proposal for the 2-year MArch 1 program we are reviewing in this report.

The School of Architecture faculty holds retreats each semester. We conducted a Strengths/Weaknesses/Opportunities/Threats exercise in December 2006 and January 2007; performed a Capacity and Preparatory Review as part of the WASC accreditation process (evaluating resources, policies, and finances); and worked throughout the spring of 2007 on an academic plan as part of the university’s master academic planning process. Extensive questionnaires were sent to students and alumni in summer 2007. Our Fall 2007 retreat was naturally focused on preparing for the NAAB visiting team in Spring 2008. During their exit interview following their February 2008 visit, the visiting WASC accreditation team identified the self-assessment procedures of the architecture program as a model for other disciplines at the university to follow. The 2008 NAAB visiting team also identified Self Assessment Procedures as a well-met condition in the BArch program. At our post-NAAB-visit Spring 2008 retreat we focused on looking ahead to the establishment of our MArch 1 program.
In preparation for the next phase in the WASC accreditation procedure the School of Architecture has been immersed in the educational effectiveness review process during the 2008-09 academic year for all of its programs, including the MArch 1 program. The process required further clarification of curricular goals and learning outcomes; identification of when they are introduced in the curriculum and when they are mastered; the establishment of a clear rubric for assessment of those outcomes; and development of a multi-year assessment plan with an internal feedback loop.

These methods of self-assessment have led the School of Architecture to identify specific areas of excellence and weakness in carrying out its mission. On balance, we determined our strengths were sufficient to move forward with our strategic plan to add the professional graduate degree. In our Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation, we proposed building on the program strengths cited in the 2008 VTR as conditions met or well met, and redressing what were weaknesses in the BArch program (conditions not met, minimally met, or causes of concern) as we launched the new graduate program. In addition, the self-assessment we have undertaken for regional accreditation has served us well in providing an overlay or holistic vision of what we currently do well, what we could easily do well with focused attention, and where we are still emerging.

1.5.1 Strengths

We launch the 2-year MArch 1 program from five internally identified strengths:

a. An identity built on core faculty interests
b. An improved and sustainable student-faculty ratio
c. Careful and intentional standards for admission
d. Robust standards for assessing achievement of learning outcomes
e. School-internal and university administration support for School of Architecture administrative structure and leadership (dean’s role, strong chairs, addition of associate dean for academic and assessment support)

a. Core faculty interests: The MArch 1 prepares its graduates for a commitment to the future of architecture and the possibilities of alternative practices fine-tuned to the opportunities of the emergent metropolis. The intersection of Architecture faculty’s wide-ranging interests encompasses the challenges and opportunities of architectural practice through the lens of place, including the Southern California megalopolis, the American West, the Pacific Rim, and global urban and border conditions.

With four new appointments (two new positions, both made possible by the successful enrollment of an inaugural graduate cohort) for the 2009-10 academic year and the addition of Interior Architecture faculty to the School of Architecture, a greater robustness in our fulltime faculty numbers allows us to move away from the model of everyone doing a little bit of everything, which was contributing to faculty fatigue, to a more sustainable model in which individual faculty develop their specific strengths and interests and are not constantly working at overload capacity.

While the two new positions are justified by the launch of the new 2-year Master of Architecture program and its new curriculum, three of the new appointments for 2009-10 are instrumental to the MArch 1 program. Barbara Bestor, as interim chair of the graduate program and visiting professor, embodies the spirit of critical and alternative practice, combining an acclaimed and successful architectural practice with lectures, writings, and graduate teaching. She is a nationally known and highly respected architect and architectural thinker, and she is passionate about architectural education. Her stature extends well beyond the Los Angeles architecture community, and Woodbury University will benefit from her association with our MArch 1
program. Ewan Branda, as a new appointment in History/Theory, brings cross-disciplinary experience to our faculty, having worked professionally in architecture firms before pursuing his Ph.D., and also bringing deep knowledge of emerging information network structures and capabilities in architectural practice to his theoretical research. Linda Taalman, as a new appointment in Building Technology, combines an impressive record of acclaimed professional experience, a deep foundation in building systems integration, and an intellectual curiosity and experimental outlook toward new technologies. Her contribution to the MArch 1 program will be to steep our short-term graduate student cohorts in the exciting combinatorial possibilities of new technologies with fundamental building systems, especially in terms of how this effects sustainable, compelling and appropriate architecture. The fourth appointment, Marcel Sanchez-Prieto, mainly supports the curriculum in San Diego. Marcel will be instrumental to the development of a distinct focus for our future post-professional MArch program in San Diego, which will emphasize urban landscapes, border issues, and alternative practices.

The appointment of Dr. Paulette Singley as inaugural chair of the MArch 1 program placed a longtime core faculty member at the heart of our nascent endeavor. The appointment capitalized on her educational vision and experience, and ensured the successful launch of the new graduate program from inception through inauguration. Her efforts will prove to have had a significant impact on our ability to achieve the successful graduation of our first cohorts and the initial accreditation of this professional program.

The MArch 1 program is underpinned by core faculty strengths; our faculty model alternative practices as we ask our MArch 1 students to construct their own. Associate Professor of Interior Architecture Joshua Stein’s research agenda interrogates the intersection of theory and digital fabrication. Participating adjuncts David Freeland and Mark Owen contribute to this area of inquiry as well. Along with Linda Taalman, these faculty and other adjuncts constitute a strong core for our graduate students to pursue an emphasis in Building Technology. Adjunct research faculty Hadley and Peter Arnold, co-directors of the Arid Lands Institute, focus on the challenges of appropriate development in arid regions, particularly the American West. Assistant Professor Jose Parral brings his expertise in landscape urbanism to our programs, and Professor Jeanine Centuori’s architecture and public-space practice for better community building demonstrates a sophisticated balance of realism and idealism. In combination with the practices of many of our faculty, fulltime and adjunct in Los Angeles and San Diego, we have significant depth in applied landscape urbanism, another emphasis our graduate students can choose to focus on. The graduate program aggregates faculty strengths into a rich and multivalent identity within which students establish their own alternative practice through experiences, networks, and knowledge exchange.

Symbiotically, the graduate program contributes to core faculty development through the new opportunities it offers our faculty to pursue their research work with eager and intelligent graduate students.

b. Student-faculty ratio: We have planned for controlled growth in the graduate program. We believe that student success in a two-year program is predicated on small student-faculty ratios, individual attention and opportunities, and the development of a strong community within the cohort. All our graduate programs cap the student-faculty studio ratio at 15:1, from the 2-year MArch 1 and the existing post-professional Master of Architecture in Real Estate Development (with a usual 12:1 ratio), extending to future professional and post-professional Masters programs as we achieve our accreditation and funding goals and continue our growth. The actual student-faculty ratio in studio is intended to be 10:1 as we grow to full capacity, when we will fill up to three graduate studio sections per level.
Given the commitment to this cap, we will clearly be working with a model that opens a second section after maximum capacity in the first section is reached and we meet minimal enrollment for a second. As we develop a 3-year (seven-semester) first-professional Master of Architecture program for students with a non-architecture-related undergraduate degree, we anticipate blending these students after their first year of study with our entering 2-year MArch 1 students, maintaining the studio ratio between 10:1 and 15:1, and running two or three blended sections of Graduate Design Studio 3 simultaneously. Likewise, Graduate Design Studio 5 would have blended sections of professional MArch 1 students (2-yr and eventually 3-yr) with incoming post-professional MArch 2 students.

c. Admissions: The newness of a program as it is launched is advantageous for determining admission policies that truly support the educational vision and learning outcomes of the program. We have identified the diversity of our student body as a strength of the School of Architecture, and we are committed to maintaining diversity in the graduate program. We seek academically qualified students whose interests and dispositions show an affinity for a transformative graduate experience and a potential for leadership in practice as citizen-architects. With the summer fieldwork semester as the hinge between year 1’s formative curriculum and year 2’s synthetic curriculum (see section 3.12), the willingness to engage in dislocation and transformation is an essential quality we look for in applicants and nurture in the incoming cohort.

Our admission standard is thus articulated as a set of minimum requirements, but we seek in applicants something much greater than satisfaction of the minimum: we look at holistic individuals who will form an integrated cohort, individuals who will challenge each other, debate architectural and educational assumptions, and work together to discover practices that are innovative, meaningful, responsive, and satisfying. Because we limit this program to at most 20 incoming graduate students, we can attend individually to each applicant’s preparation, determine her/his eligibility and potential for success, and then advise each admitted student on the full five semesters of study he or she would undertake, including filling any gaps in the undergraduate education.

Admission to the program requires an earned Bachelor degree equivalent to a 4-year pre-professional degree in architectural studies, a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or better (or a GRE score between 500 and 800), and for non-native speakers of English, a TOEFL score of at least 550. These minimum quantitative measures are supplemented with a qualitative evaluation of the applicant’s portfolio, three letters of recommendation, and a statement of purpose. Qualitative measures are reviewed by a small committee consisting of the graduate chair and two members of the fulltime faculty. In the portfolio we seek evidence that applicants have mastered at least the learning outcomes demonstrated by our undergraduate students entering fourth year. Since we have strengthened our assessment procedure for the undergraduate threshold portfolio (successful submission at the end of third year defines readiness for upper division work), we use a modified version of that assessment instrument to verify preparation of our graduate applicants, and to identify in otherwise strong applicants the need for an additional studio or coursework in the summer before admission to the MArch 1 curriculum. The portfolio assessment instrument may be found in section 4.2.

Applicants are encouraged to come to campus for a tour and interview; for those who cannot visit, a telephone interview helps determine the fit between applicant and program, and helps us construct a coherent cohort. The interview provides the opportunity for the graduate chair and applicant to discuss an individualized full course of study, the options for pursuing one of the three tracks offered, the need to complete any missing preparatory requirements (completion of physics, for example), and the individualized support package including scholarships and a teaching or research assistantship. The foundation of a successful program and a fulfilling
graduate education is ensured by careful selection of students who can make an informed commitment to the professional and academic objectives of our curriculum.

d. Assessment: Again, the newness of the program is an advantage in determining standards for assessing learning outcomes. The School of Architecture has been developing an assessment plan for each of its curricula; each plan includes an alignment of professional accrediting body criteria with school outcomes, a curriculum map, and a schedule for assessing outcomes. Assessment at the program level relies on the faculty-determined standard of assessment applied at the course level. Because the MArch 1 program does not have an entrenched routine in need of updating, and because it is five semesters rather than ten, the assessment standards and plan are straightforward, clear from the start, and written to be part of a feedback loop that contributes to continuous improvement. That is, faculty have intentionally constructed the MArch 1 standards and plan to be practiced, tested and modified based on data collected in the first offerings of the curriculum.

The five tracks of mastery – Critical Thinking, Design, Building, Representation, and Professionalism – are defined by the school as its outcomes and manifested in each program. The five tracks overlay and reinforce the NAAB Student Performance Criteria. The level of achievement for each track is necessarily higher for the MArch 1 program, as graduate students are expected to engage their education from an already accomplished intellectual position. For example, the final MArch 1 studio is a thesis project; this capstone is not just a demonstration that the student has mastered the material that came before, it requires an inquiry that clearly defines a question of architectural interest, a new investigation and a reasonable process to support it, the weighing of arguments and counterarguments, and the production of new knowledge. The thesis demonstrates a deep understanding of each of the five tracks and synthesizes knowledge and skill through its creative and critical solution to the identified inquiry.

Section 4.2 provides a plan for assessing student progress.

e. Structural support: The new administrative structure of the School of Architecture, with a school dean, associate dean for academic support, and department chairs, is an immediate asset to the MArch 1 program. Faculty in the program, both fulltime and adjunct, understand and support the leadership role of the chairs. The structure is also transparent to other academic and administrative units on campus, so communication is facilitated. Graduate students know exactly where to go for answers, as the graduate chair has direct oversight of faculty effectiveness and student learning.

The university administration has endorsed this model and is providing the chair stipend and course release needed. The graduate chair meets regularly with other program chairs to coordinate resources across the programs and identify interdepartmental faculty and student opportunities. The associate dean provides academic support to all programs, especially through management of assessment and accreditation obligations, freeing the graduate chair to develop appropriate curricular responses to the initial graduate cohorts.

1.5.2 Challenges

In our Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation, we estimated that we would need 12 students in the initial cohort to balance the budget the first year. Our first class has eight students, but with clearer figures for faculty and administrative costs, we demonstrate a nearly balanced budget with this cohort. The challenge is to retain all of these students for the full five semesters, and offer a strong enough experience that our second cohort is more robust in number.
While we see a particular strength of our graduate architecture programs being the synergy created by asking students of different educational backgrounds to work together on design problems, it is unclear how the mix of students in a small cohort will affect our curricular plans for the MArch 1. In an entry survey of our eight current students, a strong trend toward research and sustainable practices was seen among their top interests. They overwhelmingly (7 out of 8) intend to become licensed architects, and unanimously hope to establish their own practices. Our emphasis on entrepreneurship, emergent technology, and landscape urbanism, with a focus on professional practice, appears to be the common thread running through the curriculum that ties together the diversity our students bring with them. We will use the term of our candidacy to test both the efficacy of studio and seminar activities and assignments in producing gains in student learning and in small group coherence, and the sequence of the curriculum as it provides for our graduate students to demonstrate mastery of the School of Architecture’s five tracks and fulfillment of the NAAB Student Performance Criteria.

For the first year or possibly two of the program, we will be demonstrating our need for and ability to fund additional administrative support and, crucially, the director of communications. This latter is a position that will serve the whole school but is of special importance for our new program, for visibility and for development opportunities for graduate students and faculty.

Given the identification of human and financial resources as areas not met in our BArch program by the 2008 NAAB visiting team, we place a major emphasis on developing smart financial planning and budgeting, especially given the economic downturn, and on continuing to increase our fulltime faculty. We are actively addressing these two important challenges as follows.

Financial Resources: The School of Architecture vetted its proposal for the MArch 1 through an internal process of review by the Educational Planning Committee (EPC), a faculty governance subcommittee. The EPC requires new programs to demonstrate both alignment with educational goals and appropriate financial planning based on a reasoned range of projected enrollment. Following EPC’s positive recommendation, the president and Board of Trustees approved the new program only with demonstration of both academic fit with the university’s mission and vision and the MArch 1’s potential to be resource-balanced (resources added vs. resources needed) from its inception. The new focus on preparing program plans that consider all resource implications (human, financial, educational) stems from the university-wide effort to develop a Master Academic Plan. Since the summer of 2001, Architecture (at that time a department) has included the professional graduate program as part of its strategic plan, and has tracked its resource allocation and consistently (and increasingly successfully) made its case for university support. Presenting a financially viable proposal has been a top priority for the dean since the establishment of the School of Architecture in 2007.

We have constructed MArch 1 budgets based on conservative projections of enrollment in the program. Given the national economic climate, we are prepared to make smart use of current physical and financial resources, and are poised to grow whenever funding opportunities present themselves and certainly as the economic forecast improves. The university administration, meanwhile, is committed to supporting approved new program initiatives for three years, until those programs can establish a revenue/expense balance. When revenue exceeds expenses, the university is committed to returning part of any net revenue to the program for improvement. We expect to achieve net revenue in the 2-yr MArch 1 program next year.

Section 3.10 presents a detailed analysis of our financial projections for the MArch 1 program, under different scenarios of enrollment.

Human Resources: The financial plan for the program includes growth in fulltime faculty numbers, better compensation for adjunct faculty, who will always play a critical role in the
School of Architecture, and the expansion of the curriculum to provide a first professional 3-year (seven-semester) MArch degree in Fall 2010 and, in Fall 2011, a three-semester 1-year post-professional MArch. The MArch 1 program itself is predicated on a balance between the human resources of students, faculty and staff, a rigorous curriculum and generous co-curricular support (travel and teaching assistantships).

In spring of 2008 the Board of Trustees agreed to a 30% raise in adjunct salaries over the cost of living over a five-year period starting with a 6% raise in year 2008-09. The Board agreed to a 10% raise in fulltime salaries over the cost of living over a five-year period. The first phase of this increase was instituted last year (2008-09), and while the plan to increase compensation for adjunct faculty may be temporarily suspended (a 5% salary increase had been slated for 2009-10, and that may be postponed to 2010-11), the general economic downturn has increased our pool of available adjunct faculty. It makes good sense to invest time and available university resources in developing our current faculty and mentoring new faculty, so that we are better able to retain them when the economy recovers and we can fully implement our compensation adjustment to better compete with other local programs. The MArch 1, MArchRED, and BArch chairs are encouraging adjunct faculty to participate in university-wide faculty development opportunities, both to improve teaching effectiveness and to strengthen the Woodbury Architecture community of teaching scholars. University faculty development workshops take place in August, October and March of each academic year; the August workshop had greater adjunct Architecture participation than ever before, thanks in part to the endorsement of this opportunity by the dean and program chairs.

President Nielsen meanwhile has reiterated his commitment to fulltime faculty, repeatedly citing this as the single most important resource of the university. Successful implementation of the MArch 1 program requires an additional 1.5 fulltime faculty positions for each entering graduate cohort in the 2010-11 academic year; next year we will add 3 new faculty for two new cohorts: the second group of 2-yr MArch students and a first cohort of 3-yr MArch students. These searches will be advertised in Fall 2009.

Among human resource issues for the MArch 1 program, the recruitment of qualified students looms large. Our current cohort is the product of a broad and deep effort by the dean, the inaugural graduate chair, and many members of the faculty to publicize the new program and to attract students who would thrive on the opportunities a new program offers. Retaining this first class and recruiting the second cohort are top priorities, though we expect the inaugural group to be of assistance. Their incoming surveys indicated that each of these students believed he or she would be successful in graduate school, and this has been reported to be the single most reliable factor in predicting success in graduate work. One of our grad students, Michael Rucinski, is already working to start an AIAS chapter at Woodbury, which will increase our visibility with potential applicants as well as provide leadership opportunities to our current students.
2. PROGRESS SINCE THE LAST SITE VISIT: not applicable to this new program
3. COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

3.1 Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

3.1.1 Architectural Education and the Academic Context

The MArch 1 program realizes the dreams of the faculty of the School of Architecture and sets Woodbury Architecture on the path to equal footing with other local programs, all of which offer professional graduate degrees (UCLA, USC, SCI-Arc, Cal Poly Pomona, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, and the New School of Architecture). With its growing body of graduate students, the School of Architecture also achieves a certain educational parity (internally perceived) with the School of Business, which has long offered an MBA and which stakes its viability on its graduate programs. The faculty and students of Woodbury’s MArch 1 program are eager to demonstrate excellence internally and externally and to further promote it.

Academic and professional standards for faculty

The faculty handbook outlines the professional and academic standards expected of the teaching scholar at Woodbury: faculty are expected to have terminal degrees appropriate for their field, or exceptionally strong professional/scholarly achievements in lieu of an appropriate terminal degree. In Architecture, fulltime studio faculty are expected to have a professional degree and a graduate degree, or a professional degree with licensure. Fulltime faculty appointed in Architecture History and Theory are expected to have a PhD. For initial ranking of newly appointed faculty, years of teaching development are also considered. For those without previous fulltime teaching appointments, three years of appropriate professional work can be considered the equivalent of one year of teaching, but no more than nine years of professional experience ($\equiv$ three years teaching) may be substituted.

For rank advancement from assistant professor to associate professor, faculty must demonstrate significant achievement toward the ideals of the teaching scholar in three areas: teaching effectiveness and development, scholarly or professional development and contribution to a larger intellectual discourse, and serious commitment to university service. For advancement from associate professor to full professor, the faculty member must demonstrate that s/he has achieved the highest ideals of the teaching scholar in the same three areas. As Woodbury does not have tenure, for contract renewal faculty at all ranks must demonstrate continued commitment in all three areas at the appropriate level for their rank.

Newly appointed faculty normally have three one-year contracts, and are then eligible to apply for a three-year contract. Faculty who have achieved the rank of full professor may apply for five-year contracts.

Adjunct faculty teaching in the MArch 1 program are expected to meet the same educational and professional standards. The Faculty Personnel Committee is proposing that participating adjunct faculty (those who receive a full one-year contract and who take on departmental duties in addition to teaching) will need to submit evidence of teaching effectiveness and development for peer review before their contracts are renewed. Currently adjunct and participating adjunct faculty are reviewed by their department chair.

For greater detail, please refer to the Faculty Handbook, Section C, Faculty Personnel Policy (see URL in 4.8 Appendix D).
Academic and professional standards for MArch students

Students admitted to the 2-year (5-semester) MArch 1 program are required to have completed a pre-professional bachelor’s degree and to demonstrate by portfolio, transcript, letters of recommendation, and interview that they have met the School of Architecture’s learning outcomes equivalent to those expected of a BArch student entering the fourth year. While preference is given to those who have completed the first four years of a NAAB-accredited 4+2 program, graduates of other architectural studies programs are also considered if they demonstrate the level of achievement described above.

Our MArch 1 students enter with a minimum of 45 units of General Education work, including the math and physics required for our Structures sequence (AR 526 and 527). They have demonstrated communication skills, as evidenced in their written statements of purpose and their interviews. Their portfolios demonstrate that they enter the MArch having already developed and practiced the School of Architecture tracks of Critical Thinking, Representation, Design, Building, and Professionalism.

A significant part of the MArch 1 curriculum requires its students to be co-enrolled with BArch students. The graduate students are expected to perform at a graduate level in these courses, and so the graduate syllabi make clear that expectations for demonstration of the learning outcomes start high and aim higher (see course descriptions in section 4.4). MArch 1 students are expected to remain in good academic standing, maintaining a minimum 3.0 overall and studio GPA throughout their program. Students who cannot maintain this level of academic achievement are placed on probation for a semester, and must demonstrate adequate progress toward re-attainment of this academic standard or be subject to loss of scholarships and assistantships, a leave of absence, or dismissal.

Interaction with other programs in the university

The 2-year Master of Architecture 1 program benefits from and contributes to the university’s commitment to interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary collaboration. The School of Architecture works actively with the three other academic divisions that comprise Woodbury University: the School of Business, the School of Media, Culture & Design, and the Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies. The School of Architecture also has a strong collaboration with the university’s first research center, the Arid Lands Institute.

The Master of Architecture program embraces transdisciplinarity through its three offered emphases – Landscape Urbanism, Building Technology, and Entrepreneurship – as well as through its fieldwork requirement and its commitment to exposing graduate students to both normative and alternative practices. The Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies (ITS) benefits our Masters students by creating and sustaining wider discussions across the disciplines through curricular and co-curricular opportunities. ITS faculty contribute to the graduate architecture education through their participation in studio reviews, their co-teaching with Architecture faculty in History and Theory courses, their support of and contribution to the study-away programs, and their commitment to deliver elective courses of transdisciplinary interest to MArch students, in areas such as Urban Studies.

A prototype of a transdisciplinary course that would be of interest to Masters students was offered this summer in ITS at the upper-division undergraduate level. Reading the West: Text, Landscape and Construction, co-taught by Hadley Arnold, adjunct architecture faculty and co-director of the Arid Lands Institute, and Will McConnell, assistant professor in ITS, offered a transdisciplinary approach to the “meanings” of the “west” in the United States. Students engaged with a variety of texts and methods for reading them by surveying the diverse ways in which Americans have used the landscape to describe, critique, structure and maintain competing notions of civilization. “Text” in this course meant multiple modalities for creating a
message, and included archeological sites, painting, photography, land art, film, and writing. This course would be appropriate for graduate students pursuing an emphasis in Landscape Urbanism.

The Master of Architecture program builds on the strong ties already established between the Schools of Architecture and of Business in the Car Project, their ongoing joint effort to design for the US Mercedes-Benz market. Several architecture studios have investigated the Mercedes-Benz issue, and other collaborations between the schools have been fruitful. For example, last year two first-year Architecture students working with adjunct business instructor Bud Walker won the top prize in the Collegiate Entrepreneurs’ Organization (CEO) competition. The MArch 1 program offers the strongest commitment yet to working with the School of Business, through our Entrepreneurship emphasis. MArch students may take the Professional Component (PC) courses offered by the MBA program as electives, and on completion of the MArch degree move directly into the 1-year MBA program. Students following this emphasis may alternatively focus on real estate development, drawing from our post-professional MArch in Real Estate Development offerings in San Diego, the real estate development seminars offered in the School of Business, and the alternative practices/development studios offered by Professor Jeanine Centuori in the Center for Community Research and Development.

The MArch 1 program benefits from the emergence of the School of Media, Culture & Design (MCD) as a major player in the university as it attracts support from the giants of the film, video and animation industries of Los Angeles and the San Fernando Valley. MCD collaborations with the “industry” include hosting the Burbank International Film Festival, collaborating with ASIFA-Hollywood, the Los Angeles chapter of the International Animated Film Society, working with the SAG (Screen Actors’ Guild) Foundation, and developing a partnership with Video Symphony, an institute providing professional training in digital media production. MCD is also a co-collaborator with the Schools of Architecture and Business on the Car Project.

The Arid Lands Institute (ALI) is the first semi-autonomous research center established at Woodbury University, and directly offers our MArch students opportunities to explore the built environment and its resource issues through their graduate education. The co-directors of ALI, Hadley and Peter Arnold, are longtime adjuncts in the School of Architecture and have offered a summer studio field experience in the American West since 2002. ALI supports student and faculty research in hydrology issues, whether from a landscape urbanism standpoint, from the perspective of emerging technologies, or from an economic or entrepreneurial approach to responsible infrastructure development.

**Faculty contribution to university governance**

Fulltime faculty in the School of Architecture consistently demonstrate their serious commitment to university service as part of what it means to be a teaching scholar. They are active participants on committees and task forces, and play a leading role in faculty governance.

Fulltime architecture faculty members Catherine Herbst, Vic Liptak, Nick Roberts, Paulette Singley, and Gerry Smulevich have served on the Faculty Senate, the governing body elected by the Woodbury University Faculty Association (WUFA); Catherine Herbst was re-elected to a second two-year term as senator from Architecture starting this fall. Paulette Singley served as secretary to the senate in its inaugural year; Vic Liptak served as vice president from 2004 to 2006. In spring 2007, Vic Liptak was elected by WUFA to preside over the senate for a two-year term and serve as dean of faculty. She was re-elected in spring 2009 to a second two-year term. This position was previously held by Randy Stauffer, chair of Interior Architecture. She also served as co-chair of the ad hoc 2006-07 Educational Planning Committee (EPC), whose purpose is to develop the university's Master Academic Plan (MAP) and review academic programs to ensure alignment with the MAP, and she chaired a task force that developed a new WUFA
constitution, ratified in fall 2008. Current EPC members from the School of Architecture include Vic Liptak, Randy Stauffer, and Jose Parral as San Diego liaison.

Stan Bertheaud, Jeanine Centuori, Norman Millar, Joshua Stein and Paulette Singley have served on the elected university-wide Faculty Personnel Committee, which evaluates and makes recommendations to the university president regarding the qualifications of all persons under consideration for faculty appointment, reappointment, advancement, and sabbatical. Paulette Singley is serving a second two-year term as the faculty member from Architecture. This committee is convened by the dean of faculty, and so both Randy Stauffer and Vic Liptak (current convenor) have also served on this important committee.

Architecture professors Jeanine Centuori, Ewan Branda and Linda Taalman and visiting Interior Architecture lecturer Nina Briggs serve on the appointed Academic Appeals Committee, whose purpose is to evaluate any and all exceptions to faculty academic policy in response to individual student petitions, as well as to initiate and recommend policy to appropriate faculty committees and the Faculty Senate.

Nick Roberts served on the university’s WASC Reaccreditation Steering Committee. In conjunction with the Steering Committee’s efforts, three other committees function to fulfill the second and third phases of reaccreditation: a Capacity and Preparatory Review Committee, on which architecture faculty member Gerry Smulevich served, and a Student Success Task Force, on which Paulette Singley, Randy Stauffer and Vic Liptak served. The current WASC committee for the Educational Effectiveness Review counts Norman Millar and Vic Liptak among its members.

Following service on two presidential advisory task forces (Marketing, which considers the restructuring and redesign of the university website, catalogs, brochures, and advertising, and Technology, which identifies university priorities for meeting academic technology needs), Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter began a two-year appointment on the Curriculum Committee this fall, replacing Gerry Smulevich who served for one year. The Curriculum Committee serves as the clearinghouse for all proposals that bear on academic programs and curricula at the university, and it makes recommendations on curricular changes.

Dean Norman Millar and Dean of Faculty Vic Liptak currently serve on the president’s Budget Advisory Committee. Interior Architecture Chair Randy Stauffer serves as special assistant for space planning to the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs, and convenes the presidential advisory Space Planning Committee, on which Vic Liptak serves ex officio. Dean Millar has served on the Development Committee for the Strategic Plan, Academic Programs Committee for the Strategic Plan, numerous university-wide search committees, the Curriculum Committee and the now disbanded Policy Committee.

**Faculty contribution to intellectual and social life of university**

In addition to the ongoing cultivation of interdisciplinary discourse in the classroom, the School of Architecture contributes to the intellectual and social life of the institution through a variety of public programs, including conferences, lecture series, and exhibitions. Architecture faculty are extremely well represented at the university-wide faculty workshops each August, as well as at annual celebrations put on by the President’s Office at the beginning of the school year, Thanksgiving, Christmas and at commencement ceremonies in May.

**CCRD and the San Fernando Valley summits, 2008 and 2009**

Professors Jeanine Centuori and Paulette Singley have reinvigorated the Center for Community Research and Design (CCRD) through an on-going investigation of the San Fernando Valley. In 2008 they brought together city officials and university administrators and scholars for Valley
Summit I: Shifting Focus, and based on that success they spearheaded the Year of the Valley, focusing multiple studios and seminars in 2008-09 on studying the socio-economic and physical urban (sprawl) conditions of the valley. Valley Summit II: Designing the SFV was a two-day conference of scholars held in the Woodbury School of Architecture on Feb. 12 and 13, 2009. The CCRD continues its community outreach mission and acts as a resource and research center for both real and visionary responses to questions about the future of the Valley.

**New Prosperities, Panel Series, Spring 2009**
With an inaugural lecture by Charles Waldheim on the emergence of landscape, and subsequent panel discussions involving engineers, landscape architects, journalists, an historian and social critic, and the head of the AIA/Los Angeles, the series focused on the role of designers in reformulating infrastructure as part of an era of economic and environmental renewal.

**Emerging Asian City symposium, November 10, 2007**
The School of Architecture and the Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies co-sponsored this one-day symposium exploring the re-emergence of Asia into the architectural consciousness, with a complex palette of issues that both challenge and expand the mainstream understanding of architectural theory and practice. The symposium featured presentations by professionals and architectural educators from Woodbury, USC, UCLA, University of British Columbia, and University of Quebec, and was attended by the Los Angeles architecture and urban design community as well as students from USC, UCLA and Woodbury.

**ACSA West Conference, October 12-15, 2006**
A major contribution to the intellectual life of the university came in the fall of 2006 when Woodbury School of Architecture hosted the ACSA West Conference, “Surfacing Urbanisms: Recent Approaches to Metropolitan Design.” Co-chaired by fulltime faculty members Paulette Singley and Nick Roberts, the three-day conference brought 85 academics and practitioners to Woodbury to discuss the future of the city.

**Lecture Series**
The School of Architecture produces an annual public lecture series that brings audiences from across the region to both Burbank/LA and San Diego. The San Diego lecture series has been particularly distinguished. A complete list of lectures from 2007-08 and 2008-09 at both locations is included in section 4.8 Appendix A.

**Public dissemination**
Our faculty’s work is shared with the university and the public in two ways predominantly: in the national and international press, and in presentations and exhibitions in academic and public venues. In the former category, recent examples include Barbara Bestor’s residential projects, repeatedly published in the Los Angeles Times and The New York Times, Jeanine Centuori’s public art/architecture projects published extensively in the architecture and design press, Paulette Singley’s Eating Architecture (MIT 2004) and her many essays and book reviews, Linda Taalman’s highly publicized IT house and DIA: Beacon museum, and Norman Millar’s critical essays in C3 Korea magazine and Space magazine. Presentations by our faculty and exhibitions of their work also contribute to the intellectual life of the university and the architecture community. Among the many notable examples are Catherine Herbst and Todd Rinehart’s exhibit in MIX: Nine San Diego Architects at the Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego, Gerry Smulevich’s presentations on photo-urbanism at the University of Buenos Aires, Roger Williams University, and ELEA XXIII, Eric Olsen’s invitations to international exhibitions in Rotterdam and Milan, Joshua Stein’s lectures on responsive technologies at the Storefront for Art and Architecture in New York, Cranbrook Academy of Art, and the Hochschule Niederrhein in Krefeld, Germany, and Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter’s explorations in façades and in glass as material and meaning, exhibited at the Centre Georges Pompidou in Paris and the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Dean Norman
Millar has lectured or been a panelist at the Los Angeles Armand Hammer Museum, on Capitol Hill as part of the “Examples in Excelencia in Education” briefing, at the Mayors’ Institute on City Design in Austin, TX, and at Woosong University in Daejeon, South Korea.

The faculty of the School of Architecture are committed to increasing our intellectual contributions to the university through greater dissemination of professional work and greater demonstration of teaching effectiveness, in internal public forums like the Faculty Development Workshops, in external public forums such as presentations and lectures at other institutions, and through a concerted publication effort that will be part of the responsibilities of the in-house Communications Office.

**Student contribution to governance and intellectual/social life of university**

Graduate architecture students have similar opportunities to undergraduate architecture students for contributing to governance and the university’s intellectual and social life. They can serve as leaders within the Associated Student Government, the university-wide student governing body, and they have both elected a representative to the Architecture Student Forum (ASF) and can and do attend forum meetings. The ASF graduate representative attends Architecture faculty meetings, as does the Forum chair. The Forum has active initiatives this year to review and revise the Studio Culture Policy, with input from the new graduate cohort, and to organize community service and design opportunities such as working with Habitat for Humanity, TreePeople, and Architecture for Humanity. A graduate student, Michael Rucinski, is working to re-launch the Woodbury chapter of the AIAS. MArch students also may participate in the Woodbury chapter of CLEA, the Congress of Latin-American Students of Architecture.

The university offers additional opportunities for our MArch students, including service on the newly formed Community Honor Council, a group of students, faculty and staff that represents the community’s interest in upholding our standards and values. MArch students may also participate in graduate student events that bring together Masters students studying Business Administration, Organizational Leadership, Architecture and, soon, Real Estate Development (as our video-conferencing capabilities come on line this fall).

The School of Architecture offers public programs every year that enhance the life of the university and provide architecture students, graduate and undergraduate, with opportunities to contribute to campus culture. MArch students will help organize the school’s lecture series, will participate in the annual Schindler Debates, and will exhibit their work in April both as an introductory celebration and as part of the NAAB candidacy visit. As the School of Architecture seeks to expand its public programming and systematic communications, graduate student involvement will be vital to the quality, breadth and identity of the public face of Woodbury School of Architecture. Most importantly, this first cohort of graduate students has an opportunity to invent the role of MArch students in the intellectual life of the school and campus, with the strong support of the Architecture faculty and the administration.

**Contribution of the university to the MArch program in terms of intellectual resources:**

**Faculty opportunities**

The university supports the ongoing intellectual, professional, and creative development of faculty within the School of Architecture through its annual Faculty Development Awards, Frankel Foundation Grants, and sabbaticals. The university also supports faculty through programs and fellowships in the Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies, the Julius Shulman Institute and the Arid Lands Institute, the hosting of faculty development workshops and other faculty development opportunities including Faculty Learning Communities, and through available course release to pursue scholarly and professional development.
Annual Faculty Development Awards
The Faculty Development Committee, appointed through the Faculty Senate, grants awards annually. Award recipients present their work the following year at a faculty colloquium and/or exhibition. In past years, awards to faculty from the School of Architecture have funded scholarly and design activities leading to exhibitions and publications on the architecture of military installations; the relationship between film and architecture; intelligent materials; urban waste harvesting; emerging Asian cities. For the 2009-10 academic year, four of the nine proposals funded by the Faculty Development Committee were submitted by faculty in the School of Architecture: Emily White, adjunct, received funding to attend the 2010 Smart Geometry Workshop; Sara Daleiden, adjunct, received funding for Domestic Hollywood Prototype Production; Professor Gerry Smulevich was funded to attend the International Surface Design Association Conference; and Professor Nick Roberts was funded for research travel to architecture schools in India.

Frankel Foundation Grant Program
Since 2005, $50,000 a year in grants is available to be split between the architecture and fashion design programs. Of that, $20,000 is available for faculty development grants, $20,000 is available for student development and scholarship grants, and $10,000 is available for honoraria and events. Administered through the Office of University Advancement, funds from the Frankel Foundation Grant Program partially fund the School of Architecture’s lecture series, exhibitions (for example, Ramon Ramirez: Postcards from a Shifting Landscape, Burbank/LA, spring 2007), and individual projects, for both students and faculty. Frankel Foundation Faculty Grants have funded faculty work on design proposals, primary research, symposium development, and continuing education. For a complete list of recent awards, please see section 4.8 Appendix B.

Sabbaticals
Fulltime faculty members may apply to the Faculty Personnel Committee for sabbaticals after six years of service. Sabbaticals are granted for the purpose of fostering the professional growth and intellectual enrichment of faculty and for the improvement of programs of courses of study at the university. The awards acknowledge faculty who have displayed exemplary service and whose proposals promise the greatest contributions to their field. Recent sabbatical projects include continuing education in land use, photographic research, and manuscript preparation. For a complete list of recent sabbatical projects, please refer to 4.8 Appendix B.

Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies Fellowships
The Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies provides a variety of means for faculty to focus on the problems of bringing transdisciplinarity and its perspectives into the life of the university. The Senior Fellows Program brings together scholars and practitioners, activists and artists from across the disciplines in order to enrich the educational experiences of our students and faculty. Senior Fellows commit to a period of research, teaching and/or service to the institute and the university for at least one academic term, part-time or full-time; the contribution may take the form of applied or theoretical research that explores the issues and boundaries of transdisciplinarity, the development of pedagogies and curricular programs dedicated to a transdisciplinary vision, the teaching of courses in interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary studies, or any combination of the three. Professor Paulette Singley held an ITS Senior Fellowship in spring 2008 to develop and enhance the history and theory program within the School of Architecture and collaborated on developing the curriculum for a proposed Urban Studies minor.

Julius Shulman Institute
Named for and endowed by the renowned architectural photographer, the Julius Shulman Institute at Woodbury University provides programs that promote the appreciation and understanding of architecture and design.
Created in 2005, the Julius Shulman Institute at Woodbury University focuses on Shulman’s enduring involvement in the principles of modernism. The institute funds lectures, seminars, tours, and special workshops at elementary, middle, and high schools in the area, as well as at community organizations. The Julius Shulman Institute also maintains an archive and research center, with the photographer’s workbooks, books, correspondence, awards, and other artifacts of his career serving as a resource for students and scholars. Since its inception, the Julius Shulman Institute has funded several public programs at the School of Architecture, named its first fellows, and supported the creation of the Arid Lands Institute.

Administered through the Office of University Advancement, the Julius Shulman Institute funded the Los Angeles: City of the Future Exhibition and roundtable, held at the Hollywood Facility in conjunction with LACE, winter 2007. The Shulman Institute also partially funded the exhibition, Mapping Woodbury: 31 Architects in spring 2006. It was at that exhibition of faculty work that the first Shulman Fellows were announced: longtime Woodbury faculty members Teddy Cruz (San Diego) and Jennifer Siegal (Burbank/LA). The fellowships supported Cruz and Siegal’s innovative approaches to architecture by lecturing, teaching and furthering their areas of research in the trans-border region and mobile design, respectively. In 2008-09, the Shulman Institute provided seed money for the launch of the Arid Lands Institute.

Arid Lands Institute
The Arid Lands Institute (ALI) is an education, research and outreach center of Woodbury University that trains adaptive, resourceful and inventive designers and leaders in addressing water scarcity, increased hydrologic variability, and climate change in the arid and semi-arid American West.

This new research center is developing an ALI Fellows Program in which fellows undertake research or study in areas that advance the mission of the institute. Fellows are drawn from the academic divisions of Woodbury and from other outside institutions. Each fellow is expected to make a specific contribution, which may or may not include teaching, to the institute that is outlined in his or her appointment letter. The Fellows program is designed specifically to attract scholars who will enhance and further the work of the institute for a finite (semester- or year-long) term. Institute directors and adjunct architecture faculty members Hadley and Peter Arnold are working to develop funding for the Fellows Program and are encouraging proposals from adjunct faculty who seek to be inaugural fellows.

Faculty Development Workshops and Opportunities
The Office of Academic Affairs, the Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, and the Faculty Association work together to provide meaningful workshops for all faculty, fulltime and adjunct, to develop their teaching effectiveness; scholarly, creative or professional contributions to an intellectual discourse; and commitment to university service. The annual Faculty Development Workshop held on August 21 had more than 85 fulltime and adjunct faculty in attendance, and featured sessions targeted to specific audiences as well as general best practices presentations. The schedule of the Faculty Development Workshop is attached as Appendix C in section 4.8. The vice president of University Advancement participated in one of the sessions discussing how to fund research opportunities, and he has committed to running faculty grant-writing workshops this academic year.

The Faculty Development Committee, an appointed subcommittee of the Faculty Association, has as its main charge the awarding of Faculty Development Grants. This year it has also been charged with developing an online repository of faculty development resources, with the assistance of the systems librarian. Architecture faculty, both fulltime and adjunct, regularly seek external funding of their professional and scholarly interests, and institutional support for these endeavors appears to be increasing.
Available course release
In 2007-08, a Workload and Compensation Task Force reviewed faculty loads and compensation, and presented the president and the Board of Trustees with a series of recommendations. Among these, the task force recommended that the Faculty Association develop guidelines and an evaluation form for faculty to apply for course release in order to pursue scholarship or other faculty development opportunities and responsibilities beyond the normal demand. Course releases are currently available to faculty through arrangement with their chairs, and the Faculty Senate is developing those guidelines and evaluation procedures this fall.

Contribution of the university to the MArch program in terms of intellectual resources:
Student opportunities
The university offers opportunities for the intellectual and creative development of architecture students through the Frankel Foundation Grants program for architecture and fashion design students, administered through the Office of University Advancement. Our grad students are encouraged to identify projects they wish to pursue and submit applications in the fall for funding the following spring and summer. For a complete list of Frankel Grants to students since 2007-08, please see 4.8 Appendix B.

The university has also established an Office of International Studies, which identifies opportunities for international studies and helps match students with those opportunities. Our MArch 1 students conduct a summer semester of Fieldwork between the first and second years of the curriculum, and they may choose to pursue that in one of the School of Architecture’s established study-away programs or in a program identified through the Office of International Studies.

Contribution of the university to the MArch program in terms of personnel
The university provides the School of Architecture in Burbank/LA with a full-time administrative coordinator, Galina Kraus, and one half-time administrative assistant, Terry LaSource. The university has committed to providing additional administrative support as the MArch 1 program grows; administrative assistance will increase by one FTE when the program achieves a positive revenue. The university has also committed to funding the Director of Communications position as soon as the university-wide staff hiring freeze, due to the recession, is lifted.

The university provides funding for a half-time shop master in each location. Both Burbank/LA and San Diego have their own dedicated admissions person for Architecture.

The university fully supported the development of a Title V PPOHA (Promoting Post-baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans) grant proposal, dedicated completely to supporting the School of Architecture’s graduate programs. If that grant is awarded, we will have additional funding for a full-time digital fabrication manager in Burbank/LA and a half-time manager in San Diego, a librarian and writing instructor in San Diego, and an enrollment services staff member in San Diego. The grant would also allow us to move forward immediately with the Director of Communications position.

Importantly, the university has given us its commitment to provide needed full-time faculty in Architecture; each year of curriculum requires an additional 1.5 faculty to cover the added courses, so we are looking to add 3 faculty for 2010-11 (1.5 for the second year of the 5-semester MArch and 1.5 for the first year of the 7-semester MArch), as well as one faculty in 2011-12 and 2012-13 to support the addition of a post-professional graduate student cohort to the final three semesters of the graduate program. The administration is ready to demonstrate its commitment to the development of academic excellence by providing appropriate human resource support to its most successful academic division, the School of Architecture.
3.1.2 Architectural Education and the Students

Woodbury School of Architecture actively supports our MArch students in assuming leadership roles within the school and within the profession.

**Leadership roles in the school**
Within the school, MArch students are involved at a variety of levels of governance and self-governance. Grad students have representation at all meetings of Burbank/LA faculty, and graduate student input is actively solicited. Graduate students will participate actively in the upcoming faculty searches for fulltime appointments in Burbank/LA. The Architecture Student Forum (ASF) has welcomed the new graduate students and encouraged graduate representation; the first cohort will elect a representative in September to serve on the ASF. The mission of the ASF is to promote community among the students; represent the student viewpoint to the architecture faculty in matters of policy; and serve as a conduit for informed communication between students, and between students and faculty. The ASF, with graduate representation, will be reviewing the school’s Studio Culture Policy this fall.

Woodbury has an active chapter of CLEA (Congress of Latin-American Students of Architecture) that regularly participates in the annual ELEA (Encounter of Latin-American Students of Architecture). Graduate students are encouraged to be active in CLEA, and have the same opportunity to attend ELEA and other CLEA-sponsored events.

A graduate student is spearheading the renewal of an AIAS chapter at Woodbury; the School of Architecture fully supports this initiative and will provide seed funding for the chapter.

**Leadership roles in the profession**
In a survey completed the first week of class, the students of the first cohort of the MArch 1 program unanimously expressed a desire to become licensed and to establish their own firms. They have entered the program with professional leadership as their goal; our curriculum will nurture that aspiration through a focus on leadership in Graduate Design Studio 4, Urban Design, and through the thesis preparation and studio courses. In addition, the Professional Practice 2 course (AR 650) will promote IDP planning and completion, and require each student to design an individualized plan to achieve licensure following completion of their Masters degree.

**Cultural diversity**
In a setting where the traditional daytime student body is 33% Hispanic American, 10% Asian-American, 13% Armenian-American, 27% European-American, 5% African American, and 10% international (based on preliminary numbers from Fall 2009 enrollment), exposure to different cultures, backgrounds, and socio-economic status is a matter of course. The School of Architecture embraces diversity as a community strength; respect for difference is basic to our school’s norms and expectations.

Woodbury University is designated by the federal government as a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI); the School of Architecture is building on that designation by pursuing a Title V grant to Promote Post-baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans (PPOHA) to fund expansion of our MArch programs. Our inaugural MArch 1 cohort is 37% Asian or Asian-American and 25% African or African-American; 3 of our 8 students are international. The first graduate class is a celebration of cultural diversity, and reflects both the cosmopolitan nature and attraction of Los Angeles as well as the community-building environment of the university and the School of Architecture.
Setting individual learning agendas
With diversity as the foundation of our first cohort, setting for each graduate student a specific learning agenda responsive to his/her goals is both necessary and desirable. Woodbury faculty recognize each student’s life experience as valid and vital to her or his success in graduate work. The students’ pre-professional studies provide a rich degree of variation and preparation, so beyond the shared core courses (AR 587 Studio 3, AR 533 Graduate Theory, and AR 526 Graduate Structures) students in consultation with the graduate chair are already constructing an individualized education. The three emphases offered in the program: building technology, landscape urbanism, and entrepreneurship, encourage students to choose their electives with a goal larger than the course content from an individual class in mind.

Each graduate student determines appropriate fieldwork for the summer semester, and works in the second fall semester to identify and develop a thesis statement to test during the graduate thesis studio in the second spring. These projects require a great deal of self-reflection, in identifying one’s specific area of inquiry, and self-discipline, in bringing the thesis through research and development to manifesting a design proposal and publicly defending it. A successful thesis depends on mutual respect between the student and his/her advisor; our faculty relish the challenges and rewards of working one-on-one with these passionate, risk-taking, self-driven graduate students in an intellectually rigorous design project.

Setting collective learning agendas
In the incoming MArch 1 student survey conducted during the first week of the fall semester, every one of these students expressed an expectation that she or he would contribute to the formation and development of the program. In this sense, the first cohort has a special opportunity to set the agenda both for itself and for the program. Students identified sustainable technologies and resources among the architectural areas to which they hope to contribute, and most also indicated they were interested in working in experimental or theoretical architecture.

Graduate Studio 3, the first design studio in the 5-semester MArch 1, seeks to engage the cohort both as a set of individuals and as a studio of people working together in these endeavors. Associate Professor Eric Olsen was asked to teach this studio because of his own experimental research and design work in emergent technologies. While the learning outcomes for the studio satisfy several key Student Performance Criteria, one of the studio’s main objectives is to initiate the establishment of this cohort’s identity and help it set an agenda for the next four semesters of work together.

Access to national and international contexts of practice
Drawing on the strength of our diverse student body, the MArch 1 curriculum seizes an opportunity to similarly diversify the pedagogical approach in understanding architectural practice. The spirit of ethical professional behavior motivated by keen observation skills and opportunistic invention guides the curriculum. Built on the premise that dislocation = transformation, the MArch 1 program offers a fieldwork-based curriculum that requires a summer of study in a host city chosen by the individual student.

In the fieldwork seminar, using their foreign or local host city as the classroom to begin thesis preparation, students examine the numerous factors that contribute to shaping the particular city or region. Through primary source readings and direct experiences, the students examine the urban environment of the host location historically and typologically. The parallel fieldwork summer mini-studio employs the study of ‘new’ and ‘old’ existing buildings and sites within the host city, exploring them tectonically through program, structure, materials and details. Design development is stressed, along with cultural/social concerns.

The primary goal of fieldwork is to transform the student’s perspective by asking for close
observation of context, deep analysis, and innovative synthesis in design solutions. Individual students are exposed to new and different contexts, and return for a fall semester of working together to develop thesis statements and projects. These students share with each other the lessons they derived from the diverse contexts of architectural practice they studied over the summer. This opportunity juxtaposes individual and collective learning agendas to deliver an educational outcome greater than the sum of its parts. Graduate thesis preparation (AR 648) is a seminar in which individual experience prior to and including fieldwork contributes to a dialogue about how one understands the context of practice at multiple scales (local, national, international) and how one constructs a practice in response to the complexity of context.

Summer travel studios are a foundation of the Woodbury Architecture curriculum; graduate students may choose to do their fieldwork with one of the established programs. In odd years, Guillermo Honles and Dave Maynard take students to the Mundaneum International Conference on Architecture in San Jose, Costa Rica; in even years they conduct focused urban study trips to Chile or Brazil. Hadley and Peter Arnold, co-directors of the Arid Lands Institute, lead a group of students throughout the desert southwest, studying water infrastructure and city shape in a variety of eras and cultures. Summer study in Barcelona and Paris has been offered at Woodbury since 1997, Berlin was added in 2004, and Rome and Nanjing, China in 2006. Woodbury has offered summer study in Korea and Japan; Professor Nick Roberts has a Faculty Development Grant and a sabbatical in Spring 2010 to develop study opportunities in India.

Summer study-away studios also prepare students for contemporary architectural practice by asking them to work in groups, by turns leading, following, and collaborating, and developing a strong foundation in clear communication and teamwork.

In fieldwork, students encounter and engage the work of allied disciplines, as the multivalent urbanisms of Europe, Latin America, Asia, North America and arid lands require a re-thinking of city form and urban futures, in at least an interdisciplinary if not transdisciplinary endeavor. Fieldwork intensively immerses students in urban design, existing and emergent building technologies, infrastructural engineering, and landscape urbanism, all critical components of the future of architectural practice.

Through fieldwork, graduate students leave the classroom to test their ideas about the world and about architecture’s role in it. On campus, they continue to test those ideas through the opportunities offered by the School of Architecture and other academic divisions. Woodbury Director of International Studies Sebastian Zacharia, formerly a United Nations ambassador to Somalia and a UND officer for Asia and the Pacific, offers courses on the challenges of globalization and brings international figures to campus to lecture publicly on world issues. The School of Business offers a series of international business courses, and students focusing on entrepreneurship can choose their electives from these.

The integrated student (nurturing diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, dignity)
One of Woodbury University’s six educational goals is the integrated student, a commitment by the faculty to assure that a student’s personal and professional principles and aspirations are fully integrated. In the School of Architecture, all programs support this goal through focused
faculty advising of individual students, through co-curricular opportunities for interpersonal exchange among faculty and students, and through mentoring and work experience opportunities that faculty extend to students. In the MArch 1 program, the first design studio asks students to draw from personal experience as they research and analyze spaces of domesticity. This acknowledgement of the value of one’s own identity and experience as it relates to the personal and professional path one forges is the foundation of the Woodbury architectural education, and is especially salient in the five semesters we have with our Master of Architecture students. The small cohort must cohere, and we believe it does so when individuals with a sure sense of self practice the exchange of information and the sharing of new learning and designing experiences that are the hallmarks of a healthy studio culture and a vibrant architecture community.

3.1.3 Architectural Education and Registration

**School of Architecture relationship with the state registration board**
Woodbury School of Architecture maintains a strong relationship with the California Architecture Licensing Board. Each year, Woodbury sends one representative to the Licensing Board’s meeting on architectural education. In alternate years, Woodbury School of Architecture has hosted that meeting on campus in Hensel Hall. While Woodbury School of Architecture is among the youngest of California’s architecture schools, and therefore has among the fewest graduates with licenses, Dean Norman Millar, who now also serves as a regent for the California Architecture Foundation associated with the California AIA, has maintained an active involvement in the statewide discussion of the relationship of licensure to education.

**Student understanding of responsibility for professional conduct**
Woodbury’s two-semester Professional Practice sequence, undertaken in the 2nd and 5th semesters of the two-year 5-semester graduate program, is designed to provide students with a full understanding of their responsibility for professional conduct. In AR 553 Professional Practice I: Documentation and Codes, students are introduced to legal codes and regulations that affect architecture and influence design, including those on energy, accessibility, egress and life-safety. The seminar that bridges the professional practice sequence and in which students prepare for their thesis projects, AR 648 Graduate Thesis Prep, focuses on theory and techniques for analyzing and integrating design methodologies, client or user needs, and site conditions into criteria for preparing for an architectural project. Students research and develop a theoretical and practical context for their final graduate thesis project. In AR 650 Professional Practice 2: Documents and Project Administration, students study design delivery and project and firm management, including understanding the client role in architecture, program preparation, an analysis of documents, services, professional contracts and fees, project budget and cost estimating, global markets, and professional ethics.

**Exposure of students to internship requirements: Intern Development Program (IDP)**
The dean promotes IDP at the all-school meeting at the beginning of each semester. The requirements for licensure, including the IDP, are discussed extensively in the graduate program’s two-semester professional practice sequence. Additionally, faculty member Nick Roberts serves as Woodbury’s IDP representative, and he meets with all graduate students along with the 4th and 5th year BArch students every year. Nick and the students discuss the ways that in-service education complements academic education. Incoming graduate students have satisfied NCARB’s minimum 96 units in a pre-professional program and may have already started their IDP. Students are also informed of the NCARB Two Year Rule that allows individuals who have graduated from a program within two years of its initial NAAB accreditation to sit for the
ARE in certain jurisdictions. Nick Roberts provides the CAB brochures and the IDP forms, instructs students on how to open an IDP file, and answers questions including what offices qualify for the IDP and what the difference is between Woodbury’s and the IDP internship requirements.

**Sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure**
Woodbury BArch students are known for their skills and ability and are sought after in the regional professional community for part-time work while they are students, and after graduation fulltime employment. We look forward to the mutual levels of influence the graduate and undergraduate students will have on each other, and we think that the high level of skills of the 3rd, 4th and 5th year undergrads will have a positive influence on the graduate students.

**Exposure of students to continuing education beyond graduation**
Woodbury hosts continuing education classes that help students prepare for the license exams. These are advertised on campus and through the AIA’s website and mailings.

**Proportion of graduates who have sought and achieved licensure since the previous visit**
The proportion of the BArch graduates who seek and achieve licensure since the 2008 NAAB visit has improved.

It may be as many as four years before we can report on the proportion of graduates of the MArch program who seek and achieve licensure. A survey of incoming MArch students indicate that seven out of eight currently intend to take the ARE exam. The California schools with MArch programs tend to have higher pass rates as well as higher proportions of graduates seeking to achieve licensure, so we expect our rates to increase as the history of the graduate program evolves.

The 2008 VTR for the BArch listed the following as a cause of concern: “Students admire the faculty and understandably view them as role models. In many cases, upon graduation, they will immediately move into the workforce and licensure is a vital asset. There is a concern this important step in the affirmation of the students’ abilities is not consistently reinforced by the faculty. Licensure should be a clear prospect for all Woodbury alumni.”

Information provided by the California Architecture Licensing Board during the 3-year period from 2004, 2005, and 2006 shows a 43% pass rate among those of our BArch graduates testing, which is below the average pass rates for California schools. Since it is difficult to identify when those testing in 2004-2006 graduated from the program, it is also difficult to determine the influences of improvements to the curriculum in the past accreditation term. For that 3-year period only an average of 16 graduates per year from Woodbury tested. For those failing in their attempt to pass the exam during this time period, the largest impediment seems to be passing the Mechanical and Electrical portion. The highest pass rates are in Lateral Forces. The following are the combined pass rates of Woodbury graduates who tested in the 3-year period from 2004 to 2006 in descending order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Tested</th>
<th>Passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Forces</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Planning</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Structures</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Technology</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Design</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Planning</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Methods</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical and Electrical</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information provided by the California Architecture Licensing Board during the 3-year period from 2007, 2008, and the first half of 2009 shows a 55% pass rate among those of our BArch graduates testing, which remains below the average pass rates for California schools, but is 12 percentage points over the previous 3-year period, or an impressive 28% improvement. For this most recent 3-year period, an average of 21 graduates per year from Woodbury tested – up by 5 per year from the previous 3-year period. For those failing in their attempt to pass the exam during this time period, the largest impediment seems to be passing the Mechanical and Electrical and the Materials and Methods portions. The highest pass rates are still in Lateral Forces but all rates are significantly better. The following are the combined pass rates of Woodbury graduates who tested in the 3-year period from 2007 to the first half of 2009 in descending order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Tested</th>
<th>Passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Forces</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Planning</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Planning</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Structures</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Technology</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Design</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Methods</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical and Electrical</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We look forward to the graduate program’s positive influence on the proportion of graduates who will seek and achieve licensure since the previous NAAB visit.

### 3.1.4 Architectural Education and the Profession

**Practicing and assuming new responsibilities in the context of increasing cultural diversity**

Because Woodbury is a minority-serving institution in a highly diverse cosmopolitan setting, cultural diversity is the normative experience for study, teaching, and practice at Woodbury. Woodbury Architecture students are well adapted to lives and practices that embrace cultural diversity because they know little of the opposite, a climate of homogeneity or insularity. With a strong liberal arts foundation, issues-oriented design curriculum, emphasis on critical thinking and writing skills, and ample technical skill set, all set within the explosive diversity of Southern California, Woodbury graduates are poised to compete in the workforce and critically engage many forms of social, economic, and professional change, with cultural diversity one form of change among many. With only a small initial cohort of eight for the MArch program it is impossible to identify a trend, however 50% of the first cohort is female and over 75% of it is minority or international. It is safe to say the cultural diversity of the undergraduate program continues in the graduate program.

**Practicing and assuming new responsibilities in the context of changing client and regulatory demands**

One of the five principal strands to the Woodbury design curriculum is professionalism, or the ability to manage, argue, and act legally, ethically, and critically in society and the environment.

While the emphasis on issues-oriented design studios and the development of critical thinking and writing skills throughout the program prepare students for practices that are informed, collaborative, and leaderly, several elements of the program tackle professionalism within the
context of client relations and regulatory constraints head on. It is, for example, the central purpose of the Professional Practice seminars, a sequence consisting of AR 553 Professional Practice 1: Documentation & Codes and AR 650 Professional Practice 2: Documents & Project Administration. These two seminars are tied together and their content bridged by AR 648 Graduate Thesis Preparation. In Professional Practice 1, students review legal codes and regulations that affect architecture and influence design, including a study of energy, accessibility, egress and life-safety laws. Students develop project documentation based on local codes, with an emphasis on technical documentation, drawing format organization and outline specifications. In Thesis Prep, students are introduced to and practice theory and techniques for analyzing and integrating design methodologies, client or user needs, and site conditions into criteria for preparing for an architectural project. The theoretical and practical context for the thesis project is researched and developed. Along with the completion of a substantiated written position of intent, a project site is selected, program written and design methodology articulated. The demands of the client and the constraints of changing, or outdated, codes are of course a principal basis for thoughtful programming, site design, and form making throughout the Thesis Project. In Professional Practice 2, design delivery and project and firm management are studied, including understanding the client role in architecture, program preparation, an analysis of documents, services, professional contracts and fees, project budget and cost estimating, global markets, and professional ethics.

Meanwhile, design that explicitly engages real clients and programs within changing regulatory demands is tested in all studios.

The School of Architecture’s Center for Community Research and Design (CCRD) has shifted from our storefront in Hollywood to the main campus with a goal of focusing on the nearby communities of the San Fernando Valley. With a mission to engage and sustain the diverse culture of the Los Angeles region through collaboration, research, and design, CCRD offers further opportunities for students and faculty to extend the professional learning atmosphere into the city itself. The CCRD’s community-based focus is intended to help students develop awareness and direct participation in the urban issues, practices and places that define the city.

Program engagement with the professional community in the life of the school
Woodbury enjoys a vital and high-profile role in the regional professional context, due not only to reputation and locale and a lively flow of visiting critics, but also to the school’s ongoing and deliberate maintenance of relationships with local chapters of the AIA. As dean, Norman Millar sits ex officio on the Board of the Los Angeles Chapter of the AIA. The School of Architecture pays the annual dues for all fulltime faculty who want to be in the AIA. Woodbury is recognized by each of the AIA chapters in the region as producing adept professional graduates. In the recent 2x8: VERT Competition sponsored by the Los Angeles Chapter of the AIA, a Woodbury student placed 3rd, competing against students representing seventeen California schools of architecture. Woodbury architecture students have been awarded Mel Ferris Travel Fellowships from the California Architectural Foundation. We are proud to point out that Woodbury students are highly competitive at the national level as well: Woodbury student teams have won first place in the ACSA National Steel Competition four years in a row. In 2008, Woodbury student teams won 1st and 3rd place in both categories and two honorable mentions. In 2009 Woodbury student teams won 1st, 2nd, and 3rd in one category and 1st in the other. Woodbury students have been accepted to and/or are currently enrolled in graduate programs at Harvard, MIT, Columbia, Penn, Syracuse, UCLA, and USC and the AA in London. Our graduate students have the opportunity and encouragement to participate in these and other design competitions as well.

Joel Jaffe, a President’s Executive Council member and an architect active in the SFV AIA, is actively seeking to encourage engagement between the students of Woodbury University and the architectural profession, in particular the San Fernando Valley Chapter of the AIA. Mr. Jaffe
initiated a program in 2007 that grants scholarships to deserving students selected through a jury that reviews the students’ design portfolios. As part of the condition for receiving these scholarships, the students give a presentation of their work at a dinner honoring them each year. Mr. Jaffe works with the scholarship winners on their presentations, helping the students hone and refine their presentations to make them appropriate for a professional audience. He is excited to extend the opportunities to our new graduate students.

**Student awareness of need to advance knowledge of architecture through a lifetime of practice and research**

How will Woodbury graduate students gain “an awareness of the need to advance their knowledge of architecture through a lifetime of practice and research”? Two ways, principally: a fieldwork, research-based final thesis project, and research-based role models on the faculty.

With a focus on fieldwork, graduate students will be introduced to the joys and rigors of devising a research-based critical approach to architecture throughout the program, but particularly so during the third semester summer field study and the fourth semester Thesis Preparation sequence. At its best, the 3rd and 4th semester sequence will afford students an opportunity to conduct both an outward survey of the field – a systematic inventory of heroes, mentors, case studies, models, methods, and monsters, at home and abroad – and equally, an opportunity to delve deeply into understanding their inner inclinations. The result is a balancing act, not only a struggle to make themselves appear relevant within the discipline, but a desire to satisfy a radical insistence on authenticity of voice, an insistence that is the hallmark of their generation. Out of this struggle to articulate a purpose for themselves and a project that embodies it effectively, architecture as mere skilled service-provision falls to the wayside, at least for a time.

Whether or not this moment of research-based radical critique and independent spirit can be sustained in the face of student loan debt, a weak economy, family obligations or cultural expectations after graduation, it is a powerful moment to witness in the education of an architect, and is perhaps part of what we think of as that Woodbury miracle.

If we hope to sustain some of these independent-spirited, research-based critical approaches to architecture, it is because most of us on the faculty have struggled to do so ourselves. The full-time and adjunct faculty at Woodbury are practicing, research-based architects and designers with idea-driven practices, often incorporating diverse disciplines and embracing collaborative roles. As examples, Norman Millar was part of a ground-breaking generation of “everyday urbanists” in Los Angeles, in which practical, theoretical, and academic work focused on populist strategies for reoccupying overlooked landscapes and marginal urban spaces. His new house in Echo Park, inspired by the generic mini mall, can be cited as one of the first real examples of “everyday architecture.” Barbara Bestor’s residential and commercial practice injects smart-design modernism with sensitive craft and humanism, never forgetting the actual experience of people and their potential to find delight in space and place. Jeanine Centuori’s practice is largely rooted in an investigation of the possibilities of public art and the public landscape, real estate development, and universal design, a set of preoccupations that shape a large part of her contribution to the Woodbury curriculum; Catherine Herbst is similarly invested, professionally and academically, in quality civic space. Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter’s interest lies in investigations of materiality as a carrier of potential form, function, meaning, program and appropriation. Eric Olsen’s interest is in the role of water, electricity and air in innovations in material and building systems. Linda Taalman has built a successful practice around innovations in premanufactured components as featured in the It house. Ted Smith has built an academic and professional career on integrating the economics and aesthetics of architecture as real estate developer and builder as well as designer. Mark Owen, adjunct faculty and Woodbury graduate, focuses on advanced technologies of representation. Adjunct faculty member Rene Peralta and fulltime faculty Jose Parral and Marcel Sanchez-Prieto integrate theory, practice and advocacy along the bi-national
border region. Paul Groh, Peter Arnold, and Gerry Smulevich are all accomplished photographers, using the camera to explore intersections between architecture, urbanism, landscape, and infrastructure, and in turn using their photographic research to inform design and teaching work. Building on Peter Arnold’s photographic documentation of the infrastructural landscape, Hadley Arnold’s work and teaching focus on the relationship between water and urban form, and architecture’s role in reshaping that relationship. John Southern is a frequent writer on urban issues. Paulette Singley, trained as a historian/theorist as well as an architect, explores her interest in film, architecture, and “dirty urbanism” in the classroom and research, while Stan Bertheaud maintains an overlapping practice in architecture, screenwriting and television production.

These examples and others serve as strong role models for the “need” – at Woodbury, a norm for both adjunct and fulltime faculty – to advance the field of architecture beyond mere professional service-provision through a lifetime of practice and research grounded in critical ideas, diverse and collaborative roles crossing over disciplines, and an expanding knowledge base.

Woodbury’s architecture faculty and curriculum, and the university’s transdisciplinary culture, continually prepare students to practice and assume new responsibilities and diverse and collaborative roles as architects.

**Development of student reconciliation of conflicts between architects’ obligations to clients and public and demands of the creative enterprise**

Since 1999, Norman Millar has used Winona LaDuke’s phrase to succinctly describe the informal mission of the School of Architecture: “Build the Right Thing.” Neither Norman’s nor Woodbury’s approach to “right” is doctrinaire. It is completely process-based, insisting in all our programs from the first through the final semester on the student’s continual, critical evaluation of appropriateness: of representation methods; of form, cultural meaning, and symbolic languages; of structure, materiality, and building methods; of environmental performance across scales and time. Sharpened by debate, the motto has evolved to include not only building the right thing, but at times, self-consciously, necessarily, and unceremoniously building the wrong thing. In other words, our students’ ability to articulate a tension or contradiction between the demands of the public and their critique of those demands is precisely the basis for supporting and evaluating their creative response. Addressing with precision, in each student project in each studio, the student’s understanding of the tensions between perceived social obligation and perceived creative autonomy is the basis of a critical and responsive pedagogy as well as a critical and responsive architecture. By demanding the written statement of critical intent in all projects, the School of Architecture has established a tradition that locates the creative enterprise fundamentally at the intersection of process and communication, and allows the faculty to measure the only thing that matters: our students’ ability to formulate and align their visions of form and matter with their unique critical observations and stated intentions. The effectiveness of this tradition in training leaders is expected to expand exponentially in the graduate program as we develop not only professional architects, but professional teachers as well.

**Student acquisition of ethics for upholding the integrity of the profession**

Ethics at Woodbury are taught at any number of levels. They are instilled, we hope and believe, in the studio and classroom through norms and expectations of ethical conduct – rule-abiding honesty, trust, and mutual respect – between students and faculty. The mechanics of ethical conduct as a professional – doing what you say you are going to do, when you say you are going to do it – are modeled by the faculty and expected from the students at all times. One of the five principal strands to the Woodbury design curriculum is professionalism, or the ability to manage, argue, and act legally, ethically, and critically in society and the environment. How that looks in the classroom is spelled out in the Studio Culture Policy, initially established in 2007. The
professionalism, or integrity of process, with which students conduct themselves in class is also part of their grade (and with which faculty conduct themselves, part of their evaluations). The “integrity of the profession” in terms of legalistic ethics is taught in the Professional Practice sequence: the obligations and rewards of responsible and precise adherence to contracts and codes. Architecturally, the ethic of integrating and aligning, indeed maximizing, performance with critical and aesthetic intent is crucial to faculty evaluation of student work, and, in time, to each student’s growing ability to critique, measure, and evaluate the integrity of her/his own work. The “integrity of the profession” in terms of the larger tradition of architect as fully integrated provider of social critique, environmental leadership, and aesthetic excellence is fundamental to all levels of the Woodbury architecture curriculum.

3.1.5 Architectural Education and Society

Throughout Woodbury School of Architecture, direct engagement with social and environmental challenges provides the foundation for architecture that is relevant, intelligent and effective. Issues of sustainability, from the ecological through the social, economic and cultural, are integral to the study of architecture at all levels.

Social and environmental problems: informed understanding and appropriate response

Our MArch students are asked to draw on first-hand observation, reflect on their life experiences, and integrate this with rigorous research, analysis, and critique. In their first semester, we ask them in their studio and advanced theory course to interrogate current events and challenges and understand them in the context of relevant precedents. The changing demographics of Southern California, the economic promises and costs of globalization, the social and economic realities of immigration, the transition from agrarian to urban society, the legacy of post-industrial economies and the prospects of a creative economy: these are not merely taught at Woodbury, they have also been lived by our students, and their direct experience is valued as an important knowledge-based springboard.

In their first studio, MArch students address social and environmental issues through an investigation of the built domestic environment. They demonstrate the application of theoretical research and critical positioning as they integrate site, program, technology, tendencies of human behavior, structure, material, environment, and social, political, economic and cultural contexts in their design work. Drawing on their own experience and synthesizing their work in the advanced theory seminar, the domestic realm investigated is necessarily multicultural, and the design work is considered in the context of a globalized urbanism and environment.

The second studio debates urbanism from a social and environmental standpoint, proposing real and ideal responses to challenges of contemporary and future local, national and global contexts. AR 589, the urban design studio, focuses on architects’ leadership role in their communities, with particular emphasis on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics. A broad array of urban theories, tactics and strategies, building and space types, landscape and infrastructure design, and politics and policy-making are explored through the dialectic between the private and public realms of the diverse urban culture.

Summer fieldwork continues the development of graduate students’ understanding of social and environmental problems. In the fall of their second year, MArch students take the comprehensive design studio and the systems integration seminar. AR 664 Systems Integration focuses on the interrelationship of materials, structures, environmental systems, building envelope systems, construction technology, building cost control, and life-cycle analysis as they
influence design development and decision making. The knowledge provided to students in this seminar is applied, adapted and tested concurrently in the comprehensive design studio. The studio requires the development of an architectural response to contextual issues that resolves not only space, form, and siting but also integration of structure, materials, and mechanical, environmental and life safety systems.

Beyond these core moments in the graduate curriculum for becoming aware of one’s responsibility as an architect to deal with social and environmental issues, students have many opportunities to explore these challenges from multiple viewpoints. MArch students have 12 to 18 units of electives in their program, and should they focus on one of the three emphases, Landscape Urbanism, Building Technology, or Entrepreneurship, they will face questions of social and environmental sustainability in seminars, lecture courses, and elective studios. AR 366, the Contemporary Issues seminar, is offered every semester, and focuses prominently on social and environmental issues in architecture and urban design. In the recent past, Vinayak Bharne has looked at Asian urbanisms in his Contemporary Issues seminar, and Mohammed Sharif examined the urban fabric of twenty megacities and their projections for 2020. A series of Contemporary Issues seminars offered by Hadley and Peter Arnold, co-directors of the Arid Lands Institute, introduced students to the complex water and power infrastructures supporting Southern California urbanism and depleting huge regional watersheds. One seminar met almost exclusively in the field, tracing the Los Angeles aqueduct and the Los Angeles River from their respective sources to their ends. One seminar looked into the historical relationship between the design of water infrastructure and the shape of urban form. Another, “Deep Green: Environmental Urbanism,” required students to analyze the critical roots, aesthetic merits, and performative effectiveness of various urban design strategies aspiring to sustainability. This semester, core faculty member Paulette Singley is offering a Contemporary Issues course with adjunct Ulises Diaz, “Introduction to Los Angeles.” The course offers its graduate students and upper division undergraduate students opportunities to learn more about the significant architecture and urbanism of a significant global city and perhaps most importantly, the city in which they are presently living. Students explore L.A. as if it were a foreign study site, simultaneously sporting tourist sunglasses and cameras along with scholar’s lenses and architect’s sketchbooks in order investigate the nooks and crannies of this complex and diverse metropolis.

MArch students may also take 300-level courses offered by the Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies, the School of Media, Culture & Design, and the School of Business as electives. While the courses offered change frequently, every semester sees a number of topic courses that address social and environmental problems. For example, last spring Doug Cremer, Dean of ITS, offered IS 3745 Sustainability, a transdisciplinary examination of the fundamental environmental, ethical and sociopolitical issues related to the creation of a stable global order through close readings of several seminal texts and documents, including analysis of such topics as exponential overpopulation, epidemic disease, toxic pollution, economic injustice, and global warming. The School of Business offered MG 315 Social & Political Environment of Business, a course designed to explore the influence of environmental forces on business institutions and the impact of corporations on their environment. Topics included business ethics, social responsibility, environmental policy, regulation, consumerism, affirmative action, politics, and current trends in organizational structures. In summer 09, Woodbury students could study IS 3747 Reading the West: Text, Landscape, Construction, an interdisciplinary studies course co-taught by professors Hadley Arnold (adjunct in Architecture, ALI co-director) and Will McConnell (assistant professor in ITS). This seminar took a transdisciplinary approach to the “meanings” of the “west” in the United States. Students surveyed the diverse ways in which Americans have used the landscape to describe, critique, structure and maintain competing notions of civilization. This fall, Dr. Emily Bills, adjunct in ITS, is teaching IS 3741 Current Issues in Urban Studies; her students are examining the theories and debates that are currently at issue in the practice and discourse of
urban studies, including the impacts of history, geography, planning and context, and covering specific topics related to the built environment, political institutions, historical frameworks, and technological forces.

Woodbury Architecture students are also made aware of social and environmental issues through lectures, presentations, and exhibits, both on-campus and off. The President’s Advisory Task Force for a Sustainable Campus sponsored several lunch-time lectures last year, well attended by architecture students: Greg Wendt, CFP spoke on “Socially Responsible Investing;” Spencer Brown, founder of Rent-a-Green-Box, spoke on “Green Entrepreneurship;” and Alegre Ramos, LEED AP, spoke on “The Five Rs of Sustainability.” The Architecture Lecture Series in Burbank/LA had an emphasis on Reformulating Infrastructure in spring 2009, and featured a lecture by Charles Waldheim, the influential landscape urbanist, and two panel discussions, one led by Christopher Hawthorne, architecture critic for the LA Times, and the other by Frances Anderton, architecture and design writer, producer and radio host. All three events focused on the impact of the built environment on social and environmental resources.

Social and environmental problems: generating solutions
At the same time that they are taking comprehensive design studio and studying systems integration, in Graduate Thesis Preparation MArch students are engaged in analyzing and integrating design methodologies, client/user needs, and site conditions for an architectural project, and preparing a written hypothesis identifying the salient issues within a larger architectural discourse, including social and environmental impacts. In other words, in AR 648 students begin to propose solutions to an identified project, which at Woodbury School of Architecture always has a social and environmental context. AR 692, Graduate Thesis Studio, fully engages the iterative process of architectural design, as students work closely with their advisors to generate and refine solutions to the thesis problems they have identified. So the capstone sequence clearly requires demonstration of the ability to identify and solve architectural problems, including the social and environmental aspects of those problems.

Innovation and leadership in the public sphere with regard to social and environmental issues is modeled widely among the faculty. Environmentally, Jeanine Centuori, Julio Zavolta and Warren Wagner all have LEED certification, with private and public work to draw from locally and share with students. Hadley and Peter Arnold have a particular area of original research in water infrastructure in the west, and design experience with energy- and water-efficient projects. Guillermo Honles, as chief architect in the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power’s solar energy program, has lectured extensively on resource use and integrated photovoltaic design in the public and private sectors.

The CityworksLA: Handbook (2005) features contributions by Woodbury architecture faculty members Jeanine Centuori and Vic Liptak. CityworksLA is a volunteer-based forum of members from the architecture and design community acting as a catalyst for “real world solutions” in Los Angeles. Writers for the handbooks are “experts researching a variety of global problems, offering a creative, comprehensive vision for a better world.” Jeanine Centuori’s research, practice, and teaching are strongly grounded in the strengthening of civic life through smart design; her “More Doors” and “Finding Public Spaces in the Margins” projects exemplify this. Director Norman Millar has served as a member of the Hollywood Design Review Board since 1999. Stan Bertheaud serves on the Oceanside Planning Commission. (According to a story in the San Diego Union-Tribune, Bertheaud, who has lived in Oceanside for about seven years, told the council that he was interested in joining the planning commission because he wants to practice what he preaches in the classroom.) Adjunct faculty member Helena Jubany serves as a commissioner of the City of Los Angeles Board of Building and Safety. Appointed by the mayor
and confirmed by the City Council, commissioners are appointed to five-year terms and volunteer their time to serve at weekly Board of Building and Safety Commission meetings.

Generating knowledge to mitigate social and environmental problems is thus a joint endeavor between faculty and students, drawing from faculty expertise and depending on student energy and innovation. We expect the graduate thesis work – even from our first cohorts – to be firmly grounded in sound architectural practice that responds creatively, intelligently, and provocatively to current and future social and environmental issues.

**Architecture, social responsibility and civic engagement**

Woodbury University’s six educational goals include *social responsibility*: a respect for the planet, a respect for its people and the environment. The university community asserts that all action has impact on the planet and that understanding that impact and accepting responsibility for one’s actions is the moral and ethical condition for the educated global citizen.

In the School of Architecture, we argue that the greatest strength of the architecture programs at Woodbury is the value we collectively place on Architectural Education and Society. At every stage and in every studio, graduate and undergraduate, we present the discipline of architecture as a social art beholden to multiple stakeholders – some individual, some collective, some abstract – an art that shapes the built environment by balancing the complex processes those stakeholders engage in. A continuous discourse about the processes, the stakeholders, the practice of our art is alive and vibrant among our faculty. Diversity of opinion is a treasured asset of the School of Architecture, held by faculty and students alike. We embrace the civic and civil debate about architecture’s role and architects’ responsibility, and the ethical implications of our design proposals and projects for the built environment. But we do not hold a singular vision of the role, the responsibility, and the implications. Our disagreements are social, political, economic and aesthetic. They are intellectual but no less heartfelt for that. Besides a sustained focus on social and environmental issues in graduate studios and supporting courses, Woodbury MArch students are exposed to and part of this vigorous debate about the architect’s role in (creating and) solving these problems. The debate is the intellectual glue that holds the program together or forces it to unravel from semester to semester, and the greatest single explanation of how the program nurtures a climate of civic engagement and commitment to professional and public services. It inevitably becomes the substance of the Woodbury architecture student.

**3.2 Program Self-Assessment Procedures**

**Institutional requirements for self-assessment**

Institutional assessment at Woodbury means the Academic Program Review. Each program is reviewed on a 5-year cycle, unless it has an external program review process, in which case the internal and external cycles are synchronized. The NAAB self-study serves as the School of Architecture’s basis for these reviews, which may require supplementary information. The Academic Program Review must make its way through several levels of approval: the Educational Planning Committee, the chief academic officer, the president, and the board of trustees must all endorse it. All plans for new programs or major program adjustment go through a similar review, prior to review by WASC’s substantive change committee.

The School of Architecture uses its NAAB self-studies to inform and interrogate its academic plan within the university. Now that the department of Interior Architecture has joined the school, and given our post-professional program in Real Estate Development in Architecture, the school will develop a broader vision of its planning and assessment, to make certain that the non-professional programs do not become satellites with an eccentric orbit.
For the Educational Effectiveness Review, the last stage in Woodbury’s WASC reaffirmation process, each program is asked to define its program-specific learning outcomes, identify where in the curriculum those outcomes are introduced, practiced or developed, and mastered, and then prepare an assessment plan that critically observes whether the curriculum achieves its goals. The program must also demonstrate that it uses information from those critical observations to continually improve its curriculum and the delivery of its mission.

The School of Architecture observes that this process is essentially what we do for our professional programs through the NAAB accreditation process. External observers support this contention: the WASC team that visited Woodbury in 2008 for our Capacity and Preparatory Review cited the School of Architecture for its strong development of self-assessment procedures.

Self-assessment in the School of Architecture goes on continually: conversations with students in the halls and with colleagues over lunch easily turn into agenda items at faculty meetings, if need be. Individual instructors review their course evaluations each semester, and the chair of each department reviews all instructors’ course evaluations each semester. All-school meetings at the start of each semester, regular meetings of studio instructor teams, open invitations to all faculty for studio reviews, faculty meetings and retreats, all contribute to the assessment of whether we are serving our mission. The School has developed a Curriculum Work Group in the BArch program, and the faculty who teach graduate students meet monthly to assess student progress toward the MArch learning objectives. Formalizing some of these processes into an intentional and self-reflective plan for continual improvement is an ongoing endeavor, and is an essential responsibility of the new associate dean position. The associate dean will be submitting the assessment plans for the MArch and BArch programs in mid-October for incorporation into the university’s Educational Effectiveness Review report.

Self-assessment process: relating mission and the NAAB perspectives
The School of Architecture’s mission, to transform its faculty, students, community and environment through architectural education, is not a response to the NAAB perspectives – rather, we see the NAAB perspectives as natural manifestation of this mission. We are architects and critical thinkers who produce other architects and critical thinkers. We do not understand our endeavor or our self-assessment as shoehorning what we teach or how we practice into ill-fitting categories. For the most part we find a natural relationship between our mission, vision and curriculum and the interests of the collateral organizations that make up the NAAB.

Because we have carefully gathered a faculty of fulltime and adjunct professionals and teaching scholars, and because our student body, both graduate and undergraduate, reflects the cultural and socio-economic diversity that has drawn people to southern California since even before its statehood, we have a multivalent understanding of – and approach to – architecture and education. We embrace critical thinking through thoughtful writing – yet not all of our faculty are writers or scholars. We take pride in the standards of our profession and the rigors and rewards of achieving registration – yet not all of our faculty seek to be registered architects. We vigorously defend the position that architecture should be intelligent, effective and beautiful – yet we do not agree, and would not want to, on where or how to draw the boundaries of intelligence, effectiveness and beauty.

The School of Architecture proudly leads Woodbury in its goal of achieving academic excellence, and this undergirds our understanding of architectural education and the academic context. While Woodbury President Dr. Ken Nielsen sees the faculty as the university’s most important asset, the School of Architecture sees our students as our most important asset – this enables us to passionately support our students through the challenges of architectural education. The
School of Architecture proudly offers a professional education at the Bachelor’s and now the Master’s level; we strongly encourage our students and alumni to pursue their professional goals beyond their academic achievements, to seek and complete licensure through IDP and the ARE. The School of Architecture believes that the architectural education we provide nurtures in our students their potential for leadership and their sense of social and ethical responsibility, and prepares them for lifelong learning and the continued honing of their critical thinking and design innovation skills. We expect our graduates to uphold the integrity of the profession, as evidenced by the inclusion of professionalism in the school’s five tracks of mastery. Finally, the School of Architecture, defined not by its location, curriculum, or numbers, but by the people that engage in the production of knowledge and the built environment through architectural education here, lives and breathes by its commitment to debating the social and environmental issues appertaining to architecture and urban design decisions, and by its resolve to seek solutions to these issues.

Faculty, student, and graduate assessment of curriculum and learning context
As this is the first semester of our MArch 1 program, the assessment we have done of its curriculum and learning context is necessarily of the “pre-test” variety. The faculty committee that initially worked on developing the graduate curriculum: Paulette Singley, Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, and Norman Millar, carefully crafted five semesters of graduate architectural education to complete a professional degree based on pre-professional preparation. The fulltime and participating adjunct architecture faculty as a whole contributed to the development of the three emphases, and the critical re-evaluation we did of our BArch curriculum following the 2008 VTR also contributed to the structure and sequence of the MArch 1 curriculum. It would be premature to claim, however, that we have assessed the curriculum and learning context, even at the faculty level, and certainly not at the student level. At the time of the submittal of this APR, our first cohort has been in class for two weeks; we won’t have graduate feedback until May 2011! But we can use this report to outline a strong assessment process to follow as the program develops.

Faculty assessment
The faculty in Architecture are not assigned exclusively to either the Master’s or the Bachelor’s program. Our faculty have long expressed their desire to have both undergrad and graduate students, and so faculty may expect teaching assignments in both programs, and/or they may teach vertical classes blending both graduate and undergraduate students. In this way, the Architecture faculty as a whole will be able to provide assessment of the graduate curriculum and learning context, especially with respect to the NAAB perspectives; we embrace the diversity of opinion.

Internal review of the curriculum, then, is a cornerstone of self-assessment. The faculty who are teaching graduate level courses this semester have already met and discussed expectations for graduate student learning outcomes. At the end of the semester we will need to look closely at how the graduate students engaged the learning context: have we set an appropriate bar for our graduate students, and does their work demonstrate that they know what that is?

The faculty retreat held every semester should devote either the morning or afternoon session to curriculum assessment, with distinct time devoted to each of the professional programs. This venue will provide adequate time for an in-depth discussion among the fulltime, visiting, and participating adjunct faculty, and the associate dean for assessment and accreditation can then provide an outline of action items and work to take place between retreats.

The graduate studio finals each semester offer familiar access to curriculum assessment, but they do not provide a complete picture. Here, too, the associate dean can gather examples of graduate student work from across their semester’s courses, and convene a subcommittee of the
faculty to evaluate both student progress and curriculum alignment with the school’s mission, learning outcomes, and NAAB perspectives. A semesterly review of student work from both studios and seminars/lectures will provide a more holistic view of how the Master of Architecture curriculum promotes student learning and achievement, and it will allow for quick adjustments to syllabi and assignments in response to the identified strengths and weaknesses in the curriculum and/or in the cohort.

Student assessment
The inaugural MArch 1 cohort completed an entrance survey on their first day of studio. The survey revealed that they believe what we told them about the program: they were attracted by its small size and the individual attention they expect to get, by the quality of the faculty, by the fieldwork opportunity, by the work our undergraduates produce, and by California itself. From this baseline, we will be able to assess whether their expectations have been met, and whether their expectations change as they move through the program. We will conduct a mid-program survey after their fieldwork summer, and a post-thesis survey. We will repeat this three-survey pattern with subsequent cohorts, if it proves to offer valuable input to program improvement.

Other ways we can get students to assess the curriculum and learning context include indirect assessment through their participation in the Architecture Student Forum and their representation at faculty meetings. Especially while the program is still small, the opportunities to engage in discussions about program direction and curriculum development can and should take place at gatherings, formal and informal, of all the graduate students with the graduate chair. Further, as we aim to produce not only professional architectural practitioners but also professional architectural educators through the Masters program, we can build assessment into the structure of the studio and seminar critique. As part of the learning outcomes for each graduate studio, we can ask students to think critically about how the assignments and activities relate to the stated learning outcomes, and to reflect on whether there are unstated learning outcomes. Their responses might be recorded either in written assignments or through transcribing directed discussions. These can then feed directly into an overall assessment of the curriculum and learning context, and importantly into the improvements made in response to assessment results.

Alumni assessment
We must make a concerted effort to get it right with our graduate alumni. The university is working to build a culture of connectivity with its alumni, and we have the opportunity to maintain a constructive relationship with every single alumnus of the professional MArch 1 program.

We do not know whether Masters alumni will remain local to the same extent as our BArch alumni; a larger percentage of our graduate students come from places other than southern California. For those that do remain in southern California, we must seize the opportunity to engage MArch alumni directly with the School of Architecture programs, especially since they will have served as graduate teaching assistants in the BArch curriculum. Inviting alumni back for reviews in both the BArch and MArch program, in both Burbank/LA and San Diego, is one way to gather indirect assessment of the development of the MArch curriculum and learning context. Sending our alumni out to teach in other programs and then asking them to compare curricula could prove to be another incredibly useful assessment tool.

Another source of direct assessment could come from appointing an alumnus of the Masters program to the MArch board of advisors (see below). As a board member, the alumnus would be part of the external peer review the advisory board would undertake regularly.

Looking to new media for effective communication, we may do well to establishing an MArch
alumni social network, and gather informal data on assessment of the curriculum and learning context through it. A more formal survey every three years may help us achieve several goals while avoiding survey fatigue: (1) gather date for assessing the program, (2) encourage and track our alumni as they seek licensure, (3) identify and meet the needs of alumni to pursue their postgraduate goals and remain connected with the School of Architecture.

External assessment
The Woodbury Master of Architecture programs would benefit from review by an advisory board. The post-professional MArchRED in San Diego is developing such a board. The faculty in Burbank/LA agree that an advisory board of peers: graduate architectural educators and practicing professionals – could help our pursuit of academic excellence through a challenging, rigorous and innovative graduate curriculum, with standards of assessment at the course level and the program level that enable us to deliver more effective learning outcomes and articulate, ethical, intelligent and professional graduates.

Summary of assessment proposals
1. Constitute a board of advisors to include graduate architectural educators, practicing professionals, and eventually at least one MArch alumnus. The board should undertake an annual or biennial review of the MArch curriculum and learning context with respect to the School of Architecture’s mission and the NAAB perspectives.
2. Convene monthly meetings of faculty teaching the graduate students. Align expectations and evaluation standards.
3. At the end of each semester, the associate dean should gather evidence of graduate student learning from graduate studios, seminars and lecture courses, and convene a faculty subcommittee to evaluate student progress and curriculum alignment with the school’s mission, learning outcomes, and NAAB perspectives. Use this information to feed into direct changes in next semester’s curriculum, and to set the agenda for that semester’s curricular assessment session at the faculty retreat.
4. Following the faculty retreat, the associate dean circulates among faculty the action items and continuing work on curricular development established at the faculty retreat. This outline provides the basis for discussions and actions at the monthly faculty meetings.
5. Get the graduate students involved in curricular assessment. Include assignments and activities in core courses that require student reflection on how the curriculum aligns with and manifests the school’s mission, its learning outcomes, and the NAAB perspectives. This activity might fit most naturally in the student’s preparation for fieldwork, as the student identifies his/her area of interest and research and places that in the context of the MArch curriculum, and in the thesis proposal produced in the Graduate Thesis Prep seminar.
6. Continue to develop the graduate student survey, and administer it at entry, just after fieldwork, and at the end of thesis.
7. Establish a systematic way of staying in communication with MArch alumni. Offer alumni opportunities to be involved in School of Architecture reviews and support their efforts to achieve licensure. Determine an appropriate and effective means of surveying the alumni every three years.
8. Use the information gathered from all the sources to effect progressive change in the Master of Architecture curriculum and the learning context of the School of Architecture.
3.3 Public Information

On page 45 of the 2008-09 catalog http://www.woodbury.edu/s/131/index.aspx?pgid=1103 the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation is reprinted. This same statement will appear in the 2009-10 catalog, to be published exclusively online, in October 2009. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, Woodbury informs its faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation in the catalog and on the website.

A description of the degree program as it appears in university catalogs and other institutionally authorized material is reprinted here:

“With facilities located in Burbank/Los Angeles, Hollywood and San Diego, the School of Architecture offers a four-year nationally accredited Bachelor of Art in Interior Architecture, a five-year, nationally accredited, professional Bachelor of Architecture degree, a two-year (five-semester) professional Master of Architecture degree and a one-year (three-semester) post-professional Master of Architecture degree in Real Estate Development for architects. Southern California 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 School sees its student population, which reflects the region’s vitality and diversity, as its greatest asset.

Woodbury University’s School of Architecture is committed to investigating and extending the social, urban, economic, environmental, technological, and formal dimensions of architecture. The School emphasizes, analyzes, and debates the role of the architect/citizen as cultural communicator and builder responsive to societal and environmental challenges. We integrate into the design curriculum recent innovations in computer aided design, multi-media, and sustainable technologies. We provide students with a strong skill base, rich interdisciplinary dialogue, and generous support resources. We are an intensely urban school that at the same time recognizes and explores its deep embeddedness in the surrounding landscapes. We focus acutely on the distinct problems and opportunities of space-making in Los Angeles, San Diego, and Southern California, and at the same time offer extensive opportunities for international study in Latin America, Asia, and Europe. We maintain a critical, inventive, resourceful, accomplished, passionate, practice-based, and exceptionally dedicated faculty representing diverse interests and strengths. We train our students — who are ethnically, economically, and academically diverse — as articulate critical thinkers and highly capable practitioners, confident in local as well as global discourse. Issues of sustainability, responsible advocacy, and appropriate and innovative use of materials and manufacturing processes are raised throughout the program, and an entrepreneurial spirit of agility and risk-taking is a hallmark of our faculty’s approach.”

3.4 Social Equity

As noted in 3.1.5 Architectural Education and Society, social responsibility is one of the six educational principles underpinning the university’s mission. This principle is a mainstay of the School of Architecture, and social equity therefore is a cherished value in the Woodbury architecture community of faculty, students, staff, and friends.

Woodbury University provides its faculty, students and staff, irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation, with an educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach and work.
The university’s policy on diversity and non-discrimination is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students and staff through the University Catalog, the Student Handbook, the Faculty Handbook, and the university website:

“Woodbury University admits students of any race, color, gender, nationality, religion, age, and sexual orientation, as well as those with handicapping conditions, and within reasonable accommodation, makes available to them all rights, privileges, programs and activities provided by the university. The university does not discriminate in the administration of its educational policies, admission policies, or scholarship and loan programs.”

Woodbury University’s equal employment/non-discrimination clause and policy read as follows:

“Nondiscrimination Clause:
Woodbury University agrees, and obligates vendors and/or contractors, not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of the employee’s or applicant’s race, religion, marital status, national origin, ancestry, citizenship, gender, sexual orientation, age or physical handicap, and that all contracts and subcontracts awarded by the university shall contain a like nondiscrimination clause.

“Policy:
The university shall make a good faith effort to include within its employ members of underrepresented groups in numbers proportionate with the minority composition of the population of the County of Los Angeles.

“Procedures:
1. Equal Employment Practices
The University represents that it will provide equal employment practices through:
   a. Ensuring that in its employment practices persons are employed and employees are treated equally and without regard to or because of race, religion, marital status, ancestry, national origin, citizenship, gender, sexual orientation, age or physical handicap.
   b. Stating in solicitations or advertisements for employees that all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to their race, religion, ancestry, national origin, sex, age, or physical handicap. Such statement shall appear as “Woodbury University is an EEO/AA employer.”

2. Affirmative Action Plan
a. The university shall recruit and make efforts to promote applications from minorities through:
   (1) Advertising employment opportunities in minority community news media as applicable.
   (2) Encouraging present minority employees to refer friends and relatives.
   b. The university shall continually evaluate personnel practices to ensure that hiring, upgrading, promotion, transfer, demotion, etc. are made to achieve and maintain an ethnically diverse work force.
   c. The university shall make a good faith effort to contract with minority contractors, subcontractors and vendors for services and supplies by taking affirmative actions. Where problems are experienced in complying with affirmative action obligations, the University shall document its good faith effort to comply with the requirements.”

Criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, reappointments, compensation, and promotion are outlined in detail in the Faculty Handbook, Section C: Personnel Policy. The Faculty Association has asked all academic divisions to prepare a school policy handbook to supplement the faculty handbook and identify policies and procedures specific to the academic
division. The School of Architecture is gathering information and constructing policies, including a search committee guide, still under construction (see 4.8 Appendix E). The school is committed to social equity in its faculty searches.

The Student Handbook (see section 4.6) outlines the university’s Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Involving University Employees Policy. It reads:

“Woodbury University is committed to creating and maintaining a community where all persons who participate in university programs and activities can work and learn together in an atmosphere free of all forms of harassment, exploitation, or intimidation. Every member of the community should be aware that the university is strongly opposed to sexual harassment and that such behavior is prohibited both by law and by policy. The university will respond promptly and effectively to any report of sexual harassment and will take appropriate disciplinary action up to and including termination.

“Any member of the university community can report conduct that may constitute sexual and/or other unlawful harassment under this policy. In addition, supervisors, faculty and other employees of authority are responsible for taking whatever action is necessary to prevent sexual harassment, to correct it when it occurs, and to report it promptly to the individuals designated to handle discrimination complaints.”

Further definitions and procedures are outlined on pages 92-97 of the Student Handbook.

Regular opportunities exist for faculty, staff, and students to participate in program governance, the most important of which is the monthly faculty meeting. Faculty, students, and staff of the School of Architecture have access to the formulation of policies and procedures, including curriculum review and program development, primarily through participation in monthly faculty meetings. The graduate student representative to the Architecture Student Forum represents the graduate students at graduate faculty meetings and all-school faculty meetings.

The School of Architecture is committed to improving the dissemination of information and decisions made at faculty meetings by publishing the agendas and minutes of all faculty meetings on the Architecture page of the university-internal portal (my.woodbury.edu, password-protected). And while staff input is frequently garnered from key staff members such as Galina Kraus, Terry LaSource, Nathan Short, Debra Abel, and members of the Office of Student Development (OSD), there is no formal mechanism to ensure that the needs or interests of staff are discussed or addressed at faculty meetings. This could be achieved simply by a direct request from the convener of the faculty meeting to the School of Architecture staff and OSD, soliciting agenda items prior to each meeting to address staff issues.

3.5 Studio Culture

Woodbury School of Architecture is committed to an architectural education that radically transforms the members of its community, our profession and our surroundings. In keeping with that commitment, the Studio Culture Policy spells out best practices to have in place throughout the Woodbury architectural education. These practices include the manner and tone with which we communicate with each other in class and in reviews; the management of time and workloads within the allotted studio hours; the resources available for managing stress and wellness; a code of etiquette (noise levels, privacy, respect for property) within studio; and mechanisms for voicing concerns and complaints.
We expect students and faculty to review, discuss and sign, and then abide by the policy at the start of each semester, and to continually offer revisions and updates to this policy.

Instructors and elected studio representatives are expected to take an active role in introducing students to good studio practices, making an explicit effort to articulate and model expectations of healthy studio culture, and to review and renew studio culture expectations each semester.

Generated by the students and faculty, the policy outlines standards of conduct for both students and faculty. At the first studio meeting of each semester, instructors and volunteer studio representatives present, distribute, and review the Studio Culture Policy in class. Students and faculty indicate their agreement to adhere to these guidelines by signing the document and returning it to the studio instructor.

Breaches of the policy may be addressed in a variety of ways. First and foremost, students and instructors should communicate early and openly with each other about perceived infractions. Should studio reps feel that there is a need to address studio culture issues more broadly than on a case-by-case basis within studio, they are expected to take their studio's concerns to the Architecture Student Forum for discussion and recommended action. The officers of the Architecture Student Forum are then expected to bring recommendations for emending or enforcing the studio culture policy to a faculty meeting for discussion and action.

The policy was last reviewed and approved by the faculty on March 27, 2007; it was last reviewed and approved by the Architecture Student Forum on April 10, 2007.

The Architecture Student Forum has on its agenda for Fall 2009 the review and revision of the Student Culture, explicitly incorporating the graduate students into the process and discussion of this first major revision.

The Studio Culture Policy is included in full as section 4.3.

### 3.6 Human Resources

The 2008 VTR for the BArch program identified this condition as “Not Met”. See the following excerpts from team comments and commentary under Condition 6:

“Student enrollment in the program has grown 50% from 336 in 2000-2001 to 506 in 2006-2007. The full-time faculty has grown from 8 to 10 during this time period (25%). As a result, the student/full-time faculty ratio has devolved from 42:1 to 50.6:1 since the last visit. As outsiders witnessing the past six years of continued development within the program, we see an alarming picture. It is hard to understand how or why the university has allowed this situation to develop in this way.... The program would benefit from the development of a deliberate plan by the university administration and address these problems. To be successful the commitment should also be established at the trustee level.”

“Not withstanding the serious concerns, it is important to note that the school is held together by its extraordinary dedicated faculty and through the sensitive and creative
leadership of Norman Millar, Catherine Herbst, Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, Debra Abel, and many others who fill formal and informal leadership roles.

“The staff of the school is truly impressive in the quality of their work and their ability to operate in a challenging environment of limited resources.

“At the moment, while the human resources are just barely meeting the basic needs of the students (with certain qualitative gaps already appearing), the signs of stress and failure are also evident in several unmet Student Performance Criteria. Perhaps even more important is the unmet potential of a program that is clearly trying to emerge in the local, state, and national arena.

“The turnover of talented adjunct faculty is of serious concern; when one of these dedicated colleagues leaves, it represents a tremendous waste of one of the core strengths of this program. There is a continuing concern about burnout among the full-time faculty given their numbers in relation to dramatic increase in student numbers. This important picture of the program’s health is seriously out of balance, especially when the team sees the disconnect between the dramatic growth in student numbers in the last six years and only two new full-time faculty hired during this period.”

Sufficient Faculty Complement
The above comments of the 2008 VTR resonated clearly with the university administration and at the level of the board of trustees. A commitment was made to add at least one new full-time faculty position per year until we reach 20. Since the 2007 APR there has been an FTE student growth of 6% and a growth of 50% in full-time faculty. Since 2000-2001, there has been an FTE student growth of 60% and a growth of 88% in full-time faculty. This is a clear demonstration that the university administration, backed by the board of trustees, is addressing NAAB concerns about human resources and implementing its plan to build a sufficient faculty complement for architecture’s professional degree programs.

Fulltime Faculty
The fulltime faculty are professional educators whose appointment at Woodbury is their principal employment and whose professional commitment includes responsibilities for the quality of the educational programs and for university service related to, and in support of, the instructional programs, as well as for classroom instruction. For full time faculty, outside activity that contributes to professional maintenance or advancement and community advancement is generally acceptable, but employment by other educational institutions or other institutions that results in reduced performance at Woodbury is precluded. Fulltime faculty are usually appointed for duty in established departments or schools of instruction. Most fulltime faculty are regular faculty who are appointed to renewable terms and are eligible for rank advancement based upon their teaching, professional development and service. Students evaluate each individual course for both teaching effectiveness and course content.

Adjunct Faculty
Adjunct members of the faculty are educators who carry not more than a fulltime faculty member’s teaching load for two semesters of any year. They do not receive salary during any term in which they do not teach, but they do participate in sick leave on a pro rata basis. Adjunct members of faculty teaching more than a half-time load are required to sign a waiver acknowledging the excess load.

In 2008 the university committed to raising adjunct salaries by 30% over a five-year period, and started with a 5% raise in the fall of that year. In January of 2009 all university employees received a 5% salary increase. Each year more adjunct faculty members are offered one-year
participating adjunct contracts, with eight in architecture for the 2009-10 year. This has had a positive effect in reducing the turnover of adjunct faculty in recent years.

**Participating Adjunct Faculty**
These are adjunct members of the faculty who teach no more than a fulltime load and are paid to perform services such as advising students, coordinating the lecture series or overseeing specific facilities. They are eligible to receive a one-year, rather than semesterly, contract.

**Graduate Teaching Assistants**
Insofar as the School of Architecture at Woodbury is dedicated to mentoring future educators as much as training new professionals, we provide a substantial number of teaching opportunities for our students. We offer teaching assistantships to qualified and interested MArch students in studio, lecture and seminar courses as a way of furthering their learning experience by also teaching them to teach. All eight of the new MArch students have been offered one or two teaching assistant positions per year, which not only provides them with financial support, but likewise provides academic support for mostly adjunct faculty in course delivery.

**Teaching Load**
The normal teaching load for fulltime faculty is 12 units of lecture, or the equivalent, per week. For the purposes of equivalency, 1 unit of studio/lab equals 1.5 units of lecture, assuming that all studio/lab courses are 2 academic hours per academic unit. Faculty may average the load between fall semester and spring semester to meet their teaching obligations. Summer term may be used to satisfy the teaching load requirements with permission from the dean. Most fulltime architecture faculty teach a studio and a seminar each semester and can satisfy their load by coming to the university two or three days per week, thus allowing them adequate time to pursue research, scholarship, and practice to enhance their professional development. Participating adjunct and adjunct teaching loads may not exceed 12 units (or equivalent) in a semester and 24 units (or equivalent) in an academic year, excluding summer term employment.

In 2010-11, the second year of the two-year MArch program’s first cohort, we plan to initiate a professional three-year MArch program for individuals whose undergraduate degree is not a pre-professional architecture degree, effectively adding a year to the front end of the two-year program. After their first year, the three-year MArch cohort will join the incoming two-year cohort for the remainder of their enrollment.

Two fulltime faculty members each teaching a full load are needed to teach the first year – fall, spring and summer semesters – of the 2-year MArch program. One and a half fulltime course loads will deliver the second year of the 2-year MArch program. Delivery of the first year of the 3-year program is covered by one and a half fulltime course loads. Following this logic helped us determine to hire two new fulltime faculty for the first year (2009-2010) of the graduate program, three new fulltime faculty for the second year (2010-2011), and one new fulltime faculty for each of the next two years (2011-2012 and 2012-2013). By fall 2012 we plan to have a total of seven fulltime positions associated with the graduate program.

The official fulltime equivalent (FTE) student enrollment in Woodbury’s professional architecture programs, including summers, has grown by 6% since the last APR, from an FTE of 506 in 2006-07 to an estimated FTE of 538 in 2009-10 (including the new MArch program). An additional fulltime faculty position was added in 2007-08, two more were added in 2008-09, and an additional two were added for 2009-10. The ratio of FTE students to fulltime faculty in professional architecture programs has gone from over 50 to one (50.6:1) at the time of the 2007 APR to less than 40 to one (39.3:1) at the end of 2008-2009 – a notable improvement! If we add the estimated numbers for the 2009-2010 academic year (unofficial at the time of the APR) the ratio of FTE students to fulltime faculty is estimated to be further reduced to less than 36 to one.
(35.9:1), including the eight graduate students and two new fulltime faculty. This is the lowest ratio this century. Further, if you include Hadley and Peter Arnold, co-directors of Woodbury’s Arid Lands Institute, whose fulltime responsibilities include each carrying a half-time teaching load that they satisfy by teaching in architecture, the ratio is less than 34 to one (33.6:1).

With a small cohort in the graduate program’s first year, the total FTE including the summer will be 9.6, and the ratio of FTE student enrollment to faculty will be less than five to one (4.8:1), much lower than the combined professional programs.

Faculty/Student Teacher Ratios in Design Studios
While the faculty/student teacher ratio in design studios has a maximum of one to 16 (1:16) in the BArch program, they often range from one to fourteen (1:14) to one to twelve (1:12). In the MArch program a maximum cohort of 20 is desired with two sections, each with a maximum faculty/student ratio of one to ten (1:10). Our first cohort has a faculty/student ratio of one to eight (1:8).

As in the undergraduate program, graduate studios meet twice per week – Tuesday and Friday from 1:00-6:00 PM. The classes are small enough that there is ample time for an effective critical and developmental exchange between the instructor and the student. Since studios meet only twice a week, students have ample time to dedicate to studio coursework and non-studio coursework outside of class.

Administrative Heads with Enough Time for Effective Administration
Fulltime department chairs in the School of Architecture, including the new chair of the first professional MArch program, have half-time course release and are expected to maintain a minimum of 20 office hours/week to carry out their administrative duties. The dean of the School of Architecture is a faculty member with no teaching load.

With the move of Interior Architecture to the School of Architecture from the School of Media, Culture & Design, the faculty of the School of Architecture organized a new administrative structure in the 2008-09 academic year, which is currently in place.

Dean of the School of Architecture (formerly the director): Norman Millar
A non-teaching faculty position under the supervision of the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs, responsible for advocacy of the school, its students, faculty and programs to the upper administration and Board of Trustees, leading in the development of new initiatives, fundraising and outreach, oversight of fulltime faculty searches, oversight of fulltime faculty performance evaluation for reappointment and rank advancement, oversight of associate dean, department chairs and program heads, and all school budget oversight at all locations, and maintaining NAAB accreditation for the professional BArch and MArch programs, and Council of Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA) and National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) accreditations for the Interior Architecture program.

Associate Dean (new position): Vic Liptak
A faculty position with ½-time course release under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for assisting the dean and the chairs in gaining and maintaining accreditation, developing and maintaining the school’s Master Academic Plan, overseeing curriculum development, maintaining and developing academic standards, student learning outcomes, assessment models, and educational effectiveness, and coordination of the integration of general education and the School of Architecture curricula.

Chair of Interior Architecture: Randy Stauffer
A faculty position with ½-time course release under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for the delivery of the curriculum, course scheduling, hiring adjunct faculty, fulltime faculty performance evaluation for reappointment and rank advancement, student recruiting, registration, and advising and academic budget oversight in Burbank/Los Angeles.

Chair of Undergraduate Architecture, LA (formerly associate director): Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter
A faculty position with ½-time course release under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for the delivery of the curriculum, course scheduling, hiring adjunct faculty, fulltime faculty performance evaluation for reappointment and rank advancement, student recruiting, registration, and advising and academic budget oversight in Burbank/Los Angeles.

Chair of Undergraduate Architecture, SD (formerly associate director): Catherine Herbst
A faculty position with ½-time course release under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for the delivery of the curriculum, course scheduling, hiring adjunct faculty, fulltime faculty performance evaluation for reappointment and rank advancement, student recruiting, registration, and advising and academic budget oversight in San Diego.

Chair of Graduate Architecture, LA (new position): Barbara Bestor
A faculty position with ½-time course release under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for the delivery of the curriculum, course scheduling, hiring adjunct faculty, fulltime faculty performance evaluation for reappointment and rank advancement, student recruiting, registration, and advising and academic budget oversight in Burbank/Los Angeles.

Chair of MArchRED, SD (formerly director): Armistead Smith
An adjunct faculty position under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for the delivery of the curriculum, course scheduling, hiring adjunct faculty, student recruiting, registration, and advising and academic budget oversight in San Diego.

Assistant Chair of Undergraduate Architecture, LA (new position): Andrea Dietz
An adjunct faculty/part-time staff position under the supervision of the LA chair of undergraduate architecture, responsible for student advising, course scheduling, maintaining the academic calendar, and organizing events and publications.

Head of History/Theory (unfilled) – a faculty position with ¼-time course release responsible for the oversight of the History/Theory curriculum development and delivery for the School of Architecture, faculty recruitment and performance evaluation, and new initiatives in this area.

Head of Building Technology (unfilled) – a faculty position with ¼-time course release responsible for the oversight of the Building Technology curriculum development and delivery for the School of Architecture, faculty recruitment and performance evaluation, and new initiatives in this area.

Head of Representation (unfilled) – a faculty position with ¼-time course release responsible for the oversight of the Representation curriculum development and delivery for the School of Architecture, faculty recruitment and performance evaluation, and new initiatives in this area.

Head of Urbanism and Landscape Studies (unfilled) – a faculty position with ¼-time course release responsible for the oversight of the Urbanism and Landscape Studies curriculum development and delivery for the School of Architecture, faculty recruitment and performance evaluation, and new initiatives in this area.

**Administrative Support Staff**
The 2007 APR reported that cumulatively a total of six and a half (6.5) administrative staff members reported directly to, or worked directly on behalf of, the School of Architecture in LA.
and San Diego. This year we have a cumulative total of ten (10) administrative staff members who report directly to, or work directly on behalf of, the School of Architecture in LA and San Diego. This is an increase of three and a half (3.5) positions. The university plans to add at least one and a half more staff positions by the start of the 2010-11 academic year.

While the 2007 APR did not report it, during the 2006-2007 year student workers averaged 445 hours per week on behalf of the School of Architecture, 190 hours per week in San Diego and 255 in LA. This was a staff student worker FTE of over eleven fulltime positions (11.12) – over four and a half (4.75) in San Diego and over six (6.37) in LA. By 2009, these numbers have increased significantly. Currently student workers put in 632 hours per week on behalf of the School of Architecture, 295 hours per week in San Diego and 337 in LA. This has a staff student worker FTE of almost sixteen fulltime positions (15.8) – 7.37 in San Diego and 8.42 in LA.

Burbank/Los Angeles
At the time of the 2007 APR, the dean’s offices of the School of Architecture and the School of Media, Culture & Design shared one administrative coordinator position (half-time each) and the School of Architecture had one administrative assistant position. Currently, there is a fulltime administrative coordinator position dedicated to the dean of the School of Architecture and assisting the chairs, removing some of the pressure on the single administrative assistant. The school is planning to add an additional administrative assistant to serve the needs of the new graduate program in its second year (2010-2011). While in 2007 paid student office assistants dedicated about 30 hours per week in support of the School of Architecture in LA, this year, paid student office assistants work 50 hours per week in the LA School of Architecture offices and we have a new paid student archive assistant who works 10 hours a week for the first time ever.

The university has agreed to establish to establish a new fulltime Communications Director position, but at the time of the APR that position remains unfilled. Starting in 2007-08 the School of Architecture was assigned a half-time director of Development to assist the dean in outreach and fundraising.

In 2007 the LA facility had a half-time shop master with paid student shop assistants working 133 hours per week. Currently the shop master position remains the same at half time, and the paid student shop assistants work 186 hours per week. The school is planning to add a half-time digital fabrication coordinator during the academic year.

In 2007 in LA the equivalent of one fulltime position was dedicated to supervising the architecture computer labs, with an average of 92 hours per week in paid student IT tech positions. Currently the equivalent of one and a half fulltime positions are dedicated to supervising the architecture computer labs, with 101 hours per week in paid student IT tech positions (with more hours during midterms and finals).

San Diego
At the time of the 2007 APR, in addition to the Administrative Director, one fulltime administrative assistant supported the School of Architecture and one half-time administrative assistant supported the Associate Director (now undergraduate chair). In addition, one fulltime director of admissions, one fulltime computer lab supervisor and one quarter-time shop supervisor were employed. Currently those positions remain the same, except the shop supervisor has been increased to half time and is parallel to the shop master in LA, and a new fulltime student recruiter/ombudsman position has been established.

While paid student workers put in 50 hours per week in the computer labs, 40 hours per week in the library and 100 hours per week in the shop in 2007, they currently work 70 hours per week in the computer labs, 105 hours per week in the library and 120 hours per week in the shop
Director of Communications, Los Angeles (unfilled)
A non-academic staff position responsible for oversight of the development, maintenance and promotion of the school’s identity, promotion of student and faculty achievements, and assisting the dean and director of development in developing fundraising and outreach opportunities.

Director of Development, Los Angeles (new position): Rose Nielsen
A non-academic position under the direction of the vice president of Development, responsible for assisting the dean and faculty of the School of Architecture in outreach and fundraising.

Administrative Director, San Diego: Debra Abel
A non-academic staff position with responsibilities that include, but are not limited to, coordinating with the Burbank/LA campus staff regarding services to students in the areas of financial aid, business affairs, registrar, admissions, student affairs and other non-academic matters. She is responsible for campus budgets and oversight of maintenance and security personnel/services. She establishes and maintains productive relationships with community organizations and business leaders to enhance and increase the visibility of the program.

Director of Admissions, San Diego: Amin Maghsoudi
A non-academic position under the direction of the administrative director, responsible for program promotion, student recruitment, admissions advising and transfer student support. Represents the campus at appropriate community college fairs, art and design fairs and other necessary events. Assists new students with timely completion of the financial aid process.

Recruiter and Student Ombudsman, San Diego (new position): Janet Asuncion
A non-academic position under the direction of the administrative director, responsible for recruiting new students and acting as a liaison between students and various offices on the main campus such as the registrar’s office, financial aid office, business office and the office of student development.

Administrative Coordinator, Los Angeles: Galina Kraus
A non-academic position under the direction of the dean in consultation with the chairs of the school, the AC assists with class scheduling, school budget, report writing, advising, committee business, and other areas as required. The AC is responsible for maintaining accreditation documents for all programs within the school, including administering the archives, and is the direct supervisor of administrative assistants and student workers in the LA School of Architecture faculty center.

Administrative Assistant, Los Angeles: Terry LaSource
A non-academic staff position under the direction of the administrative coordinator, responsible to provide secretarial support to the Los Angeles chairs and faculty of the School of Architecture. Coordinates calendars, purchases, syllabi, events and faculty meetings, and maintains student files. Assists with special projects such as lectures, lecture series and catalog, takes meeting minutes and keeps records of departmental policies.

Administrative Assistant, San Diego: Viola Sampson
A non-academic staff position under the direction of the administrative director, responsible to provide secretarial support to the administrative director, the administrative staff, the chairs, and faculty at the San Diego campus. Oversees the general (daily) office operations, provides student services by implementing university policies and procedures, assists with financial matters pertaining to the San Diego campus operations, conducts errands and assists with event preparations.
Administrative Assistant, San Diego (new position): Susan McFetridge
A non-academic ½-time staff position under the direction of the undergraduate chair responsible to assist faculty, students and administration with questions regarding faculty activities, maintain student advising files, set advising appointments, coordinate special projects, collect and distribute faculty evaluations, participate in website revisions and help to coordinate printed materials and publications.

Supervisor of Computer Lab, Los Angeles Campus: James Ly
A non-academic staff position under the direction of the vice president of Information Technology, responsible for computer lab operations, training and supervision of student assistants, lab scheduling and hardware, and software purchases and maintenance.

Supervisor of Computer Lab, San Diego: Nathan Short
A non-academic staff position under the direction of the vice president of Information Technology and the administrative director, responsible for computer lab operations, training and supervision of student assistants, lab scheduling and hardware, and software purchases and maintenance.

Shop master of Los Angeles: Victor Herrera
A non-academic ½-time position under the direction of the dean and the chairs, responsible for shop operations and development, including student safety certification, training and supervision of student assistants, shop scheduling, and equipment purchases and repair.

Shop master of San Diego: Chris Puzio
A non-academic ½-time position under the direction of the dean and the chair, responsible for shop operations and development, including student safety certification, training and supervision of student assistants, shop scheduling, and equipment purchases and repair.

MArch 1 Students’ Educational Backgrounds
Students entering the professional 2-year MArch 1 (pre-professional degree plus 66 to 72 units) program have successfully completed the first four pre-professional years of a NAAB-accredited 4+2 program, or must demonstrate the equivalence of such. They enter the program with a minimum of 96 undergraduate units including 45 units of general education. Incoming graduate students submit a portfolio that demonstrates a level of work equivalent to or better than Woodbury BArch students completing their third year and moving into the fourth year.

3.7 Human Resource Development

A list of visiting lectures, critics and public exhibitions in the School of Architecture for 2007-08 and 2008-09, as well as what is planned for 2009-10, is included in 4.8 Appendix A.

Faculty Development
The Faculty Handbook, Section C, Faculty Personnel Policy (see 4.8 Appendix D) describes expectations for faculty development in part as follows, “The university seeks to provide and maintain an environment conducive to professional and personal development for faculty as well as for students. This environment is the major responsibility of the university community whose members encourage each other toward excellence and individuality in teaching performance, professional growth, and service to the university. We have a right, therefore, to expect from each competence, scholarship, and service.” (C.IV.A.)
Faculty in the School of Architecture take seriously their responsibility to progress toward the ideals of the teaching scholar. Within the school, an active debate about constructing one’s own effort toward these ideals keeps us striving for new goals. Woodbury does not have a tenure system; its fulltime faculty hold rank and have renewable contracts. Architecture faculty are active teaching scholars seeking teaching effectiveness, pursuing and developing professional or scholarly or creative opportunities, and continually demonstrating a serious service commitment to the school, the university and the greater community. In the last five years (since academic year 2004-05), every fulltime faculty member in Architecture has submitted only successful contract renewal applications; seven faculty have applied for and taken (or will take this year) a sabbatical leave; six faculty have successfully applied for rank advancement; and two faculty have taken unpaid one-year leaves of absence to pursue scholarly development opportunities, and returned successfully to their appointments at Woodbury.

The ranks that fulltime faculty at Woodbury University may hold are Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Full Professor. Adjunct faculty hold the rank of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer. The Faculty Personnel Committee, the Faculty Senate, and the Faculty Association regularly review the criteria for each rank. Newly appointed fulltime faculty, whether regular, visiting, or interim, have their credentials evaluated by the Faculty Personnel Committee, which decides rank and level within rank. In addition to evaluating a candidate’s academic degrees, teaching experience, and professional experience, the committee evaluates the candidate’s potential or progress toward achieving or fulfilling the ideals of the teaching scholar. Teaching scholars should be recognized scholars in their field, should serve as role models for junior faculty, and should fulfill requirements in teaching effectiveness and development, professional or scholarly development, and university service. The Lecturer shows potential toward achieving the ideals of the teaching scholar; the Senior Lecturer demonstrates accomplishment in achieving many of these ideals; the Assistant Professor shows potential toward fulfilling the ideals; the Associate Professor demonstrates significant progress toward achieving the ideals; and the Full Professor demonstrates the highest fulfillment of the university’s ideals of the teaching scholar.

A full description of the policies, procedures and criteria for faculty appointment, promotion and contract renewal may be found in the Faculty Handbook, Section C, Faculty Personnel Policy (4.8 Appendix D).

The Faculty Personnel Policy addresses the issue of university-provided faculty development opportunities through its description of sabbatical policy, leaves of absence, and faculty attendance at professional meetings and activities. It states, “The university through its departmental budgets shall endeavor to provide assistance for fulltime faculty to attend appropriate professional meetings and other activities where the desirability of attendance has been determined by the relevant department chair and dean to be in the interests of the university and where the member’s absence will not be a serious detriment to the educational process.” The School of Architecture facilitates faculty participation in professional and academic conferences, including the ACSA regional and annual meetings, especially when the faculty member is presenting a paper or receiving an award. Examples include sending Gerry Smulevich to the ACSA annual meeting to receive the ACSA-AISC Steel Competition Awards, which his students have won awards or honors in for eight years in a row; supporting adjunct faculty members Julio Zavolta and Vinayak Bharne to ACSA meetings (regional and national, respectively), to present accepted papers; sending fulltime faculty Vic Liptak and Joshua Stein to the National Conference on the Beginning Design Student to present papers; and supporting Jeanine Centuori’s travel to the Monterey Design Conference to receive an AIA California Council design award. The school supports participating adjunct Mark Owen in his continuing education as he attends new software workshops each year.
Woodbury University Faculty Development awards go to both fulltime and adjunct faculty in Architecture on a regular basis. Architecture faculty have an additional opportunity to apply for faculty development funding through the annual Frankel Foundation Awards program. Maxine and Raymond Frankel, friends of Woodbury in general and the Architecture specifically, have generously funded an annual award program offering $20,000 in faculty awards, as well as $20,000 in student awards and $10,000 for special projects. See 4.8 Appendix B for a list of awardees since 2007.

Keeping faculty current in practice and licensure
Woodbury’s faculty is a practicing faculty; the demands of a highly competitive urban architecture market require faculty to stay current. Southern California’s growing demand for sustainable design requires practicing faculty to stay current with changing codes, professional standards such as LEED certification, and evolving materials and building methods. Built work and permits pulled are probably the best evidence of faculty members staying current.

Members of the faculty who are AIA members must fulfill the AIA’s continuing education requirements. Faculty are given opportunities and support to stay current with new products and technologies. The university provides support for individual faculty initiatives through Faculty Development Grants, Frankel Awards, Shulman Institute support, and sabbatical project funding.

Because so many of our faculty define their professional development through their design practice, situating the projects they undertake within a greater intellectual discourse and bringing that discussion directly into the classroom and studio, we have no faculty who rest on their laurels. While one of Woodbury’s six educational principles is the integrated student, the School of Architecture nurtures integrated faculty, who define holistically their practice of architecture through teaching, scholarly and professional development, and service to their communities.

Details of faculty development and extramural activities may be found in the faculty resumes, compiled in section 4.5.

Student Development
The Office of Student Development (OSD) comprises thirteen staff members and has over sixty student employees to serve the needs of students, faculty and staff on our Burbank campus. Its mission is, in collaboration with students, faculty, staff and families, to facilitate students’ transformation and enrich their educational experience by embracing their goals, dreams and aspirations. Student Development offers opportunities for engagement in educationally purposeful activities, challenges students to develop academically and personally, provides the support necessary for them to do so, and advocates for their needs.

The office covers five functional areas including administration, student services, health, counseling, and academic support. Each area has activities, programs, and services that address the co-curricular and curricular focus of the institution.

Administration:
Students with Disabilities
Medical Appeals
Facilities (campus-wide)

Academic Support:
Academic Advising
Early Alert Referrals
Peer Advisor and Mentor (new, current, and International)  
Tutoring  
Supplemental Instruction  
Placement Exams  

**Student Services:**  
Residential Life (on and off-campus housing)  
Security and Safety  
Judicial Process  
Fitness Center  
Student Leadership and Organizations  
International Student Regulations  

**Counseling and Wellness:**  
Students in Crisis  
Individual and Group Counseling  
Wellness Outreach  

**Health Center:**  
First Aid  
Health Insurance  
Doctor Referrals  
On-site medication and immunizations  
STD screenings  

While some services in academic support, counseling and health have already started in San Diego, the services need to grow. An expanded menu of student support offerings in San Diego would resemble a scaled-down version of the Burbank office. A new administrative position, shared by student development and the financial aid/registrar's office, is being tested in the recruitment/ombudsman position in San Diego, filled by a San Diego alumna, Janet Asuncion.

Our MArch students on the Burbank/LA campus have full access to all these support services, and have come through the OSD signature orientation program, SOAR (Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration), in an event targeted specifically for graduate students and held on Saturday, August 22. Some of the other OSD services that support the academic success of our graduate students are advising and tutoring offered through OASIS.

**Advising**  
Woodbury offers student-advising services that not only assist students as they enter their programs but that continue to support graduate and undergraduate students in their educational goals.

The graduate chair monitors each MArch student’s progress through the program, from initial placement in courses, through identification of an emphasis or focus of study, through identification and selection of appropriate fieldwork, and through choosing an appropriate advisory team for the graduate thesis. The graduate chair and other members of the faculty advise all students on professional goals and on co-curricular and post-curricular architecture, design, and educational opportunities.

The Office of Academic Success and Instructional Services (OASIS) offers additional advising support and provides tutoring and other instructional services for students. It oversees the Early Alert program, in which instructors notify OASIS when a student shows signs of failing to meet the rigorous standards of the architecture curriculum. An OASIS staff member contacts the
student and offers advice and counsel; this intervention often enables the student to maintain satisfactory progress.

When students are in need of personal advising, they may refer themselves or be referred to the Counseling Center. The Counseling Center currently has three part-time counselors available to meet with students and, if necessary, to refer them to additional off-campus services.

**Tutoring and supplemental instruction**

OASIS also offers tutoring and supplemental instruction. Students can walk in or make an appointment for tutoring in many academic subjects, including, for example, the Structures sequence. Supplemental instruction is a series of weekly study sessions for historically difficult courses. These group study sessions allow students to compare notes, discuss important concepts, develop strategies for studying, and prepare each other for an exam.

**Career Services**

While the BArch program requires 300 hours of work experience as a degree requirement, the two-year MArch program does not have a work experience or internship requirement. Our survey of incoming graduate students revealed that 7 out of 8 have relevant work experience already under their belts; all 8 are eligible to enroll in the IDP having completed at least 96 units as an undergraduate. Woodbury’s career services are located in the Careers and Alumni Office, a relatively recent reorganizing of services that seeks to capitalize on the synergies possible between alumni and current students seeking internships. The office keeps a list of self-identified architecture and design firms who may offer employment or internships to Woodbury students. The office sponsors recruiting programs and events throughout the school year, open to graduate and undergraduate students, as well as alumni. On-campus recruiting events and programs offer valuable information about jobs, internships, and networking opportunities, and some events offer on-campus interviews with employers.

**Off-campus Opportunities**

The school facilitates ample student opportunities to participate in field trips and other off-campus activities. The educational value of leaving the classroom, in fact, is one of the foundational tenets of the MArch curriculum, partly because it has been so transformative for our faculty and many of our BArch students. Individual instructors make arrangements appropriate to their courses, from organizing informal carpooling to off-campus site visits to obtaining rental vans paid for by the school to lobbying for university and program subsidies of airline tickets to remote sites. The summer of fieldwork required in the MArch program bridges the first year of immersion in analytic research and design with the second year of synthetic design and research. Graduate students identify an appropriate site and research interest for summer fieldwork, and conduct this mainly off-campus educational experience as a directed study under the guidance of a faculty advisor.

Additionally, graduate students have all the opportunities offered in architecture and general education and elective courses to use Los Angeles and Southern California as an experimental laboratory. A good example of this type of off-campus in-course opportunity is the Contemporary Issues section offered by Paulette Singley this fall, *Introduction to Los Angeles*. The course consists of a series of fieldtrips – urban cross-sections – specifically designed to examine both the architecture and urbanism of the vast terrain of Los Angeles. The metropolis serves as an open-air classroom and a place for experimental student learning. Site visits include bike riding on Venice Beach, a walk along the L.A. River and Arroyo Seco confluence, exploring downtown, visiting museums, and if the trails re-open, an exploration of the San Gabriel foothills after the Station Fire. Half the graduate cohort is enrolled in this course, so its off-campus opportunities will have an immediate impact on how our graduate students see and understand L.A.
Organizational and leadership opportunities
The school supports the development of leadership among our students; it has paid for student travel and printing costs to support their participation in scholarships and competitions. Students have ample opportunities to participate in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other campus-wide activities. A complete list of current student organizations and guidelines for their operation and financing appears in the Student Handbook (pages 41 through 46). We expect our graduate students to embrace a leadership role in the school; we are encouraged that one grad student is already seeking to revive a Woodbury AIAS chapter. In the incoming graduate student survey, a majority of students expressed interest in leadership aspects of architectural practice, including policy-making, a social agenda, sustainability and urban design.

3.8 Physical Resources

Building plans for the School of Architecture, including the new San Diego campus, are in 4.8 Appendix F.

Physical resources appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture
To meet our goal of providing an excellent architectural education, the School of Architecture takes advantage of facilities with a combined area of approximately 85,600 square feet. While 25,500 square feet out of at our Burbank/LA campus is exclusively for graduate and undergraduate Architecture use, all of the 27,000 square feet at the Barrio Logan facility in San Diego is exclusively used by architecture. The 2-year MArch 1 program is located on the Burbank/LA campus.

Enrollment-induced space challenge
Meeting the space needs for the architecture program had become a serious challenge and cause of concern, due to a 50% surge in enrollment since the 2002 NAAB visit. Fortunately the university foresaw the challenge and embarked upon a major building initiative for Burbank/LA in 2005. In anticipation of the summer 2008 culmination of the lease for the 8th and C building in downtown San Diego, the university negotiated a lease on new space nearby in the Barrio Logan area. We moved into the new San Diego facility in September 2008.

Burbank/LA Physical Resources
Included in the building initiative for Burbank/LA was a plan to add 10,000 square feet for non-architecture design programs, a new 25,000 square foot building for the School of Business on the parking lot adjacent to the main central quad, and a new 19,000 square foot studio facility for the School of Architecture. A 340-car parking lot was completed in August 2006 on the upper campus to accommodate the parking displaced by the new buildings and the additional parking required by the City of Los Angeles due to added square footage. At the completion of the new buildings in spring 2008, phase 2 of the reallocated space plan began, and the faculty moved out of the upper campus trailers and into the newly renovated Isaacs Faculty Center, formerly Wilshire Hall. The former Faculty Center was completely renovated by S3 Construction, a design/build firm co-owned by an alumnus of our BArch program, and the Office of Student Development (OSD) consolidated all its programs and moved into the new Pop Whitten Student Center in August 2009. Still to be developed is a plan for reusing the spaces formerly occupied by the various programs of the OSD; Randy Stauffer, chair of interior Architecture and special assistant to the VPAA for space planning, is leading this effort to align space planning with the Master Academic Plan.
Kirby Hall
Kirby Hall, a 10,000 square foot sprung building on the upper campus, was completed by fall 2005 to house design studios, review space and seminar rooms. Interior Architecture had been the primary user of this facility, with an Architecture topic studio housed there and its review space used for architecture pin-ups, but it currently houses the Fitness Center and provides classroom space for Study Group, an international program to transition students to university study in English. The Space Planning Committee will make recommendations on how this building best meets the master academic planning needs, and it may serve again as overflow studio space for the School of Architecture.

Design Center
The Design Center is a 20,000 square foot, two-story building that mainly serves animation, graphic design and interior architecture classroom, studio and lab needs. Architecture studios and seminars use its Powell Gallery for reviews. Currently, a jointly-offered Architecture/Interior Architecture studio occupies one of the design studio spaces. The render farm, used by Animation and Architecture students, is located on the second floor. The laser cutter is located on the first floor in a space accessed from the outside only.

New School of Business Building
The new 23,000 square foot School of Business building accommodates specific needs of students, faculty, and administration for that school, but also serves the needs of the School of Media, Culture & Design and the School of Architecture. The ground floor houses faculty offices and a dean’s suite for exclusive use by the School of Business. The rest of the ground floor, including a videoconference room, an auditorium with a seating capacity of 250, and a two-story entry lobby/reception space, along with the entire top floor, with four 40-student class rooms and four 20-student classrooms, is shared by all academic programs. Architecture and animation are among the most frequent users of the auditorium. The videoconference room will increase opportunities for instruction at the San Diego facility.

New Architecture Studio Building
The new 19,000 square foot architecture studio building, completed in February 2008, fully addresses the space concerns in Burbank/LA. One hundred dedicated studio spaces per floor are available in the new two-story building. Each floor features an open studio environment flanked by a long gallery that serves as a pin-up and review space for the adjacent studios. Restrooms cluster around the elevator lobby on each floor. The 2000 square foot double-height Ahmanson Main Space at the west end of the building and the southern terminus of the major north-south campus walkway serves as a multi-use meeting and exhibit hall for the School of Architecture complex. A large bi-fold hangar door connects that space to the Architecture Commons, a new outdoor room created by the completion of the project. The new building houses third year studios, advanced fourth and fifth year studios, and now the graduate studios. The Ahmanson Main Space functions as a review space, lecture space, exhibition space and event space.

New Isaacs Faculty Center
The former Wilshire Hall, which housed three architecture studios, the Writing Center, and OASIS, has been transformed into the new Isaacs Faculty Center, occupied in February 2009. The Isaacs Faculty Center houses faculty, administrators and support staff for the School of Architecture, the School of Media, Culture & Design and the Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies. For the first time, all fulltime faculty have individual offices, and every faculty office has an operable window. The Architecture Dean’s office is set up as a combination work space/meeting room, and the large office next to it, slated to house the Director of Communications, currently accommodates the assistant chair and a participating adjunct faculty member/advisor. Two 175 square foot corner offices in Isaacs currently house adjuncts; one has four dedicated desks for participating adjuncts who do advising, while the other has five unassigned desks that are
available to all adjuncts on a first-come, first-served basis (occasional use). The courtyard at Isaacs Faculty Center has outdoor seating and tables, and already has proven to be a fine space for faculty gatherings. Isaacs also has two conference rooms: the Kirkendall and the Nielsen Conference Rooms. The table in Kirkendall seats 20, and the space is equipped with a digital projector and retractable screen; the Faculty Senate meets here. Videoconferencing to San Diego will be available in Kirkendall by 2010. The Nielsen Conference Room is used for smaller meetings, as the table seats six.

**New Pop Whitten Student Center**

Student services that had been housed in several locations across campus have been brought under one roof through modifications to the old Faculty Center. All programs in the Office of Student Development moved into this renovated facility in August 2009; the facility already housed Central Services, and continues to do so. Included in the Whitten Center are the offices of the associate vice president of Student Development, the dean of students, OASIS, the Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Center, the Writing Center, Health Services, and the Counseling Center.

**Existing Design Studios**

The bulk of our dedicated architecture studios in Burbank/LA are located in A102, A104 and A106 of the architecture complex, accommodating the six sections of first year studio and the six sections of second year studio, with each section having 14 to 16 students, and the new studio building, accommodating the six sections of third year, five sections of combined fourth and fifth year students (vertical studios), and the graduate studios. All of our studio spaces are wired for the Internet. The studios have fresh air, heating and air conditioning, and a reasonable amount of natural light provided by windows and skylights. Restrooms are appropriately sited close to studio, and there is adequate lighting at night to provide a safe environment for our students.

**Jury Rooms and Exhibition Spaces**

The Wedge Gallery (A100) located at the southeast corner of the main campus quadrangle and at the entry of the Burbank/LA architecture complex, provides a venue for exhibitions, reviews, and informal pin-ups during studio hours. During studio hours, rooms A101, A105, and A108 are not scheduled for other classes and provide space for pin-ups or reviews on a sign-up basis for exclusive use by architecture. Architecture studios may also sign up to use the long galleries in the new studio building, as well as the Ahmanson Main Space, for pin-ups and reviews. Also available on a sign-up basis during studio hours are the Cabrini Meeting Room (C10), the Design Center Powell Gallery, and the Kirby Hall Main Space, which are used by architecture, graphic design, and interior architecture. There appears to be adequate review space to accommodate all our design studios, especially with improved scheduling through the administrative coordinator in the School of Architecture and the program coordinator in OSD.

**Computer Labs**

Woodbury’s Burbank/LA campus has eight student computer labs, which perform a service function for the university and its programs, especially architecture, design and business. Woodbury University compares very favorably in facilities to peer institutions. The eight labs are currently housed in rooms A103, A110-111, D201, D202, D203, M202, M204, M205 and M206. A render farm was added in the labs in the Design Center, and IT plans to expand its capacity (having recently expanded university bandwidth) to accommodate not only Burbank/LA rendering needs (animation and architecture) but also the rendering needs of architecture students in San Diego. This distance rendering will be online by mid-semester, fall 2009.

**Shop Space**

The amount of shop space on the Burbank/LA campus was increased last spring, having not changed since the NAAB visit in 2002. The former classroom 108 was annexed to the shop,
adding an additional 450 sf of shop work space, and the classroom was moved to the end of A102. The 2150 square foot shop and 500 square foot open-air metal fabrication shop now serve approximately 450 architecture students each semester, including the MArch students. The shop also serves students from interior architecture (approximately 90 FTE), however not all of those students use it. With continued growth in the graduate program, we will need more shop equipment and workspace to support the needs of the students and the curriculum. The School of Architecture is working with the space planning committee to relocate the Physics Lab from A107 to somewhere outside of the architecture complex to make room for more shop expansion and storage space.

If we receive the Title V PPOHA grant, we will turn classroom A105 into a digital fabrication laboratory, as it is adjacent to the shop and incorporates well the many processes of fabrication with which we expect our students to be familiar.

Archive Space
The archive for Burbank/LA architecture programs currently occupies 405 square feet in the west end of A102. A new 25’x20’ academic archive storage space is under construction behind the Whitten Student Center. The space planning committee is determining how best to accommodate all design departments’ archive needs; one strong possibility is that the new archive space will be shared by Interior Architecture and Architecture. With appropriate built-in shelving and an external staging area, as well as an intelligent, supervised cataloging system, the professional architecture programs (MArch and BArch) should be able to manage our archiving needs in the new space.

Faculty and Administrative Offices
Every fulltime faculty member in Architecture has an individual office in the Isaacs Faculty Center of approximately 100 square feet, with an operable window. The dean’s office is larger, approximately 200 square feet, and set behind the administrative coordinator’s area. The 150 square foot office next-door to the dean is intended for the Director of Communication; until that position is filled, it is occupied by the assistant chair of undergraduate architecture in Burbank/LA, Andrea Dietz, and long-time participating adjunct and faculty advisor Jay Nickels. The administrative coordinator and administrative assistant for the School of Architecture have desks in the main entry hall of Isaacs; work-study students provide additional administrative assistance to the School of Architecture and occupy the third desk in the main entry hall.

Hollywood CCRD Physical Resources
The lease of a storefront on Hollywood Boulevard for our Center for Community Research and Design (CCRD) has traditionally allowed us to accommodate up to 50 students there in any one semester, although we typically had 30 or less. For the past two years, with the new architecture studio building providing ample space for upper division studios and now the graduate program as well, the Hollywood storefront has housed the university gallery, providing an exhibition and event space for the School of Architecture and other university programs. The mezzanine space houses the offices of the Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urbanism. As our graduate program grows and expands to include the 3-year first professional option and the 1-year post-professional option, we will again find ourselves pushing on the boundaries of on-campus studio space. We intend to maintain our month-to-month lease in Hollywood, and develop that space to accommodate new initiatives and growth in our programs.

Information Technology Resources
Technology is a shared resource on campus, and there is a constant effort by the university to
maintain technology resources at a level demanded by the professions. All technology, including the more specialized elements, is available to members of other departments. Technology is viewed as a tool that supports the various media and design disciplines and not as a discipline of its own. All information technology is supported and maintained by the Information Technology Department (IT).

All fulltime faculty members are provided with a university laptop or desktop computer, either a Dell or an Apple. While IT has stronger support for the Microsoft operating system, there is a dedicated support person for Mac OS. The IT Department installs appropriate software on faculty computers based on individual faculty requirements, and supports those who require software in their courses.

The School of Architecture coordinates the computer labs in the Naidorf complex to accommodate class schedules and open lab time. The computer labs are available as open labs when not in use for classes. Student lab techs are present during all open lab hours. The A103 and A110-111 labs are open on average 105 hours per week, with extended hours during midterms and finals. A103 has 21 computer stations, one Mitsubishi projector, and a set of speakers. A110, the printing/plotting room, has one HP Laserjet B/W printer, one Ricoh 5560 color printer, and two HP 42" wide plotters. A11 has 21 computer stations, one Mitsubishi projector, a set of speakers, and one HP 42" wide plotter that supports two rolls. Students have access to additional printing through the Miller and Design Center labs, and to document printing in Miller Hall and the Library.

The render farm in the Design Center has one 5TB file server and five render nodes, featuring Qube software, which supports rendering in 3ds max, maya, mental ray and rhino.

An inventory of the hardware and software in the computer labs, including San Diego’s, may be found in 4.8 Appendix F.

The School of Architecture has responded to strong student desire for more electives in digital media by adding to the 3-unit elective studios we offer. We have offered design courses that focus on Maya, Rhino, Revit, and other programs) and by introducing several one-unit workshops that emphasize acquiring specific software skills. For example, this semester we are offering 1-unit workshops in Rhino, Advanced Rhino, and Revit in San Diego, and 1-unit workshops in Grasshopper/Revit and Advanced Rendering in Burbank/LA. The IT Department has kept pace with this student need by providing appropriate software on computers in the Architecture labs.

Woodbury University is behind many of the other architecture programs in Los Angeles in terms of providing digital fabrication technologies such as CAD/CAM milling tables, laser cutters, and 3-D printers. One focus of the Title V PPOHA grant proposal we submitted this summer was digital fabrication equipment and staffing to operate it. Currently our students make use of the digital fabrication equipment at nearby Glendale Community College. Digital Fabrication is a popular 3-unit studio we offer nearly every semester, and graduate students who are interested in focusing on emergent technologies will likely take this course as an elective. We expect to accommodate not only the instruction and design aspect of this course but also the fabrication on campus within the next year.

At the beginning of each semester, the vice president of Information Technology and Planning sends an email updating the campus community with completed and newly identified initiatives in support of strong, reliable, and eventually cutting-edge technologies. Vice President Steve Dyer sent an update to the campus community on August 24, 2009; we have included it here in near entirety because it clearly demonstrates a sensitivity and commitment to the needs of the architecture programs and our students:
Networking: Internet Connectivity and Campus Network
-- Implemented a high speed wireless Internet connection in place of one of our two land connections. Presently we have two land based Internet connections from the same Internet Service Provider (ISP), AT&T. If they have Internet problems, it probably would affect both of our connections. Also land lines are prone to being cut/broken during digging and ground disruption during an earthquake. In these cases the university's Internet service could be down for days. The high speed wireless Internet connection from a different ISP will greatly reduce the risk of Internet service disruption.
-- Providing improved Internet performance to meet the needs of faculty, staff, and students: 1. We now restrict Internet usage such that no one can hog the network and anyone consuming excessive bandwidth can be identified. 2. We are setting up this week a separate network made up of all classroom instructor workstations and giving it priority so Internet performance is predictable and meets classroom needs. 3. Have provisioned the necessary cable and tools to be able to re-establish the campus network in the event of a disaster.
-- Coming this fall: 1. Reconfigure the Fletcher Jones auditorium audio and video systems to play on the two CNN monitors in the atrium of the Business School on an as needed basis. This will accommodate overflow audiences and allow for late seating of attendees. 2. Create the ability to stream video on campus and onto the Internet.
-- Coming next summer: Work with Student Development to get wireless Internet access in the residence halls.

"IQ Web/Moodle, Moodle Course Home Page, Blended and Distance Learning"
-- IQ Web was upgraded to the redesigned product “Self Service,” which has a more traditional and easier to use interface. Grades will continue to be entered here.  
-- But Moodle has replaced IQ Web’s course home page: Moodle offers many more features than IQ Web. For training in Burbank refer to “Upcoming Events” on Woodbury’s portal home page or contact Nathan Garrett x147. In San Diego contact Nathan Short.  
-- And a separate syllabus library was established so students and chairs can see each and every syllabus of interest.  
-- The ability to do synchronous online classes as needed is available. If interested contact Nathan Garrett x147.  
-- Both Self Service (formerly IQ Web) and Moodle are now running on redundant servers and can be accessed if either server fails or if either Internet connection fails.

Classrooms
-- Providing classroom capture and playback (audio and everything projected) for any faculty who choose to use it. Contact the IT Help Desk at x295 if interested.  
-- Replaced five projectors in the Design Center with new higher quality definition projectors with wireless capabilities. The existing projectors did not have the definition quality required for the classes being taught there.

"Computer Labs – Hardware, Software, and Printing/Plotting"
-- Simplified and more accessible printing/copying account depositing: 1. Replaced the current card system so student PIN numbers are only needed to deposit money in student printing/copying accounts. Also for the first time a printed receipt for the transaction is available. In a few weeks students will also be able to deposit money via credit card from any lab computer. 2. Added a deposit station in the Architecture complex so they no longer need to go to the Library to deposit money into their account.  
-- Architecture complex related improvements: 1. Added a plotter with two spools so students can print on special paper on one of the spools to meet their needs. 2. Added a scanner.
-- Architectural rendering: Reconfigured the render farm so Architecture students can use it. This can dramatically reduce their render times.
-- Placed electronic displays in each print center showing lab hours, printing/copying costs, lab procedures, announcements...

“Technology for Students
-- Adding a second laser cutter in the next two weeks. When the existing single laser cutter broke down, students had great difficulty getting their assignments done and completed on time.

“Computer Emergency and Disaster Planning
-- Backed up the configurations of all servers onto tape and stored them in San Diego so they will be immediately available in the event all servers are lost in Burbank. New servers would be obtained and the configurations loaded from tape, thus saving days of configuration.
-- Coming this Fall: Place a backup server in San Diego that can be used to test restoring the applications and data stored in San Diego. This validates that what we have will be useable in the event of a disaster.

“Video Conferencing
-- Coming next month: Establishing video conferencing between the Burbank and San Diego campuses, starting with an architecture classroom in Burbank and one in San Diego.
-- Coming depending on funding: Install video conferencing in the Ahmanson and Fletcher Jones auditoriums and the Bowman and Kirkendall conference rooms. This will support School of Business and Faculty Senate video conferencing needs.

“Security
-- Have alarmed most projectors and classroom workstations on campus.

“Burbank Campus Building Plans
-- Supported the Wilshire hall renovation and moves, ensuring a technology infrastructure is in place to meet all phone, computer, printer, and copier requirements.

“San Diego
-- Replaced the four slow speed DSL connections with one high speed connection.
-- Coming next month: San Diego architecture students will be able to use the render farm in Burbank to do their rendering. This can dramatically reduce their render times.
-- Establishing video conferencing between the Burbank and San Diego campuses starting with a classroom in Burbank and one in San Diego.
-- Coming depending on funding: Establish videoconferencing from one of the large open spaces on the San Diego campus. This space could do videoconferencing to any space set up for it on the Burbank campus or elsewhere.”

The faculty, staff and students of the School of Architecture extend our continued gratitude to Steve Dyer and his staff.
3.9 Information Resources

Context and Institutional Relationships
Library and information resources available to Woodbury University’s architecture program are best described by addressing the Burbank and San Diego facilities individually.

Woodbury – Burbank:
The Library at Woodbury University - Burbank is a single facility serving all students, faculty, and staff, and supporting all majors and areas of study. The library facility is near the center of the campus complex, visible and easily accessible. Collections, functions, and services are consolidated under a single administration. All resources and collections are housed in the library; there is no separate architecture library. The existing collection is generally sufficient to support the research and curricular needs of the Woodbury community, and does not rely substantially on other libraries.

Woodbury – San Diego
In the early years of Woodbury’s architecture program at the San Diego location, the library and research needs of students were fulfilled by the San Diego Mesa Community College as part of an agreement with Mesa to teach the first two years of the architecture curriculum at their campus. Woodbury’s architecture collection was developed to be part of a total collection co-mingled and housed at the San Diego Mesa library. The Woodbury collection was acquired over the course of 10 months in 1998-99 as an “opening day” collection, and very few additional materials were added by Woodbury over the ensuing years.
In response to concerns in the 2002 NAAB VTR, and addressing student and faculty requests, the Woodbury-San Diego library collection was separated from the Mesa Community College collection in 2004, moved to the former location on 8th Ave., and moved again to its current location on Main St. in 2008. The current library collection at the satellite campus is a small architecture-specific collection, housed in a single room. Security and administrative oversight are provided by the local staff in addition to their other duties. There is no professional library staff on site.

Library and Information Resource Collections

1. Mission and Goals
Mission Statement, Woodbury University Library
The Library is dedicated to enriching the life of the Woodbury community through the expansion of knowledge and creativity. We seek to build and preserve resource collections that meet current and future curriculum, research, intellectual, creative and professional needs of the University. In pursuit of this mission the Library strives for excellence in the quality of programs, services and resources.

Goals
• Collect, organize, preserve, and provide access to the record of human knowledge in an expanding range of print and digital media. Represent both discipline-focused and
transdisciplinary information resources of quality in support of all areas of study and research.

- Further the evolution and development of library staff, programs and resources in anticipation of and responsive to trends and advances in library practices and technology.
- Teach information literacy as the foundation of communication in the academic environment and beyond. The ability to find, evaluate and use information effectively and ethically provides students with the means to communicate their visions.
- Provide an online environment that makes the discovery and access to library collections and programs transparent, and that streamlines and enhances the user experience.
- Promote the intellectual development of library users while advocating for academic integrity through the communication of economic, legal and social issues surrounding the access and ethical use of information in all formats.
- Optimize the use of library space to provide a variety of study, research, and cultural opportunities that enrich users’ experiences and position the Library as the intellectual center of the campus.

Educational Goals
- Provide learning opportunities and support in an environment that encourages the creative pursuit of knowledge.

Student Learning Outcomes
  - The ability to develop and implement an effective research strategy, and interpret and synthesize the results for the creation of a unique product.
  - Awareness of the difference between scholarly and popular resource materials, their functions as vehicles for the communication of ideas, and the appropriate uses of various types of information.
  - Locate and recognize diverse perspectives and other viewpoints, respecting the importance of alternative ways of thinking in the advancement of scholarship.
  - Use information ethically, respecting copyright and avoiding plagiarism.
  - Develop the lifelong skills necessary to locate, access, and critically evaluate reputable information in all materials formats.

The library’s mission and goals support the goals of the architecture program by providing access to current and retrospective resource materials that enable researchers to investigate the social, urban, economic, environmental, technological, and formal dimensions of architecture; by providing professional research librarians to assist students and faculty; and by providing formal education in the foundational aspects of information literacy.

The librarian assigned subject responsibility for architecture identifies and selects the majority of materials for purchase to support the architecture curriculum and program. The position of Architecture Librarian has been unfilled since May 2009. At this time, materials selection is initiated by part-time reference librarians relying strictly on favorable evaluations in new materials review sources geared to librarians. The Director of Library Services makes all final
decisions regarding book and non-book purchases for both the Burbank and San Diego campuses.

The Architecture Librarian works at the Burbank campus library. This position is also responsible for library outreach programs and serves as the library liaison to the San Diego campus. The librarian in this position resigned in May 2009. Due to the current economic climate, a hiring freeze was implemented by the university and the position has not been filled. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will in the near future be presenting to the President’s Cabinet a request to fill the position, but the outcome of that request is uncertain.

The relocation of the Woodbury – San Diego library collection from Mesa Community College to the Woodbury - San Diego campus presented numerous challenges in the provision of services and development of the collection. A stable materials budget was made available in FY 2006-2007, supporting the goal to develop a foundational collection that reflects the general nature and trajectory of the program and which meets the needs of current and future students. A full collection analysis is needed to identify significant gaps, future directions, and prioritize specific materials acquisitions. This project is on hold until professional staffing is increased in the library.

A part-time librarian position serving the San Diego campus was approved in 2007. A search for a qualified candidate was initiated, but unsuccessful. The position was not reactivated. A grant has been written and is under consideration, which would provide some funding for this position.

2. Collection Description
The library collection is actively managed to ensure that it supports the mission, goals, and curriculum of the architecture program and the university at large. The subject coverage is monitored to ensure adequate breadth and depth. The library has a detailed collection development policy, revised and expanded in 2007, using collection levels 0-5 as described by ARL/RLG (Association of Research Libraries/Research Libraries Group). Architecture materials are collected at level 3 – Study or Instructional support. In addition there is a special concentration on materials with a regional focus, materials associated with locales and issues of Woodbury’s international study programs, and materials to support the new concentrations in landscape urbanism, building technology, and entrepreneurship.

In 2008-09 $1500 in additional special funding was received for library materials related to sustainability. Though this donation was not specifically earmarked for architecture materials, the transdisciplinary nature of sustainability issues resulted in a boost to the library collection in general that directly imparts resources for the architecture program in a positive way.

Materials selection for the San Diego campus has been problematic in the past, due to the lack of a stable materials budget. This changed in FY 2006-2007, and materials are being actively acquired to make up for this deficit, though progress has slowed in the absence of an Architecture librarian. The additional funds for sustainability materials mentioned above benefited the San Diego campus library as well.

a. Books
Woodbury – Burbank:
The number of volumes held at the Woodbury - Burbank facility is 61,565. 7186 of
these are in the LC NA call number range, 10,690 additional volumes directly support
study in architecture (Appendix C).  These numbers are lower than previous years’
reports as new accounting methods are available to use that allow eliminating from the
count materials that have been discarded or lost. The current numbers now reflect an
actual count of materials available rather than the number of materials represented in
any way in the library catalog.
Deeper retrospective holdings are less comprehensive, as architecture was not actively
collected until 1984. A full analysis is needed to identify any significant gaps in materials
of historical significance. Addendum A outlines the initial framework for evaluation.

Reference materials in print format are housed on open shelves near the front entrance
and are easily accessible. Key reference materials are systematically updated as new
editions become available. Electronic format and access are purchased if appropriate
to either supplement or replace print format.

The acquisitions and cataloging processes are efficient and quick. New materials are
generally available for public use within one week of their receipt.

Woodbury – San Diego
4606 volumes are held at the San Diego campus. 3489 of these are in the LC NA call
number range, 496 additional volumes directly support study in architecture. (Appendix
C)
This collection was purchased and added 1998-1999. Until 2006 acquisitions were
largely the result of donations. Beginning with acquisitions purchased in 2006, most
materials acquired for the Burbank collection are duplicated in the San Diego collection.
Retrospective and current holdings are inconsistent at this time. A full analysis is
needed to identify any significant gaps in materials of historical significance.

Reference materials in print format are housed on open shelves in a separate area and
are easily accessible. Key reference materials are updated as new ones become
available.
If online electronic format and access are purchased for the Burbank collection, it is
available to students in San Diego as well.

A physical inventory of the San Diego collection was completed in August 2009 and
initial reports suggest that of the 4606 noted above, approximately 560 items are
unaccounted for. There is still some cleanup and record reconciliation to be done which
may reduce that number somewhat, but the large number still raises some concerns
about security of the collection.

Materials for the San Diego campus are purchased, cataloged and processed by the
Burbank staff and shipped to San Diego.
b. Serials

Woodbury – Burbank:
The serials collection at Woodbury – Burbank is sufficient in coverage and scope to support the needs of students and faculty. Retrospective collections do not generally date before 1985 as architecture was not actively collected until 1984. The library has 305 current serials title subscriptions in total. 66 of these are architecture titles, and an additional 27 support research and study in architecture. The library has active print subscriptions to 63% of the titles on the 2009 Association of Architecture School Librarians Core List, and 19% of the titles on the AASL Supplementary List. The library has numerous full-text journal databases amounting to more than 5000 full-text periodicals online. Of the ASSL core list publications to which the library does not have print subscriptions, 3 are available fulltext online through our subscription databases, and 2 from the supplemental list are likewise available. Key periodical indexes include Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals, Architectural Index, Art Full Text, daai, WilsonSelect, and ProQuest.

The serial subscriptions have not been reviewed since the recent revision of the AASL lists. A review is projected for summer 2010, and since the percentage of the core periodicals to which Woodbury subscribes has dropped, it is likely that new subscriptions will be added.

Woodbury – San Diego

The serials collection at Woodbury – San Diego is barely sufficient in coverage, and lacking in scope. The library has 20 current serials title subscriptions in total; all of these are architecture titles. Retrospective coverage does not generally date before 2003. There are a few retrospective titles that have been donated, but title runs are not complete or easily accessible. The library has active print subscriptions to 30% of the titles on the 2009 Association of Architecture School Librarians Core List, one from the supplemental list. The library has numerous full-text journal databases amounting to more than 5000 full-text periodicals online. Of the ASSL core list publications to which the library does not have print subscriptions, 3 are available fulltext online through our subscription databases, and 2 from the supplemental list are likewise available. Key periodical indexes include Avery index to architectural periodicals, Architectural Index, Art Full Text, daai, WilsonSelect, and ProQuest.

Enhancing and completing serials sets would be a priority for a new San Diego librarian, particularly in light of the recent revision of the AASL lists.

c. Visual and non-book resources

Woodbury – Burbank:
The library collection includes a selection of 215 senior degree projects by architecture students. (These are included in the book volume count.) The library has a small collection of materials samples such as adobe, resin, types of wood, etc.
The audio/visual collection consists of 1988 DVDs and VHS tapes. This number has declined significantly due to a project in 2008 evaluating VHS tapes for quality, discarding those that had deteriorated beyond usefulness. 298 items (15%) of the current collection of audio/visual materials support the curriculum and interests of architecture students and faculty. Materials in VHS format are systematically being replaced by DVD if usage patterns suggest that need. A small percentage of the materials budget is dedicated to upgrades in format. A special allocation was used to replace discards from the 2008 evaluation project if appropriate.

The library subscribes to 46 electronic databases. Databases for research specific to Architecture include, among others,

- **Architectural Index**
- **Art Full Text**
- **Avery index to architectural periodicals**
- **daai: Design and applied arts index**
- **Oxford Art Online (formerly Grove Art Online)**
- **Project MUSE** (arts, humanities, social sciences.)
- **ProQuest Direct** (arts, humanities, business, social sciences)
- **WilsonSelect Plus** (arts, humanities, education, business, science)

- The library subscribes to ARTstor – a database comprised of more than one million digital images and related data
- The library subscribes to RefWorks, a web-based bibliography and database manager that allows researchers to set up individual accounts to collect bibliographic citations electronically and produce bibliographies in multiple formats, including MLA and APA.

Microform format is no longer actively collected, but the current collection is supported. Only five titles related to architecture are retained in this unpopular format, and only one of these titles is an active subscription. The library has a microform reader/printer with the ability to capture digital images to save to disc. Microform have been discarded as replaced by electronic full text available through our database subscriptions.

Since the addition of the library’s subscription to ARTstor with its digital images, slides are no longer actively collected, but the existing collection is supported.

*Woodbury – San Diego*

The audio/visual collection at the San Diego campus is extremely limited: total of 2 items. This is an area that will be addressed in the pending collection analysis.

Students and faculty at the San Diego campus have equal access to the electronic databases listed above.
The San Diego library does not have a microform collection.

Since the addition of the library’s subscription to ARTstor with its digital images, slides are no longer actively collected. The slide collection has been temporarily removed from the San Diego location for inventory and evaluation for image quality, as a number of slides have begun to deteriorate.

d. Conservation and preservation
Woodbury – Burbank:
Materials are repaired or replaced as necessary. The library owns very few rare or delicate items. They are maintained in archival quality storage boxes but the facility itself does not provide archival storage conditions relative to temperature and humidity.

Woodbury – San Diego
Materials are repaired or replaced as necessary. The San Diego library houses no rare or delicate items that require archival storage conditions.

Services
Woodbury – Burbank:

1. Reference
A professional librarian is available on site for research and reference assistance during all library open hours. Researchers may make appointments with subject specialist librarians for in-depth research assistance. Appointments with an architecture specialist librarian are limited due to the unfilled position of Architecture Librarian. Consulting on research at the graduate level requires a level of architecture subject background that the current Woodbury librarians do not have.

The general reference staff is consistently rated highly in the library’s annual survey of students and faculty (see Addendum B). Print and web-based research guides are readily available and regularly updated.

2. Information Literacy
Information literacy is well integrated into the curriculum, including the architecture curriculum. All incoming students must take CO 105 Information Theory and Practice as a required General Education course. Courses are taught by librarians, and cover research skills, effective use of library and global research resources, ethical use of information, and information literacy standards as defined by the Association of College and Research Libraries. The library has begun assessing information literacy across the curriculum, evaluating research product in various courses to determine whether knowledge and skills gained in CO 105 are transferred and retained for use in other courses. Results of this assessment will aid the library in adjusting and enhancing efforts in information literacy education.
Additional course-related bibliographic instruction is provided by librarian subject specialists, and is available to any instructor for any class, though at this time accessibility is limited due to the unfilled librarian position.

3. Current awareness

The library has a New Books display shelving area, including seating. A display rack contains handouts, guides, and free publications. There is a suggestion box and a board for posting suggestions and responses. There is a bulletin board / white board for library and campus postings.

The library’s website is maintained by the Burbank librarians who have full control of content and structure. The library regularly includes announcements on the library home page. A new website for the library is currently in development and is expected to go live in January 2010, with significant expansion to the number of pages and amount of information.

4. Access to collections:

a. The library collection is cataloged and organized according to the Library of Congress Classification System. The library catalog provides public access to records for all items owned by the library, including the materials housed at the San Diego library facility. New materials are generally available for public use within one week of their receipt. Returned materials are generally re-shelved within 24 hours.

b. The Library building is open 82 hours per week (extended to 89 hours/week during studio and lecture finals). According to the annual survey of library users (Addendum B), a significant majority of students and faculty agree that the library’s open hours meet their needs. Course reserves are available during all library open hours. Written circulation policies are in place, and are reviewed annually. Some policies are posted on the library’s website; the new website under development has significant expansion in this area.

Off-site storage of little-used materials was initiated in summer 2009. Policies and procedures suggest a 24 hour maximum retrieval time, but this has yet to be tested with any level of significance as the service is so new.

c. The library does not have an electronic reserves system. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate digital documents in their course pages maintained on the Moodle course management system and accessible to all students at any time. In the fall of 2008, the library implemented a scanning service for faculty to provide digital files for posting on Moodle (within the guidelines of copyright and Fair Use provisions).

The library’s online catalog and subscription databases are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Off-campus / remote access to the library’s online catalog and subscription databases is available through a proxy server 24/7.
The number of network ports is sufficient to handle the traffic. Access to the online *Avery Index* is the only one based on the number of simultaneous users; difficulty in access is very rare.

5. Cooperative agreements
InterLibrary Loan service through OCLC is provided to faculty, students, and staff free of charge. Access to information about the holdings of other institutions is provided through the OCLC WorldCat subscription database. The position of InterLibrary Loan clerk is currently unfilled, but the impact of that is yet to be seen as the fall semester has only just begun as of this writing.
Students, faculty and staff residing in the state of California are eligible for library privileges at Glendale and Pasadena public libraries, including the Brand Library and Art Center.
Students, faculty and staff residing in Los Angeles County are eligible for library privileges at any of the 88 branches of the LA County Library system.
Students, faculty, and staff residing in the Burbank area are eligible for library privileges at Burbank Public Libraries.
Woodbury faculty and qualified researchers have reciprocal borrowing privileges at the 92 institutions belonging to SCELC (Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium), as well as at UCLA and CSUN.

*Woodbury – San Diego*
1. Reference
There is no professional librarian available on site at the San Diego library. Reference and research assistance is available by email or telephone to the Burbank librarians. Print and web-based research guides are readily available and regularly updated. It is hoped that the grant currently under review will be successful and provide for a parttime librarian on location.

2. Information Literacy
In the absence of professional or para-professional library staff on site, it has been difficult to provide this program for students and faculty. Infusing information literacy into the curriculum will be a priority should a librarian become available. A new librarian would be responsible for orienting students to the library and providing instruction in research skills and methods, and also teach CO 105 Information Theory and Practice when needed.

3. Current awareness
The library’s website is maintained by the Burbank librarians who have full control of content and structure. Web pages have been developed that are specifically designed to address the needs of San Diego students and faculty.

4. Access to collections:
a. The library collection is cataloged and organized according to the Library of Congress Classification System. The library catalog provides public access to records for all items owned by the library, including the materials housed at the San Diego library facility. When using the library catalog to search, patrons may limit the results to items held at the San Diego location.

b. The library is open 69 hours per week when classes are in session. Anecdotal information suggests that this is sufficient to meet users' needs, but a more formal inquiry is needed for future planning.

Initially the library collection was not set up to circulate except by special arrangement. A major component of the summer 2009 inventory project was to barcode all items to enable circulation of materials using the library’s library management system. This was completed at the end of August 2009, so the arrangement is yet to be tested and evaluated.

c. The library does not have an electronic reserves system. The library’s online catalog and subscription databases are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Off-campus / remote access to the library’s online catalog and subscription databases is available through a proxy server 24/7. Our licensing agreements specify that access is for all Woodbury affiliates. The number of network ports is sufficient to handle the traffic. Access to the online Avery Index is the only one based on the number of simultaneous users; difficulty in access is very rare.

5. Cooperative agreements
Students at the San Diego campus have full borrowing privileges at the San Diego Mesa College Library, which is approximately 10 miles distant.
Students, faculty and staff residing in the state of California are eligible for library privileges at all San Diego Public Library locations, and all San Diego County Library branches.
InterLibrary Loan service though OCLC is provided to faculty, students, and staff free of charge by the ILL staff in Burbank. Access to information about the holdings of other institutions is provided through OCLC WorldCat subscription database. The position of InterLibrary Loan clerk is currently unfilled, but the impact of that is yet to be seen as the fall semester has only just begun as of this writing.

Woodbury faculty and qualified researchers have reciprocal borrowing privileges at the 92 institutions belonging to SCELC (Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium).

Staff

1. Structure
The Director of Library Services reports to the Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs.
Librarians are members of the faculty and participate fully in faculty governance and committees. There are numerous opportunities to interact with the teaching faculty through committee work and outreach activities.

Library Organizational chart:

2. Professional expertise

All librarians have MLS/MLIS degrees from ALA accredited institutions. Position descriptions and reallocation of responsibilities are reviewed annually to ensure alignment with the library’s and institution’s missions and goals. A faculty librarian position was eliminated for 2007-2008; the additional vacancy resulting from the Architecture Librarian’s resignation in May 2009 has made it difficult for the remaining personnel to do much other than keep the library operational with existing programs and services. There are insufficient librarians and degreed professionals with subject expertise in architecture and closely related fields to adequately meet all of the needs of the architecture program at the Burbank campus at this time.

- Director - MA, Library Science; BA, Psychology; BA, German. 14+ years professional academic library experience, 5 years paraprofessional academic library experience.
  Associate Professor III - Annual salary $74,902 + $13,000 stipend
- Access Services Librarian – Master of Library and Information Science; BS, Elementary Education. 3 years professional academic library experience, 1.5 years professional public library experience, 10.5 years paraprofessional academic library experience.
  Assistant Professor III - Annual salary $63,379
• Systems Librarian - Master of Library and Information Science, BA, Psychology. 1 year professional academic library experience, 6 years paraprofessional academic library experience. Assistant Professor II – Annual salary $57,616
• Outreach Librarian – *Position is open at this time*
• Instruction Librarian (1/2 time) – Master of Library Science; BA, Anthropology, 18.5 years professional academic library experience. Annual salary $37,458
• Part time reference librarians have MLS degrees and a minimum of 5 years of professional library experience. Hourly pay is based on years of professional experience, starting at $22 per hour.

3. Support staff
The library is fortunate to have a well-educated and experienced support staff. A high school diploma and some college experience are required for entry level staff. Written job descriptions are reviewed annually. With one open staff position, there are barely sufficient paraprofessional and student staff members to effectively and efficiently manage the library collections and services.

• Cataloger (1/2 time) - Master of Library Science; MFA; BA, Music History, 27 years professional academic library experience. Annual salary $31,059
• Technical Services Coordinator - BS, Education (major Library Science), 37 years paraprofessional academic library experience. Annual salary $63,835
• Public Services Coordinator (Interlibrary Loan, Serials) - *Position is open at this time*
• Circulation/Reserves Manager – MBA; BS, Business & Management, 14 years paraprofessional academic library experience. Annual salary $42,196
• Stacks Manager/ Instructional Media Coordinator – MBA; Business & Management; BS, Fashion Marketing; 7 years paraprofessional academic library experience. Annual salary $39,458
• Evening/Weekend Circulation Assistant (1/2 time) - Library Media Technician Certificate; 5 years paraprofessional academic library experience. Hourly wage $16 per hour

4. Compensation
Staff salaries are commensurate with those of other staff at Woodbury with similar training and experience. There is some financial support for librarians to take advantage of professional development opportunities, though the travel budget has been reduced by half this year and it will not be possible for the full time librarians attend at least one national conference or equivalent development activity as they have done in the past. Paraprofessionals have been encouraged to attend at least one local conference or workshop per year to enhance their professional growth, though this will not be
possible this year due to lack of funds and lack of personnel to allow the library to remain open if anyone is gone for more than one day. At least one outside workshop is brought to the Burbank campus each year for the ongoing development of library staff. Leave with pay is available to all staff for attendance at professional conferences and workshops.

Facilities

Woodbury – Burbank:

1. Space
The library provides an attractive, welcoming, barrier-free environment for its users. There are approximately 140 seats in public areas. A large majority of students and faculty agree that the library environment is comfortable, though lighting needs to be improved at study tables (Addendum B). The current arrangement of the library interior provides few areas conducive to group study. An addition of a library courtyard in formerly unused exterior space was completed in summer 2008. This space provides additional seating areas and tables for group study.

2. Environmental factors and security
Each exit door is alarmed, and there is a fire detection system installed in the library. All materials are tagged with security strips, and there is a security gate at the front entrance. Environmental controls are adequate for a general collection. An upgrade to the electrical system was completed in 2007 as planned for in conjunction with the courtyard project mentioned above. Written emergency procedures and a disaster plan are in place.

3. Equipment
The shelf space in the library is at maximum capacity. Off-site storage was implemented in summer 2009.

Library users report that there is sufficient equipment for their needs in the form of photocopiers, printers, and scanners (Addendum B). The library has 3 desktop PC computer workstations near the reference desk, 16 desktop PC computer workstations in a lab setting, and 1 desktop PC computer workstation with high resolution scanner in the lab. The media resource room in the library houses 2 desktop Mac computer workstations, a digital video editor, televisions with DVD/VCR players, audio equipment, and a slide viewer. All staff members have their own computers.

Wireless network access is available throughout the library facility, and access is reliable. Down time is quite rare.

Woodbury – San Diego

1. Space
The library provides an attractive, welcoming, barrier-free environment for its users with an open and airy feeling. There are approximately 13 seats in a group setting; there is no space in the library area for individual quiet study.

2. Environmental factors and security
All materials are equipped with security tags, and there is a security gate at the front entrance. Lighting and climate control are sufficient.

3. Equipment
The library area has one desktop computer with scanner. The existing shelf space allows space for the growth of the collection.

**Budget, Administration, and Operations**

**Woodbury – Burbank:**

1. Funds
Library funding is provided primarily through institutional allocation. The library materials budget has been stable over time. The Director of Library Services draws up and defends the library budget and has authority for budget expenditures. Funds are sufficient to maintain the current level of collections and services. Over the years the library’s budget has increased enough to keep pace to annual increases in serials and database subscription rates. The Library Associates (friends of the library) group regularly raises funds for the library. Past projects funded by Library Associates include new carpeting for the library, moveable stacks, remodeling of the library foyer and circulation desk area, and furniture for the library’s electronic study hall.

2. Efficiency of operations and services
The library has operated efficiently and provided good service in the past, as is evidenced in the library’s annual survey of students and faculty (Addendum B). As mentioned earlier, the unfilled faculty and staff positions (Outreach/Architecture Librarian, San Diego Librarian/Information Literacy Instructor, and Public Services Coordinator/InterLibrary Loan/Serials clerk) in the libraries on both the Burbank and San Diego campuses will negatively impact the ability of the library to provide programs and services at the same level previously established. Because the Burbank library facility has such a small staff, everyone works in multiple areas, and almost all services will be affected in some way: reference, instruction, collection development, marketing and outreach, InterLibrary Loan, serials, circulation, and acquisitions. As we are only just beginning the new academic year without these positions, the impact has yet to be measured in any significant way. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will in the near future be presenting to the President’s Cabinet a request to fill the positions, but the outcome of that request is uncertain.

3. Participation of faculty and students
The library implements an annual survey of students and faculty to evaluate services and resources. Results and comments are used to inform or revise services and programs. They are also used as evidence of demand to justify budgetary resource requests.

It is the policy of the Library to purchase all faculty and student requests for materials that support curricular and research needs, within reason and budget. Electronic forms to suggest materials for purchase are available on the library’s website. Librarians actively solicit faculty input for materials to support the curriculum and programs. Through the annual Campus Campaign, many faculty and staff make contributions to enhance the library’s collections.

Woodbury – San Diego

1. Funds
Library funding is provided primarily through institutional allocation, and is included in the Woodbury – Burbank library budget. The budget for library materials has been stabilized, enabling the enhancement and systematic development of collections. The Director of Library Services has authority for materials budget expenditures.

2. Efficiency of operations and services
The library is well used by students. Materials are re-shelved in a timely manner. Accuracy of shelving locations will improve with additional training for student employees.

3. Participation of faculty and students
It is the policy of the Library to purchase all faculty and student requests for materials that support curricular and research needs, within reason and budget. Electronic forms to suggest materials for purchase are available on the library’s website. Librarians actively solicit faculty input for materials to support the curriculum and programs.
3.10 Financial Resources

For the purpose of demonstrating improvement in the area of Financial Resources a significant portion of this section will address improvements in Financial Resources for the BArch program. The 2008 VTR for the BArch program identified this condition as “Not Met”. See the following excerpts from team comments and commentary under Condition 10:

“The program accomplishes a great deal on a very tight budget. They should be commended for their ingenuity and enthusiasm. Nonetheless, as with Human Resource, it is the assessment of this team that the balance between student numbers and financial support has not found the proper equilibrium to adequately support this fine program. This was implicitly a Cause for Concern at the last visit, and although there have been significant steps in the right direction with respect to capital investment (primarily in the new Burbank architecture building and the projected new space in San Diego opening this summer), operating funds have not kept pace. Comparative data in the APR show clearly on a per–student funding basis, and this situation needs to be corrected.”

Again, the team comments of the 2008 VTR of this condition “Not Met” have resonated well with the university administration and the board of trustees. While BArch program budgets leveled off in Burbank/LA and slipped a bit in San Diego in the year of the NAAB visit (2007-08), there was a sharp increase in both budgets the following year (2008-09), including 18.9% in LA and 23% in San Diego, and we are projecting another year of significant increases in 2009-10. The architecture programs have also continued to benefit from capital expenditures since the 2007 APR with the completion of the new studio building in LA in March 2008, a new classroom building and 250 seat auditorium in May 2008 in LA, a complete new San Diego facility in September 2008, a new faculty center in LA in February 2009 and a new student development center in August 2009.

In the two years since the last NAAB visit, the architecture programs have had increasing access to institutional support from the Office of Enrollment Management and University Marketing and the Office of University Advancement, both of which offer more support to Architecture than any program at Woodbury except for the School of Business, with which it is about equal. For example, of the $987,473 in the 2006-07 budget for the Office of University Advancement, an estimated 29% or $290,398 benefited the School of Architecture. Of the 2008-09 actual expenditures of $1,472,468 for the Office of University Advancement, which includes Career Development efforts, an estimated 32% or $471,190 benefited the School of Architecture.

Enrollment Management and University Marketing
The costs for all marketing and recruiting for the new MArch program in the year leading up to the arrival of its first cohort were covered by the Office of Enrollment Management and University Marketing, including recruiting trips by faculty, posters, publications and postcards, website development, and online advertising. That office estimates that typically one third of the annual budgets of their departments have been allocated to support the architecture program as follows:

1) Recruiting and Admissions (approximately 1/3 of total budget)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$220,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$235,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$245,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$254,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Marketing and Communications (approximately 1/3 of total budget except for 2007, where additional resources were dedicated to the School of Business in a marketing blitz)

- 2006 - $325,000
- 2007 - $300,000
- 2008 - $325,000
- 2009 - $325,000

3) Registrar and Financial Aid (approximately 1/3 of total budget)

- 2006 - $134,300
- 2007 - $143,500
- 2008 - $149,240
- 2009 - $155,209

It should be noted that as the architecture programs continue to grow with the evolution of the new graduate program, the Office of Enrollment Management and University Marketing fully expects to increase the proportion of resources allocated to supporting the School of Architecture. For example at least half of the school’s Director of Communications budget of $150,000 is expected to be covered by this office. In the meantime, this office is expected to cover the cost of a PR stipend paid to Interim Graduate Chair Barbara Bestor.

**Annual Undergraduate Budgets**

Since the last APR in 2007, a closer look at access to financial resources for other professional undergraduate programs at Woodbury indicates increases in Architecture’s budget allocations and decreases in all others except for Accounting, which has increased significantly, and Business and Management. Interior Architecture, Graphic Design, and Animation appear to be righting themselves based upon loss of enrollment and excessive budget expansion in the previous six-year cycle.

It should be noted here that in order to achieve accreditation from the Association for the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), “the highest standard of achievement for business schools world wide,” the School of Business, currently accredited by the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP), has been informed that they must build up the stature of the faculty as well as their enrollment. The Accounting budget increase from $167,762 in 2006-07 to $389,646 in 2008-09 primarily reflects hiring two new highly accomplished faculty members and a nearly 50% increase in student enrollment.

The total annual Architecture budget is unlike other Woodbury program’s budget. The Burbank-LA budget includes the academic expenses and the expenses associated with the Hollywood CCRD, the shop and the Dean’s Office. The San Diego budget includes the academic budget and all of the costs associated with having the program at that facility except rent. For example, the San Diego budget includes the salaries and benefits of the administrative director, admissions director, head of Information Technology, and an administrative assistant, the shop, the computer lab, building maintenance, security, and the annual SOAR registration costs.

Since 2006-07 the total annual undergraduate Architecture budget has risen 13.8% from $2,697,684 to $3,070,689 in 2008-09. Broken down for that period, the San Diego budget rose 7.3% from $1,189,914 serving a student FTE of 137 in 2006-07 to $1,276,195 serving a student FTE of 115.3 in 2008-09. The Burbank/LA budget for that period rose 19% from $1,507,770 serving a student FTE of 369 in 2006-07 to $1,794,494 serving a student FTE of 395.5 in 2008-09. San Diego had a 15.8% decrease in student FTE for that period and Burbank/LA had a 7.2% increase, for an undergraduate architecture total of only 1% increase in student FTE.
### Budget Amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>% Chg. Since 2006-07</th>
<th>% Chg. Over Prior Yr.</th>
<th>FY 2008-09</th>
<th>% Chg. Over Prior Yr.</th>
<th>FY 2007-08</th>
<th>% Chg. Over Prior Yr.</th>
<th>FY 2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-Burbank/LA</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1794.484</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2089.44</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2036.76</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-Burbank</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1794.484</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1847.10</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>1530.10</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-San Diego</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>2170.297</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>1946.03</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>1962.37</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-Total</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>2170.297</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>2225.69</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
<td>2445.36</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Architecture</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>429.093</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>454.14</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>479.20</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>146.674</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>146.67</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>146.67</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>368.167</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>368.16</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>377.02</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>409.640</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>409.64</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>409.64</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE Business (Traditional)</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>429.464</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>429.46</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>429.46</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIArch. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIArch. R10</td>
<td>-30.4%</td>
<td>198.045</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>198.04</td>
<td>-31.2%</td>
<td>198.04</td>
<td>-31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Programs (Traditional)</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>474.560</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>474.56</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>474.56</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FTE: Including Summer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>FY 2008-09</th>
<th>% Chg. Over Prior Yr.</th>
<th>% Chg. Since 2006-07</th>
<th>% Chg. Over Prior Yr.</th>
<th>FY 2007-08</th>
<th>% Chg. Over Prior Yr.</th>
<th>FY 2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-Burbank/LA</td>
<td>433.5</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>395.3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>395.3</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-Burbank</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-San Diego</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>-16.1%</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-Total</td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>129.8</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>129.8</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Architecture</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE Business (Traditional)</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIArch. 1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIArch. R10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Programs (Traditional)</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unofficial estimates derived by using summer 2008 FTEs & unofficial fall 2008 FTEs

### Budget per FTE: Including Summer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>% Chg. Since 06-07</th>
<th>% Chg. Over Prior Yr.</th>
<th>FY 2008-09</th>
<th>% Chg. Over Prior Yr.</th>
<th>FY 2007-08</th>
<th>% Chg. Over Prior Yr.</th>
<th>FY 2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-Burbank/LA</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.525</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>4.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-Burbank</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>11.060</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>17389</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>16420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-San Diego</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture-Total</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>132.0</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Architecture</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>5.928</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.693</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>5.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>5.413</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>5.413</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>5.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE Business (Traditional)</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>5.510</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>5.510</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>5.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIArch. 1</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIArch. R10</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Programs (Traditional)</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Annual Expenditures per Undergraduate Professional Student**

In 2008-09 the average annual expenditure per FTE undergraduate student in a professional program at Woodbury was $5,613. Overall, Architecture is now over that average at $6,009, but that cost is still driven up because of the extra administrative costs associated with running the San Diego program and maintenance and security costs for the building. In the 2007 APR undergraduate architecture was the only professional program at the university whose annual expenditures per student went down in the past accreditation cycle. This time, undergraduate architecture went up 12.7%. The annual expense per FTE student went from $8,686 per student in 2006-07 to $11,066 per student in 2008-09 in San Diego (27.4%), and from $4,086 per student to $4,535 per student in Burbank/LA (11%).

The annual expenditure per student in two other undergraduate programs has also gone up since 2006-07. Interior Architecture rose 1.7% from $4,748 per student to $4,826 per student (and it should have). Accounting went up 56.9% from $6,710 per student to $10,531 per student due to increases explained above. The rest went down. UG Business went down 21% from $3,635 per student to $2,872 per student. Graphic Design went down 17.2% from $7,200 per student to $5,960 per student. Animation went down 9.7% from $7,591 per student to $6,856 per student.

**Annual Graduate Budgets**

Since the last APR in 2007, the budget allocation for the post-professional MArchRED program, now entering its fifth year, has settled into a revenue stream that operates further into the black each year, in spite of the fact that the budget allocation has been voluntarily reduced 33% from $198,876 in 2006-07 to $149,045.

Meanwhile due to the pursuit of AACSB accreditation for the School of Business, leading to new faculty hires and a surge of enrollment brought on by serious marketing campaign, the MBA program has experienced a 70.8% growth in annual budget allocation from $138,555 in 2006-07 to $4,74,516 in 2008-09.

The MArch 1 program will be identified with a new revenue stream. The annual budget of the first year to cover the net expenses is estimated at $264,294. Revenue generated in 2009-10 is expected to be $244,440, with a first year loss of just under $20,000. The first year is the only year that the program is expected to run in the red. Starting in the second year, following what we are practicing with the MArchRED program, the financial model for the MArch 1 program will be one where the university recognizes the net revenue (after expenses) and then uses that profit to replenish the program, the school, and the university by dispersing it according to the following algorithm:

- 25% to MArch 1 program
- 25% to School of Architecture
- 50% to the university for quality improvement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>Annual tuition</th>
<th>UG TA Savings</th>
<th>Lab Fees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 cohort</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$29,205</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>233,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>233,640</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>244,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes faculty salaries with benefits, computers, and travel allowance for two associated fulltime positions, graduate chair stipend:
  - Chair stipend: $13,000
  - Ewan Branda: $74,901
  - Barbara Bestor: $82,393
  - 2 computers: $6,000
  - Travel allowance: $2,000
  - Total: $178,294

**Annual Expenditures per Graduate Student**

In 2008-09 the average annual expenditure per FTE graduate student in a program at Woodbury was $2,248. The MArchRED program came in much higher at $11,040 per FTE student, due to the small size of the cohort. By sharp contrast, the MBA program has an annual expenditure per FTE graduate student of only $1,798.

In 2009-10, the first year of the first professional MArch 1 with a cohort of 8 students (equivalent of 9.6 when summer semester is included), the ratio of annual expenditure is expected to be $27,531 per FTE graduate student. The university understands that these numbers can be expected continue to go down each year towards $10,000 per FTE student as the program matures.

**Ratio of FTE Students to Fulltime Faculty**

The ratio of FTE students to fulltime faculty in professional architecture programs has gone from over 50 to one (50.6:1) at the time of the 2007 APR to less than 40 to one (39.3:1) at the end of 2008-09 - a notable improvement! If we add the estimated numbers for the 2009-10 academic year (unofficial at the time of the APR), the ratio of FTE students to fulltime faculty is estimated to be further reduced to less than 36 to one (35.9:1), including the eight graduate students and two new fulltime faculty positions. This is the lowest ratio this century. Further, if you include Hadley and Peter Arnold, co-directors of Woodbury’s Arid Lands Institute whose fulltime responsibilities include each carrying a half-time teaching load that they satisfy by teaching in architecture, the ratio is less than 34 to one (33.6:1).
With a small cohort in the graduate program’s first year, the total FTE including the summer will be 9.6, and the ratio of FTE student enrollment to faculty will be less than five to one (4.8:1), much lower than the combined professional programs.

One-time Capital Expenditures
In the two-year period since the 2007 APR, Woodbury University’s primary one-time capital expenditure has been completing phase 1 of its major construction campaign. $21,421,352 was spent in 2007-08 bringing the new business and architecture studio buildings on the Burbank/LA campus to substantial completion, and $3,500,000 was spent completing the new parking lots and infrastructure improvements for the campus.

In 2008-09, $4,476,533 was spent on phase 2 of the building campaign, including $1.8 million in tenant improvements on the new San Diego architecture facility in the Barrio Logan, completed September 2008, about $2.4 million for modifying the former Wilshire Hall into the new Isaacs Faculty Center, completed February 2009, and $700,000 for modifications to the old faculty center, now the new Whitten Student Center, completed August 2009.

Total Capital Investment Per Student
Aside from the one-time expenditures Woodbury University has regular annual capital expenditures that fall into four main areas:

- Building and maintaining the library collection
- New equipment, furniture and fixtures
- New computers and software
- Building improvements

In 2007-08 the total regular capital expenses amounted to $896,644, or $565 per FTE student. Statistically it could be argued that, since architecture students made up 37% of the total university FTE students that year, $332,635 in regular capital expenses were for architecture students. Of the total regular capital expenses in that period:

- 12% or $105,597 was dedicated to building and maintaining the library collection,
- 15% or $135,765 was dedicated to new equipment and furniture,
- 26% or $231,824 was dedicated to computers and software, and
- 47% or $423,458 was dedicated to building improvements.

In 2008-09 the total regular capital expenses amounted to $853,284, or $528 per FTE student. Using the same argument, since architecture students made up 32% of the total university FTE students that year, it could be said that $273,050 in regular capital expenses were for architecture students. Of the total regular capital expenses in that period:

- 9% or $76,519 was dedicated to building and maintaining the library collection,
- 27% or $233,506 was dedicated to new equipment and furniture,
- 51% or $438,816 was dedicated to computers and software, and
- 12% or $104,443 was dedicated to building improvements.

Information Technology costs per Student
The following Tables is a listing of regular annual computer lab expenditures for years 2007-08 and 2008-09 broken into costs per student per department per year. This Table attempts to give a rough estimate of IT Lab costs per student across the different Woodbury departments. It does so by estimating the percent that a lab is used by a specific department, (see 'Labs' tab for breakdowns) as compared to labs that are shared by all departments, to estimate approximate
disciplinary specific cost drivers (such as programs, hardware, maintenance agreements, etc). These numbers are then combined with the overall budget numbers for IT and the enrollment numbers to apportion, for each major's headcount, the approximate level of Lab costs.

This analysis is very limited, as the real cost drivers for each program vary widely. It is intended to give a rough approximation of costs across departments, and should not be used for any fine-grained analysis.

### Computer Expenditures

#### FY 07-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Computers</th>
<th>Total Computers</th>
<th>% of Computers by Department</th>
<th>% of Total Cost</th>
<th>Students Enrolled</th>
<th>Cost / Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>$243,779.59</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>$643.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch-SD</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>$60,227.90</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>$427.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>$71,699.85</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$1,280.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>$50,169.92</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$2,503.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Design</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>$63,095.89</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>$643.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>$50,169.92</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$955.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Architecture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>$80,227.90</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>$792.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>$42,200.50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$1,318.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Mgmt</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>$88,907.85</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$604.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>$71,699.85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$1,866.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Info Sys</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>$34,415.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Marketing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>$45,867.52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$882.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>$34,415.94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$1,912.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>$2,968.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$478.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics &amp; History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>$2,968.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$239.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FY 08-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Computers</th>
<th>Total Computers</th>
<th>% of Computers by Department</th>
<th>% of Total Cost</th>
<th>Students Enrolled</th>
<th>Cost / Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>$221,747.03</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>$580.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch-SD</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>$54,784.56</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$445.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>$65,219.72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$1,144.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>$69,132.90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$1,536.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Design</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>$57,363.35</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$683.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>$69,132.90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$1,115.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Architecture</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>$54,784.56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$760.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>$65,219.72</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$2,248.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Mgmt</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>$65,219.72</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>$429.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>$65,219.72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>$1,811.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Info Sys</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$31,305.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Marketing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>$41,740.82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$888.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>$12,174.35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$553.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>$13,043.94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics &amp; History</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>$10,435.15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$802.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development and Advancement Activities

Woodbury University has continued to grow its advancement functions since establishing an Advancement Office in 1994. Under the current vice president, a separate Development Office and a Careers and Alumni Office were established in 2006. Both these offices are providing more support for the School of Architecture. In particular, Rose Nielsen is now the director of
development for the School of Architecture. She spends a significant portion of her time on architecture and through another staff member, the annual giving function is more aggressively soliciting architecture alumni and parents. The Careers and Alumni Office continues to grow the base-building efforts for the School of Architecture and the university through revamped career development and alumni connection efforts.

Friends of the School of Architecture was established in 2008 as a fundraising entity specifically dedicated to the School of Architecture. Friends are encouraged to give at levels ranging from $50 to $5,000 and over. Donors can target their gifts to one of the following funds:

- Scholarship Fund
- Study Abroad Fund
- Dean’s Fund
- Material Fabrication Fund
- Architecture Books for the Library Fund
- San Diego Fund
- Julius Shulman Institute Fund
- Arid Lands Institute Fund

In its first year, the Friends of Architecture struggled to make over $10,000.

Since the September 2007 APR, university trustees have personally given $830,316. Major gifts ($40,000 or more) committed or received from foundations and individuals totaled $3,583,000 and are detailed below.

### 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Isaacs</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorthy Dumke</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Baker</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Soderling</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Tamkin</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Thomas</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Brenner</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kummer</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkeboll Foundation</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankel Foundation</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles and Lynn Saffell</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Parsons</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hallman</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ted and Charlotte Kirkendall</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Baker</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weingart Foundation</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kresge Foundation</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>building fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankel Foundation</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles and Lynn Saffell</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>scholarship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the September 2007 APR the university has also increased unrestricted giving to $474,695, and this amount benefited the School of Architecture as part of the annual budgets in 2007-08 and 2008-09. Pre-audit financials indicate that the university has increased private gifts and grants to nearly $5.8 million in the last two years.
TOTAL GIVING BY FINANCIAL CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2006-07</th>
<th>FY 2007-08</th>
<th>FY 2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$313,480</td>
<td>$273,072</td>
<td>$201,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td>2,932,404</td>
<td>3,186,366</td>
<td>1,876,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>6,176</td>
<td>230,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Private Gifts &amp;</td>
<td>$3,645,884</td>
<td>$3,465,614</td>
<td>$2,308,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the last NAAB visit the dean and the associate dean of the School of Architecture continue to give large enough gifts to the school to qualify them as members of the President’s Round Table. Others give regularly to the library associates and other university funds. Forty architecture and non-architecture faculty and staff members gave at least $100 to the Friends of Architecture last year. Other than what has been mentioned above, within the School of Architecture itself, development activity has remained limited since the last visit. The School of Architecture Director of Communications position is expected to have a positive impact on the school’s development activities as well when the position is eventually filled.

Endowments
-- Beginning in 2004 the university received a $1.1 million endowment to support scholarships for architecture students. Upon the sale of the Sachs apartments, that endowment is expected to rise by as much as $600,000.
-- In 2005, the Maxine and Raymond Frankel Family Foundation set aside $1 million for Woodbury to provide $50,000 in annual awards for faculty and students in Architecture.
-- The Estate of Jan Stussy has provided a gift of art that will be liquidated to initiate an Architecture Endowment and fund a chair for the School.
-- Woodbury University’s total endowment was $12 million at the time of the 2007 APR, and due to the economic downturn was reduced to $10.8 million on June 30, 2009.

Scholarships - Undergraduate
The university has continued to increase its own financial aid program for both need- and merit-based awards. In fiscal 2008-09, the university awarded $7,284,001 in funds to students, with architecture students receiving $3,204,960 or 44% of those funds. Donor-based scholarships have continued to increase through the solicitation of named scholarships, which provide $2,500 awards. Trustee Louis Naidorf, FAIA and his wife Sandra, as well as trustee Eddie S. Y. Yang, AIA and his wife Betty, have been particularly supportive of this effort with funds designated for architecture students. A business alumnus, Robert H. Baker of San Diego, has established a scholarship fund that is providing $5,000 awards to Woodbury students with extreme financial need.

Every traditional undergraduate student admitted to Woodbury University can qualify for an institutional merit scholarship based upon an academic index for freshmen and upon college GPA for transfer students as follows:

Freshmen Index: \((\text{GPA}_{4.0} \times 12.5) + (\text{SAT} \times 0.03125) = \text{index}\)

For example, the index of a student with a GPA of 3.0 and an SAT of 1000 is calculated as follows:
\((3.0 \times 12.5) + (1000 \times 0.03125) = 37.5 + 31.25 = 68.75\) (index)
GPA is on a 4.0 scale, with a maximum possible GPA of 4.0. ACT scores are converted to SAT. The index is then matched to the following rubric to determine the amount of the first year award, which can be maintained each year if the student keeps a Woodbury GPA of 3.0:

F1   Index of 80.0 and higher       $ 10,000
F2   Index of 67.0 to 79.99        $  7,500
F3   Index of 60.0 to 66.99        $  5,000
F4   index below 60.0             0

Transfer students have a straightforward rubric tied to their transfer GPA. They, too, must maintain a Woodbury GPA of 3.0 to continue receiving their scholarships:

T1   GPA 3.5 and higher            $  6,000
T2   GPA 3.00 to 3.49              $  5,000
T3   GPA 2.5 to 2.99               $  4,000
T4   GPA below 2.5                 0

Undergraduate architecture students received 38% of the institutional scholarships and grants in 2006-07, 45% in 2007-08, and 44% in 2008-09.

UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS AND INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS
Comparison of Years 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMED SCHOLARSHIPS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous Scholarship</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Peppers Scholarship</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Baker Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Bryant Scholarship</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Garjian Charitable Trust Scholarship</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken &amp; Rose Nielsen Scholarship</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Parrish Memorial Scholarship</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabel Wilson Richards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankel Foundation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirian McDonald Scholarship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozella Stillman Knox Memorial Scholarship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Wang Scholarship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$20,715</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDOWED SCHOLARSHIPS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Cova Endowed</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Eyerick Endowed</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Gillaspie Endowed</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Jones Foundation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert C. Laatsch Endowed</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lluella M. Murphey Endowed</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury Estate</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Scholarships
The budget of the first professional MArch 1 program includes an average of $6,000 in institutional aid per student per year, and up to $4,000 per student in teaching assistantships. In the first cohort, students were offered scholarships based upon their apparent need, the strengths inherent in their portfolio, undergraduate transcripts, and statements of intent. Of the eight students in the first cohort the following scholarships were offered:

$ 8,000 per year 3
$ 6,000 per year 3
$ 4,000 per year 1
$ 2,000 per year 1

Teaching assistantships of $2,000 per semester were offered at a maximum of one per semester and two per year for the duration of the two-year enrollment. Of the eight students in the first cohort, the following teaching assistantships were offered:

$ 4,000 per year 5
$ 2,000 per year 3

3.11 Administrative Structure

Regional accreditation
Woodbury University is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and publishes the following approved statement in its catalog, both online and in print: "Woodbury University is accredited by the Senior Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC: 985 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 100; Alameda, CA 94501; 510-748-9001) and is approved by the Postsecondary Commission, California Department of Education. WASC granted Woodbury its original regional accreditation in 1961."

Two websites offer further information:
http://www.woodbury.edu/s/131/index.aspx?sid=131&gid=1&pgid=1296 describes the university’s current accreditation status and process; and http://www.wascsenior.org/wasc provides a downloadable list of accredited institutions.
**University systems of governance and administration**

The working relationship between the administration officers, faculty, and staff is one of cooperation, flexibility, and accessibility at all levels. The university self-governance policy allows academic departments, under the guidance of department chairs, school deans, and with the support of the senior vice president, cabinet and board of trustees, to administer their programs and develop educational plans that meet both departmental goals and university expectations to provide successful academic and professional programs for our students.

The educational and administrative systems conform to the bylaws of the university and to rules outlined by the university’s Policies and Procedures Manual, as well as the constitution and policies set forth by the Faculty Association. Administrative prerogative and faculty governance as defined in those documents determines specific processes. The faculty, in their units and as a whole, have the power to recommend or endorse all areas of educational policy, including curriculum, faculty qualifications, and admission standards. The process requires consent of the various faculty units, the faculty governance body, the senior vice president who serves as the chief academic office (CAO), and president. In some cases, the consent of the board is also required.

There are regular meetings of all groups in which information is shared. The School of Architecture has two all-school all-faculty meetings per semester, and the chair of each department within the school convenes their faculty four times per semester. Each department reviews, comments upon, and responds to university administration via the dean, who serves as a liaison and advocate for the faculty, staff, and students of the school to the administration. Departments review and respond to faculty and academic policy issues via the School of Architecture senator, who acts as liaison between the governing body of the Faculty Association and the faculty in the School of Architecture.

These procedures have proven effective and have passed the review of various accrediting bodies, including WASC.

The university administrative and governance structure is based in the following entities:

**Board of Trustees**

The governance and administrative structure of Woodbury is clearly stated in the Bylaws of Woodbury University, a California Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation. The board of trustees is Woodbury University’s governing body, providing policy leadership and oversight, and endowed with the responsibility of meeting the needs and guiding the direction of the university as a whole.

The board consists of 30 individuals who have diverse experience in education, design, business, law, philanthropy, medicine, and public service, two of whom are Woodbury alumni. Trustees are appointed to serve five-year terms that are renewable. Their primary powers, as stated in the bylaws, are “a) to determine the corporation’s goals and objectives and assure that plans and programs are designed to meet them, and b) to establish policies for administering the affairs of this corporation.” The means to fulfill these objectives is outlined in the bylaws under Article IV, BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

The president is a member of the board of trustees and is designated as the chief executive. He presides over the Cabinet of University Officers. The cabinet informs the president concerning affairs in all the university’s areas and gives advice on policy affecting the university as a whole.

Kenneth R. Nielsen, Ed.D., President
Phyllis Cremer, Ed.D., Associate Vice President, Student Development
Steve Dyer, Vice President, Information Technology and Planning  
Seta Javor, Executive Assistant to the President, Secretary to the Board of Trustees  
Ken Jones, Vice President, Finance and Administration  
Richard M. Nordin, Vice President, University Advancement  
David M. Rosen, Ph.D., Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs  
Don E. St. Clair, Ed.D., Vice President, Enrollment Management and Marketing

Presidential Advisory Committees
The president has charged several university-wide committees to provide advice in specific and sensitive areas of community-wide interest.

Space Planning Committee
(Interior Architecture Chair Randy Stauffer chairs this committee. Associate Dean Vic Liptak and Professor Nick Roberts serve on this committee. Dean Norman Millar previously served on and chaired it.)
The committee solicits and prioritizes requests from academic and administrative units for needed facilities and oversees the coordination of campus-wide summer building and maintenance projects.

Technology Steering Committee
(Professors Eric Olsen and Cameron Crockett serve on this committee; previously Chair Ingallill Wahlroos-Ritter and Professor Gerard Smulevich served on it.)
The committee oversees and coordinates technology issues specifically as they pertain to information technology, computer labs, software, etc. It makes annual recommendations about the purchase of equipment and software in keeping with the university’s strategic needs.

President’s Task Force on a Sustainable Campus
(Professor Linda Taalman serves on this committee; previously Professors Vic Liptak and Gerard Smulevich served on it.)
The committee advises the president on policies and on operations to create and sustain a “green” campus.

Budget Advisory Committee
(Dean Norman Millar and Associate Dean Vic Liptak serve on this committee.)
The committee recommends the allocation of funding for strategic purposes as part of the yearly budget. It also helps track the allocation of resources and makes recommendations relevant to the appropriate use of those resources.

University-wide accreditation committees
Senior Vice President David Rosen initiated the formation of university-wide accreditation committees that bring representatives from faculty, staff, and administration to the table to oversee the university’s regional accreditation re-affirmation efforts.
WASC reaccreditation is a multi-year process; for each stage a committee was formed and led the university successfully through preparation, report, and visit. Professor Nick Roberts served on the university’s WASC Reaccreditation Steering Committee from 2005 through 2007. Professor Gerard Smulevich served on the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Committee in academic year 2006-07. Professor Paulette Singley served on the WASC Student Success Task Force in academic year 2006-07. Dean Norman Millar served on the WASC Educational Effectiveness Review Committee in 2008-09, and Associate Dean Vic Liptak currently serves on that WASC committee. The Educational Effectiveness Review visit will take place on campus March 9 and 10, 2010.
Faculty Governance
Constitution of the Woodbury University Faculty Association and Senate
The Bylaws of Woodbury University provide the mechanism for the members of the Woodbury University Faculty Association (WUFA) to organize a self-governing structure. The WUFA membership consists of all fulltime faculty and adjunct faculty under current contract whose primary responsibility at Woodbury University is teaching. Through its organization the faculty receives and reviews proposed faculty and university policy changes, recommends faculty appointments, contract renewals, and advancement through the elected personnel committee, oversees faculty elections and the appointment of non-elected committees, advises the administration with regards to admissions and academic standards, and assesses and makes recommendations to the administration regarding academic resources.

The Faculty Senate and WUFA Governing Committees
(Vic Liptak currently serves as the president of the senate and thus dean of faculty. San Diego BArch Chair Catherine Herbst serves on the senate as the school’s elected representative. Professors Paulette Singley, Gerard Smulevich, and Nick Roberts have also served as senators; Randy Stauffer served previously as president of the senate.) The senate is a faculty governing body that serves to represent the aspirations and responsibilities of the WUFA membership. WUFA elects the senate from its membership for two-year terms to serve as its representative body. The senate meets twice a month and has a joint meeting with the WUFA membership once each term or more frequently as the business of the university may require.

Personnel Committee (elected)
(Vic Liptak serves ex-officio as dean of faculty to convene this committee. Professor Paulette Singley currently serves on this committee. Professors Stan Bertheaud, Jeanine Centuori, Joshua Stein and Dean Norman Millar have also served on the committee. Professor Randy Stauffer convened this committee previously as dean of faculty.) The committee evaluates and makes recommendations to the university president regarding the qualifications of all persons under consideration for appointment or reappointment to the fulltime faculty, the qualifications of all candidates under consideration for rank, placement, and promotion, and applications for sabbatical leave. In addition, it makes recommendations to the senate and thus to the administration on what university-wide standards should be applied in the determination of all faculty personnel matters.

Educational Planning Committee (EPC) (appointed)
(Professor Randy Stauffer previously served on this committee; Professors Vic Liptak and Jose Parral currently serve.) The committee makes recommendations relevant to all new academic programs and all major changes to existing programs. It reviews and makes recommendations about all existing programs as part of the academic program review process. The committee coordinated development of a Master Academic Plan in collaboration with the individual academic units. This plan, part of the WASC accreditation process, serves as a guide for future institutional development.

Curriculum Committee (appointed)
(Burbank/LA BArch Chair Ingallill Wahlroos-Ritter serves on this committee; Professor Gerard Smulevich previously served.) The committee serves as the clearinghouse for all curricular proposals, sending those that involve new programs or major changes in philosophy or structure to the EPC; evaluates existing curricula and conducts a systematic review of descriptions of courses and course prerequisites; considers proposed modifications of courses; and reviews and makes policy recommendations on grading policies, withdrawals, incomplete grades, independent studies, retroactive withdrawals, residency requirements, academic overloads, and grade changes.
Faculty Development Committee (appointed)
(Professors Nina Briggs and Marcel Sanchez Prieto serve on this committee; Nick Roberts served previously.) The committee oversees the distribution of faculty funds that assist faculty in undertaking creative activities, additional education, and scholarly research.

Academic Appeals (appointed)
(Professors Jeanine Centuori, Gerard Smulevich, and Stan Bertheaud serve on this committee.) The committee reviews and decides all exceptions to faculty academic policy in response to individual student petition, and recommends to the Senate any review of policy based on that process.

Institutional Review Board (appointed)
(Professor Joshua Stein currently serves on this board; previously Eric Olsen served.) Woodbury University policy requires that researchers respect and protect the rights and welfare of individuals recruited for, or participating in, research conducted by or under the auspices of Woodbury University. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversees the protection of human subjects in research projects conducted by or under the auspices of Woodbury University. Woodbury University is guided by the principles set forth in the Belmont Report in accordance with Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46 (45 CFR 46). Further, the actions of Woodbury University also conform to all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations.

School of Architecture administrative structure
The School of Architecture, inaugurated in January 2007, has been developing an administrative structure to reflect its mission, vision, and growth. From its former department structure with a chair and assistant chair, as one of five departments in the former School of Architecture and Design, the professional architecture program has developed, strengthened, and expanded to include a second professional program, the five-semester Master of Architecture 1, and the resulting school has successfully incorporated two non-professional programs into its mission.

An academic dean leads the School of Architecture. The dean of the School of Architecture (formerly the director) is a faculty position with full course release under the supervision of the Senior Academic Vice President, responsible for advocacy of the school, students, faculty and programs to the upper administration and Board of Trustees, leading in the development of new initiatives, fundraising and out-reach, oversight of fulltime faculty searches, oversight of fulltime faculty performance evaluation for reappointment and rank advancement, oversight of associate dean, department chairs and program heads, and oversight of all school budgets at all locations, and maintaining NAAB accreditation for the professional B.Arch and M.Arch programs and CIDA and NASAD accreditations for the Interior Architecture program.

A new position, associate dean, is a faculty position with ½ - time course release under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for assisting the dean and the chairs in gaining and maintaining accreditation, developing and maintaining the school’s Master Academic Plan, overseeing curriculum development, maintaining and developing academic standards, student learning outcomes, assessment models, and educational effectiveness, and coordination of the integration of general education and the School of Architecture curricula.

The administrative director in San Diego holds a non-faculty position. The responsibilities include, but are not limited to, coordinating with the Burbank campus staff regarding student services in the areas of financial aid, business affairs, registrar, admissions, student development and other non-academic matters; oversight of the campus budgets; oversight of maintenance and security personnel and services; and establishing and maintaining productive relationships with relevant
community organizations and business leaders in San Diego to enhance and increase the visibility of the program.

A chairperson leads each of the five departments: in Burbank/LA, the three departments are undergraduate Architecture leading to the Bachelor of Architecture, graduate Architecture leading to the first professional Master of Architecture, and Interior Architecture leading to the Bachelor of Fine Arts; in San Diego, the two departments are undergraduate Architecture leading to the Bachelor of Architecture, and graduate Real Estate Development for those holding a professional architecture degree, leading to the post-professional Master of Architecture in Real Estate Development. The largest department of the five, undergraduate Architecture in Burbank/LA, is supported by an assistant chairperson.

Chair of Interior Architecture: a faculty position with ½-time course release under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for the delivery of the curriculum, course scheduling, hiring of adjunct faculty, fulltime faculty performance evaluation for reappointment and rank advancement, student recruiting, registration, and advising and academic budget oversight in Burbank/Los Angeles.

Chair of Undergraduate Architecture - LA (formerly associate director): a faculty position with ½-time course release under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for the delivery of the curriculum, course scheduling, hiring of adjunct faculty, fulltime faculty performance evaluation for reappointment and rank advancement, student recruiting, registration, and advising and academic budget oversight in Burbank/Los Angeles.

Chair of Undergraduate Architecture - SD (formerly associate director): a faculty position with ½-time course release under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for the delivery of the curriculum, course scheduling, hiring of adjunct faculty, fulltime faculty performance evaluation for reappointment and rank advancement, student recruiting, registration, and advising and academic budget oversight in San Diego.

Chair of Graduate Architecture – LA (new position): a faculty position with ½-time course release under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for the delivery of the curriculum, course scheduling, hiring of adjunct faculty, fulltime faculty performance evaluation for reappointment and rank advancement, student recruiting, registration, and advising and academic budget oversight in Burbank/Los Angeles.

Chair of MArchRED - SD – (formerly director): an adjunct faculty position under the supervision of the dean of Architecture, responsible for the delivery of the curriculum, course scheduling, hiring of adjunct faculty, student recruiting, registration, and advising and academic budget oversight in San Diego.

Assistant Chair of Undergraduate Architecture LA – (revived position): an adjunct faculty/staff position under the supervision of the LA Chair of undergraduate architecture, responsible for student advising, course scheduling, maintaining the academic calendar, and organizing events and publications.

A director of advancement for Architecture reports to the vice president for University Advancement and works closely with the dean of the School of Architecture to identify potential donors and develop opportunities for advancing the school’s mission and goals.

The architecture faculty have identified four major components of the architecture curricula, and have proposed that a program head be appointed to lead each component. The four programs are History and Theory, Building Technology, Representation, and Urban/Landscape Studies.
Each program head is a faculty position with ¼-time course release responsible for the oversight of the program’s curriculum development and delivery for the School of Architecture, faculty recruitment and performance evaluation, and new initiatives in this area. Only History and Theory has had a head appointed, and that position is currently unfilled. As the Master of Architecture program continues to develop and refine its curriculum, the faculty will determine the need to fill these program head positions and/or to revisit their definitions.

At each level of studio for which there is more than one section offered, a studio coordinator serves to bring together the studio instructors, lead discussions on assignments and evaluation standards, and coordinate other aspects of studio as it relates to the larger curriculum and community.

At each campus, a shop master manages the shop facilities and staff, works to actively engage students in the act of making as essential to their architectural education, supports the school and curriculum through shop projects and opportunities, and ensures that students and faculty work safely in a safe and productive shop environment.

The School of Architecture houses two programs, the Community Center for Research and Design (CCRD), and the Julius Shulman Institute, and has a strong collaboration with a third, the Arid Lands Institute (ALI), which is housed independently within the university. A fourth program, the Borderlands Institute, is in development and will be housed in the school at the San Diego campus. The director of the CCRD is a fulltime member of the Architecture faculty and reports to the dean; the co-directors of the ALI are adjunct members of the Architecture faculty and report to the VPAA in their administrative capacity.

The other academic divisions of Woodbury University (School of Business, School of Media, Culture & Design, and Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies) have a broadly parallel structure: a dean leads each division; two of the divisions, Business and MCD, have associate deans with a clearly defined scope of responsibility; each division houses several departments; and a chairperson heads each department. A diagram of the administrative structure of the School of Architecture is at the end of this section.

School of Architecture degree programs
The School of Architecture offers four degree programs:
1. A two-year, five-semester first professional graduate program in architecture for students who hold a pre-professional undergraduate degree in architectural studies, leading to the professional Master of Architecture degree. This program is eligible for NAAB candidacy, and this Architecture Program Report has been prepared as part of that process.
2. A five-year undergraduate professional education in architecture in Burbank/LA and San Diego, leading to the NAAB-accredited Bachelor of Architecture degree. This program received a six-year term of reaccreditation from the NAAB in 2008.
3. A three-semester post-professional graduate program in Real Estate Development for students who hold a professional architecture degree, leading to the post-professional Master of Architecture in Real Estate Development for Architects.
4. A four-year undergraduate program in Interior Architecture, leading to the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree. This program is accredited by the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA, formerly known as FIDER) and the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD).

The School of Architecture plans to launch a three-year seven-semester first professional graduate program in architecture for students who hold an undergraduate degree in a field other than architectural studies, leading to the professional Master of Architecture degree, in Fall 2010. We will follow all NAAB procedures for attaining accreditation for this program.
Finally, the school plans to launch a three-semester post-professional graduate program in architecture for students who hold a professional degree in architecture, leading to a post-professional Master of Architecture degree, in Fall 2011. This program will offer distinct emphases in Burbank/LA and in San Diego.
3.12 Professional Degrees and Curriculum

**Master of Architecture 1**

The School of Architecture offers a two-year five-semester Master of Architecture 1 degree, with a total requirement of 168 credit hours, 94 of which are professional architecture credit hours. Minimum undergraduate credit hours are 96, of which a minimum of 40 are professional architecture, a minimum of 45 are general education, and a minimum of 11 are electives. Minimum graduate credit hours are 66, of which 54 are required professional architecture. The remaining 12 credit hours are unrestricted.

**MASTER OF ARCHITECTURE 1 curriculum**

Minimum undergraduate units: 96  
Required professional courses: 40  
ARCH 114 Design Communication 1 3  
ARCH 211 Design Communication 2 3  
ARCH 243 Materials and Methods 3  
ARCH 267 World Architecture 1 3  
ARCH 268 World Architecture 2 3  
ARCH 281 Design Studio 2A 5  
ARCH 283 Design Studio 2B 5  
ARCH 383 Design Studio 3A 6  
ARCH 384 Design Studio 3B 6  
ARCH 425 Environmental Systems 3

Required general education courses: 45  
PHYS 240 Physics 1 3

Undergraduate electives: 11

Required graduate professional courses (P): 54  
Required graduate electives (E): 12  
Minimum semester hours required: 168

**Suggested sequence of required courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1</td>
<td>ARCH 587 Graduate Design Studio 3</td>
<td>6 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 526 Structures 1</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td>PHYS 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 533 Advanced Theory of Architecture</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate elective</td>
<td>3 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate elective (optional)</td>
<td>(3 E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1</td>
<td>ARCH 589 Graduate Design Studio 4</td>
<td>6 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 527 Structures 2</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td>ARCH 526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 534 Graduate Urban Design Theory</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 550 Professional Practice 1</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate elective</td>
<td>3 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1</td>
<td>ARCH 575 Fieldwork Summer Research Studio 1</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 576 Fieldwork Summer Research Studio 2</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2</td>
<td>ARCH 691 Graduate Design Studio 5</td>
<td>6 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 648 Graduate Thesis Preparation</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 664 Systems Integration</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td>ARCH 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate elective</td>
<td>3 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master of Architecture 1 Program Emphases (optional)

Three areas of focus augment the basic MArch 1 curriculum in the form of 6-unit topic studios and 3-unit elective seminars or mini-studios:

1. Landscape Urbanism
   Courses offered will address but not be limited to: history of city, rural and urban landscapes, contested landscapes, wilderness edge conditions, borders, watersheds, demography, infrastructures, energy, geography, mapping, GIS, community design, public art, landscape architecture, urban design and planning, and non-western traditions.

2. Building Technology
   Courses offered will address but not be limited to: emergent technologies and materials, green technologies, rapid prototyping, building skins, building systems, mass production, prefabrication, case study, and ornament.

3. Entrepreneurship
   Courses offered will address but not be limited to: alternative practices, parallel practices, real estate development for architects, open-ended building and building slow. Students wishing to receive a Master of Architecture followed by an MBA degree may opt to follow the Entrepreneurship track, taking six pre-MBA courses as graduate electives. These courses: PC 501 Accounting Practices, PC 502 Financial Economics, PC 503 Legal and Ethical Issues in Business, PC 504 Global Marketing, PC 505 Production, Operation and Systems Management, and PC 506 Organizational Behavior and Strategy, would qualify the MArch recipient to move directly into a 1-year MBA program.

Bachelor of Architecture

The School of Architecture offers a five-year ten-semester Bachelor of Architecture degree with a total requirement of 160 credit hours, 97 of which are in architecture. Of the 51 credit hours required in general education, 21 are required and 30 are elective. The remaining 12 credit hours are unrestricted.

**BACHELOR OF ARCHITECTURE curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leading to the Bachelor of Architecture (BArch) Degree</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major (M)</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education (GE)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated General Education (GE*)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted electives (UE)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum semester hours required</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 300 hours work experience required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Recommended GE courses indicated in brackets.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested sequence of required courses</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Prereq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST YEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 114 Design Communication 1</td>
<td>3 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 182 Design Studio 1A: Principles &amp; Processes</td>
<td>4 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 111 Academic Writing I</td>
<td>3 GE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDS 10x Interdisciplinary Studies course</td>
<td>3 GE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 249 College Algebra</td>
<td>3 GE*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARCH 183 Design Studio 1B: Natural Tendencies  
ARCH 211 Design Communication 2  
ARTH 205 History of Contemporary Art  
MATH 251 Trigonometry with Descriptive Geometry  
WRIT 112 Academic Writing II

SECOND YEAR
Fall Semester
ARCH 243 Materials and Methods  
ARCH 267 World Architecture 1  
ARCH 281 Design Studio 2A: Program and Space  
PHYS 240 Physics I  
COMM 120 Public Speaking
Spring Semester
ARCH 250 Professional Practice 1: Documentation & Codes  
ARCH 283 Design Studio 2B: Site Orders  
ARCH 268 World Architecture 2  
PHYS 241 Physics II  — xxx General education elective

THIRD YEAR
Fall Semester
ARCH 326 Structures 1  
ARCH 330 Theory of Architecture  
ARCH 383 Design Studio 3A: House and Housing  — xxx General education elective  — — Unrestricted elective
Spring Semester
ARCH 327 Structures 2  
ARCH 384 Design Studio 3B: Structure, Systems, Space, Form  
ARCH 425 Environmental Systems  — — Humanities or INDS core

FOURTH YEAR
Fall Semester
ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues: Practice and Theory  
ARCH 487 Design Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design + 425  
ARCH 464 Systems Integration + 425  — — Social science or INDS core
Spring Semester
ARCH 334 Urban Design Theory  
ARCH 489 Design Studio 4B: Urbanism  — 3xx General education elective  — — Social science or INDS core

FIFTH YEAR
Fall Semester
ARCH 448 Professional Practice 2: Research and Pre-Design  
ARCH 491 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics  — 3xx General education elective
—— Unrestricted elective 3 UE

Spring Semester
ARCH 450 Professional Practice 3: Documents & Proj. Admin. 3 M ARCH 366 + 448
ARCH 492 Degree Project 6 M ARCH 448 + 491
—— Unrestricted elective 3 UE
—— Unrestricted elective 3 UE

ARCHITECTURE ELECTIVE COURSES:
ARCH 112 Drawing 3
ARCH 166 Southern California Architecture 3
ARCH 186 Case Studies in Architecture 3
ARCH 269 Object Making 3
ARCH 293 Second Year Open Studio 1 5
ARCH 293.1 Second Year Open Studio 2 5
ARCH 350 Publications 3
ARCH 351 Design, Animation and Simulation in the Digital Environment 3
ARCH 352 Fictional Cartographies 3
ARCH 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study 3
ARCH 393 Third Year Open Studio 1 6
ARCH 393.1 Third Year Open Studio 2 6
ARCH 456 Marketing Professional Services 3
ARCH 458 Real Estate Development 3
ARCH 468 Digital Media 3
ARCH 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio 6
ARCH 493 Fourth Year Open Studio 1 6
ARCH 493.1 Fourth Year Open Studio 2 6
ARCH 493.2 Fourth Year Open Studio 3 6
ARCH 495 Internship 3

WORK EXPERIENCE
Prior to graduation, candidates for the Bachelor of Architecture degree must complete 300 hours of work in the office of an approved architect or allied professional. The work experience must be accomplished after the completion of the second year and prior to the completion of the fifth year. With the aim of maintaining the highest level of excellence in course work, fulltime students are encouraged to work no more than 20 hours per week.

MINORS
BArch students wishing to minor in another discipline have the following choices available.

ART HISTORY MINOR
Select at least 1 course from the following:
GDSN 240 Digital Photography 3 units
FOUN 101 Beginning Drawing 3 units
Select at least 2 from the following
ANIM 240 History of Animation 3 units
ARCH 267 World Architecture I 3 units
ARCH 268 World Architecture II 3 units
FDSN 160 History of Fashion I 3 units
FDSN 161 History of Fashion II 3 units
ARTH 202 History of Ancient Art 3 units
ARTH 203 History of European Art 3 units
ARTH 204 History of Modern Art 3 units
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 205</td>
<td>History of Contemporary Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 210</td>
<td>History of Eastern Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 211</td>
<td>History of Latin American Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 220</td>
<td>History of American Film</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDSN 260</td>
<td>History of Graphic Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARC 164</td>
<td>History 1, Ancient-1800</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARC 165</td>
<td>History 2, 1750-Present</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSI 201</td>
<td>History of Music</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 331</td>
<td>History of Modern Painting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 332</td>
<td>History of Photography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 340</td>
<td>Multicultural Dance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 370</td>
<td>Topics in Fine Arts 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND 327</td>
<td>Film and Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND 329</td>
<td>Harlem Renaissance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND 322</td>
<td>Music and Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum unit requirement 15 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHILOSOPHY MINOR**

Select 1 course from the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 201</td>
<td>Introduction to Philosophy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 210</td>
<td>Ethical Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 230</td>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select 4 from the following courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND 310</td>
<td>Postmodernism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 310</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 311</td>
<td>Moral Philosophy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 312</td>
<td>Philosophy of Religion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 313</td>
<td>Modern Thought</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 314</td>
<td>Existentialism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 315</td>
<td>History of Ideas I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 316</td>
<td>History of Ideas II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum unit requirement 15 units

**ACCOUNTING MINOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 205</td>
<td>Principles of Accounting I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 206</td>
<td>Principles of Accounting II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 300</td>
<td>Cost Accounting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 304</td>
<td>Intermediate Accounting I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 3xx/4xx</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum unit requirement 15 units

**BUSINESS MINOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 205</td>
<td>Principles of Accounting I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT 100</td>
<td>Introduction to Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT 310</td>
<td>Principles of Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 301</td>
<td>Principles of Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINA 360</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum unit requirement 15 units

**ENTREPRENEURSHIP MINOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGMT 100</td>
<td>Introduction to Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 205</td>
<td>Principles of Accounting I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 301</td>
<td>Principles of Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP 310</td>
<td>Fundamentals Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP 330</td>
<td>New Venture Creation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minimum unit requirement 15 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MINOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT 100</td>
<td>Introduction to Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBUS 350</td>
<td>Global Enterprise *</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose any 3 from the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBUS 360</td>
<td>International Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBUS 430</td>
<td>World Economic Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBUS 450</td>
<td>Business in Pacific Rim</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBUS 465</td>
<td>International Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBUS 466</td>
<td>International Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minimum unit requirement 15 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* ECON 200 or ECON 203 will serve as a prerequisite for IBUS 350 for non-business minors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FASHION MARKETING MINOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMKT 115</td>
<td>Introduction to Fashion Business</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMKT 235</td>
<td>Trend Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMKT 245</td>
<td>Fashion Promotion Lab</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 301</td>
<td>Principles of Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select one of the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMKT 246</td>
<td>Retail Fashion Buying</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMKT 375</td>
<td>Field Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 310</td>
<td>Consumer Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minimum unit requirement 16 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MARKETING MINOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT 100</td>
<td>Introduction to Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 301</td>
<td>Principles of Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select 3 of the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 312</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 321</td>
<td>Advertising &amp; Promotion Mgmt</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 340</td>
<td>Marketing Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKT 341</td>
<td>Marketing on the Internet</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 209</td>
<td>Introduction to Advertising</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minimum unit requirement 15 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ANIMATION MINOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM 100</td>
<td>Animation Principles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM 121</td>
<td>Storyboarding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM 261</td>
<td>Intro to 2D Computer Animation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM 102</td>
<td>Beginning Figure Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select 1 from the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM 221</td>
<td>Animation Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM 240</td>
<td>History of Animation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM 230</td>
<td>Conceptual Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM 325</td>
<td>Animation as Actor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM 330</td>
<td>Animal Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM 262</td>
<td>Intro to 3D Computer Animation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minimum unit requirement 15 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNICATION MINOR
COMM 210 Interpersonal Communication 3 units
COMM 220 Media Culture 3 units
COMM 329 Visual Communication 3 units
Select one from the following:
COMM 203 Communication Theory 3 units
COMM 204 Introduction to Public Relations 3 units
COMM 209 Introduction to Advertising 3 units
COMM 230 Research Methods 3 units
COMM 231 Oral Interpretation of Literature 3 units
COMM 232 Screenwriting 3 units
COMM 233 Digital Video Editing 3 units
Select one from the following:
COMM 305 Ideology and Persuasion 3 units
COMM 307 Rhetorical Theory 3 units
COMM 310 Argumentation and Debate 3 units
COMM 312 Communication and Culture 3 units
COMM 314 Journalism 3 units
COMM 315 Story Structure 3 units
COMM 323 Communictn & Popular Culture 3 units
COMM 326 Crisis Communication 3 units
COMM 327 Communication and the Sexes 3 units
COMM 328 Family Communication 3 units
COMM 370 Special Topics 3 units
Minimum unit requirement 15 units

FASHION DESIGN MINOR
FDSN 111 Sketching I 2 units
FDSN 213 Prof Practices in Fashion Design 3 units
FDSN 125 Technical Studio I 4 units
FDSN 130 Textiles 3 units
FDSN 161 History of Fashion 2 3 units
Minimum unit requirement 15 units

GRAPHIC DESIGN MINOR
GDSN 106 Intro to Graphic Design 3 units
GDSN 107 Digital Practice 3 units
GDSN 116 Typography 1 3 units
GDSN 288 Graphic Design 2 3 units
Select one from the following:
GDSN 216 Typography 2 3 units
GDSN 315 Package Design 3 units
GDSN 240 Digital Photography 3 units
GDSN 260 History of Graphic Design 1 3 units
GDSN 355 Interactive Design 1 3 units
GDSN 207 Digital Production 3 units
GDSN 310 Communication Design 3 units
Total units 15

INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE MINOR
FOUN 103 Color Theory 3 units
IARC 252 Space Planning 3 units
IARC 328 Tectonics 2: Detail Design 3 units
IARC 366 Contemp IA History & Theories 3 units
IARC 365 Lighting Design 2 units
IARC 282 Design Studio 4 4 units
Minimum unit requirement 16 units

PSYCHOLOGY MINOR
PSYC 200 Introduction to Psychology 3 units
Select 4 from the following:

INDS 312 Terrorism 3 units
PSYC 300 Social Psychology 3 units
PSYC 301 Group Processes 3 units
PSYC 302 Research Methods 3 units
PSYC 305 Personality 3 units
PSYC 306 Influence and Persuasion 3 units
PSYC 309 Abnormal Psychology 3 units
PSYC 310 Developmental Psychology 3 units
PSYC 311 Human Sexuality 3 units
PSYC 312 Environmental Psychology 3 units
PSYC 314 Psychology of Gender 3 units
PSYC 315 Industrial/Organizational Psych 3 units
PSYC 316 Cross-Cultural Psychology 3 units
PSYC 317 Consumer Psychology 3 units
PSYC 318 Media Psychology 3 units
PSYC 370 Topics in Psychology 3 units
Minimum unit requirement 15 units

HISTORY MINOR
Select 2 courses from the following:

POLI 202 Early History of the United States 3 units
POLI 203 Modern History of United States 3 units
POLI 207 World Civilization I 3 units
POLI 208 World Civilization II 3 units
INDS 101 Journeys 3 units
INDS 102 Natures 3 units
INDS 103 Conflicts 3 units
INDS 104 Knowledges 3 units
Select at least 3 from the following:

POLI 300 The Evolution of Science 3 units
POLI 301.1 Modern No. Africa & Mid East 3 units
POLI 301.2 Modern Sub-Saharan Africa 3 units
POLI 302.1 Modern Japan 3 units
POLI 302.2 Modern China 3 units
POLI 303.1 19th Century Europe 3 units
POLI 303.2 20th Century Europe 3 units
POLI 304.1 Modern Latin America: Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean 3 units
POLI 304.2 Modern Latin America: South America 3 units
POLI 305.1 The United States: End of the Reconstruction to World War I 3 units
POLI 305.2 The United States: 20th Century 3 units
POLI 306 Modern Europ Women’s History 3 units
POLI 307 Modern U.S. Women’s History 3 units
INDS 300 AIDS and Epidemics 3 units
INDS 301 Nazi Germany 3 units
INDS 308 The Soviet Union 3 units
Minimum unit requirement 15 units

POLITICS MINOR
Select 2 from the following:
INDS 101 Journeys 3 units
INDS 102 Natures 3 units
INDS 103 Conflicts 3 units
INDS 104 Knowledges 3 units
POLI 202 American Political Systems 3 units
POLI 250 Contemporary World Affairs 3 units
Select 3 from the following:
INDS 312 Terrorism 3 units
POLI 301 Political Theory 3 units
POLI 302 Comparative Politics 3 units
POLI 303 International Relations 3 units
POLI 304 Ancient Political Philosophy 3 units
POLI 305 Early Modern Political Philosophy 3 units
POLI 306 Modern Political Philosophy 3 units
POLI 307 United States Constitutional Law 3 units
POLI 308 Racial Identities and the Law 3 units
POLI 309 Gender Roles and the Law 3 units
POLI 310 Socioeconomic Class and the Law 3 units
POLI 311 The Legislative Process 3 units
Minimum unit requirement 15 units

Off-Campus Programs – Fieldwork
MArch 1 students are required to do six units of summer research studio between their first and second years. MArch students identify their area of interest and place to study, get approval from their advisor, and conduct the research studio as a directed study. MArch students may choose to participate in one of the summer study away programs organized in the BArch program, or they may identify another opportunity and develop that with the help of their advisor.

Off-Campus Programs – Summer Study Away
Barcelona
Description of facilities and resources: Typically Woodbury rents review space from CCC Barcelona (Centro de Cultura Contemporania) or from IAAC (Institut d'Arquitectura Avançada de Catalunya). Pre-arrangements are made for students to stay in shared apartments. Faculty make their own arrangements. Costs are covered by a $400 student program fee for a total budget of $6,400 over and above the 40% allotment from tuition.
Course requirements: ½ AR 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study and ½ AR 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio for a total of 4½ credit-hours. (Equivalent to ½ AR 334 Urban Theory and ½ AR 489 Design Studio 4B: Urbanism or AR 591 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics Studio)
Length of stay: The program is in Barcelona for four weeks.

Rome
Description of facilities and resources: Woodbury rents studio space and shared apartments for students and faculty from Penn State. Costs are covered by a $1750 student program fee for a total budget of $21,000 over and above the 40% allotment from tuition.
Course requirements: ½ AR 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study and ½ AR 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio for a total of 4½ credit-hours. (Equivalent to ½ AR 334 Urban Theory and ½ AR 489 Design Studio 4B: Urbanism or AR 591 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics Studio) Rather than ½ AR 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio, some students may opt to take a 3-unit advanced mini studio.

Length of stay: The program is in Rome for four weeks.

**Nanjing**
Description of facilities and resources: Woodbury has use of studio space at the Southeast University School of Architecture. Students stay in university dormitories and faculty stay at a university guest hotel. Costs are covered by a $350 student program fee for a total budget of $5,600 over and above the 40% allotment from tuition.

Course requirements: ½ AR 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study and ½ AR 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio for a total of 4½ credit-hours. (Equivalent to ½ AR 334 Urban Theory and ½ AR 489 Design Studio 4B: Urbanism or AR 591 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics Studio)

Length of stay: The program is in China for five weeks.

**Berlin**
Description of facilities and resources: In Berlin Woodbury rents an 800 sq ft studio space in an office building at Alexander Strasse 7, 10th floor. Pre-arrangements are made for students to stay in shared apartments. Faculty make their own arrangements. Costs are covered by a $400 student program fee for a total budget of $6,400 over and above the 40% allotment from tuition.

Course requirements: ½ AR 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study and ½ AR 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio for a total of 4½ credit-hours. (Equivalent to ½ AR 334 Urban Theory and ½ AR 489 Design Studio 4B: Urbanism or AR 591 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics Studio)

Length of stay: The program is in Berlin for four weeks.

**Paris**
Description of facilities and resources: Woodbury rents studio space from Prep' Art art school. Pre-arrangements are made for students to stay in shared apartments owned by the Georgia Tech School of Architecture. Costs are covered by a $400 student program fee for a total budget of $6,400 over and above the 40% allotment from tuition.

Course requirements: ½ AR 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study and ½ AR 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio for a total of 4½ credit-hours. (Equivalent to ½ AR 334 Urban Theory and ½ AR 489 Design Studio 4B: Urbanism or AR 591 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics Studio)

Length of stay: The program is in Paris for four weeks.

**ALI/Dry Studio + Summer Field Station**
Description of facilities and resources: ALI's Dry Studio is a ten-week course based out of Burbank, with a 17-day field trip at the start of the course and a required 3-day field trip at its conclusion. There are no program fees for students in the Dry Studio; travel costs are covered by a 50% allotment from tuition. On-campus student housing for SD students enrolled in the Dry Studio is paid for out of the 50% tuition allotment. During the first week of travel, students survey infrastructural, architectural, and urban sites across the American west, with a particular focus on water management throughout history. Students live and work out of rented four-wheel-drive vehicles and tents for one week of camping and fieldwork. During the second portion of the trip, students are immersed in a remote case-study community, living and working out of a rented apartment and studio for one to two weeks. Rental accommodations in Embudo/Dixon, NM, site of the 2009 Summer Field Station, include dormitory-style apartments, a shared kitchen + courtyard, and a 2000-square-foot open-plan work space for classes and public presentations. Students return to Embudo/Dixon for two nights at the conclusion of the semester, to install an exhibition of their final work and host a community presentation. ALI also rents a survey-grade Trimble GEO XH mobile GPS surveying unit, post-processing software, and
external antenna; provides for high-definition audio + visual documentation of fieldwork and public presentations; and underwrites a day-long seminar led by specialists in the law, culture, and mechanics of local water management. Consultants are paid modest honoraria.

Course requirements: AR 489 Urbanism or AR 591 Contemporary Topics
Length of stay: 17 days on the first trip, three days on the second.

Off-Campus Programs – German Exchange Program
Fachbereich Architektur
FACHHOCHSCHULE DÜSSELDORF, University of Applied Sciences, Germany

Description of facilities and resources: The program is a direct exchange program. Up to four students from either university can participate in the program each year. Woodbury students pay tuition at Woodbury and take courses at Fachhochschule Dusseldorf. They have access to all student services of that institution at no extra cost and have access to student housing and dining facilities at the German rate.

Course requirements: Woodbury students take the equivalent of a full semester from the fourth year Woodbury architecture curriculum of from 12 to 15 credit-hours including an upper division design studio.

Length of stay: Woodbury students stay at the University of Applied Sciences in Dusseldorf for one full semester.

3.13 Student Performance Criteria

Overview of curricular goals and content

Expectations of incoming MArch students
In many respects, the identity of Woodbury Architecture MArch 1 is an outgrowth of the interests and strengths of its higher achieving undergraduate students, often minority, low income, first in their family to go to college. These students bring a passion for improving their lives and the lives of others. Their work is rooted in their identities and in the communities from which they come and to which they hope to return to make a difference. While the design of the MArch program allows us to admit only those who are qualified academically for a place, the interests and dispositions of the candidates for admission play a role in their selection. For them, as for our other students, we seek transformation that comes from knowledge, skill, and vision with purpose.

Students admitted to the MArch. 1 program with a 4-year pre-professional architecture degree must demonstrate that they have met, at a minimum, the architecture major learning outcomes equivalent to those expected of a Woodbury BArch student entering the fourth year.

They constitute a community of diverse individuals from multiple backgrounds and places who demonstrate the potential to become leaders who are citizen architects – competent in the contemporary practice of the discipline, who understand the place of building in the environment, who have the intelligence to conceptualize in a way that has impact, who have the professional ethics to ensure that that impact is for the greater common good, and who will develop these skills as leaders in the field.

They must demonstrate competence in research methods, intensive expository writing, description, and narration, and the abilities to discuss ways to solve problems, evaluate arguments, make decisions, and reason soundly using different methods of inquiry. They demonstrate an understanding of contemporary communication theory with their abilities in the practices of interpersonal communication, oral presentation of ideas, and methods of listening.
and hearing. They must have satisfied the math and physics prerequisites for our structures sequence and may have satisfied the equivalent of one or both of our structures courses (AR 326/526 Structures 1 and AR 327/527 Structures 2).

Drawing on the strength of our diverse student body, Woodbury’s Master of Architecture curriculum seizes an opportunity to similarly diversify the pedagogical approach in teaching architecture. The spirit of ethical professional behavior motivated by keen observation skills and opportunistic invention guides the MArch 1 curriculum. Built on the premise that dislocation = transformation, the MArch 1 program offers a fieldwork-based curriculum that follows one of three optional focuses or a combination thereof: landscape urbanism, building technology, and entrepreneurship.

Beginning in the first semester, every studio project is expected to satisfy the requirement of having a clearly written statement of intent based upon a well-researched position. As a rule western, non-western and regional traditions are discussed and researched at every studio level. Highly developed drawing and model-making skills, digital and by hand, are stressed in design studio as a means to express design intent.

**Fall 1 (first semester)**

In their first studio, MArch students address social and environmental issues through an investigation of the built domestic environment. They demonstrate the application of theoretical research and critical positioning as they integrate site, program, technology, tendencies of human behavior, structure, material, environment, and social, political, economic and cultural contexts in their design work. Drawing on their own experience and synthesizing their work in the advanced theory seminar, the domestic realm investigated is necessarily multicultural, and the design work is considered in the context of a globalized urbanism and environment. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of speaking and writing, critical thinking, research, graphics, fundamental design, the use of precedents in architecture, program preparation, site conditions, and technical documentation; and by achieving understanding of western, non-western, national and regional traditions, human behavior, and building materials and assemblies in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Critical Thinking, Design, Building, Representation and Professionalism.

In the theory course, advanced concepts, philosophies, ideologies, models, and polemics that have influenced or been the genesis of architectural expression and form are surveyed and analyzed. Special attention is given to current debates in the field of architectural design in order to identify alternative forms of delivery into which architectural theory has immersed itself beyond buildings – websites, zines, blogs, journals, exhibitions, course syllabi, etc. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of speaking and writing, critical thinking, research, collaboration, and the use of precedents in architecture; and by achieving understanding of formal ordering systems, western, non-western, national and regional traditions, human diversity and leadership skills in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Critical Thinking, Design, Representation and Professionalism.

In the structures course, fundamental architectural structures, forces, force systems, and resultants are studied, including concepts of forces and stresses on statically determinate structures such as trusses, beams, and columns. Topics include equilibrium, behavior of structures subject to vertical and lateral forces, and strength properties. Basic structural analysis and design as it relates to wood is studied. Students meet NAAB criteria by achieving understanding of structural systems in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Design and Building.

In one or two elective courses students begin to develop expertise in one of the concentrations
or emphases identified with the MArch 1 program – landscape urbanism, building technology or entrepreneurship.

**Spring 1 (second semester)**

In the professional practice course, legal codes and regulations that affect architecture and influence design are reviewed including a study of energy, accessibility, egress and life safety. The development of project documentation based on local codes is studied, with an emphasis on technical documentation, drawing format organization and outline specifications. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of accessibility and technical documentation in architecture; and by achieving understanding of life safety, client roles, architectural practice, professional development, legal responsibilities, and ethics and professional judgment in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Representation and Professionalism.

In the second structures course, structural analysis and design with respect to wood and steel structures is studied including tension, compression, and seismic design. Fundamental concepts in reinforced concrete design are studied emphasizing the ultimate strength method. Students meet NAAB criteria by achieving understanding of structural systems in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Design and Building.

In the urban design theory course, cultural, sociological, contextual and formal issues of urbanism and their influence on the contemporary design of cities are studied. The course investigates the relationship between architecture, landscape architecture, and urban planning. Emphasis is placed on the process of visual analysis, nature and society, public and private space, human behavior and the physical environment, human diversity, and regulation and public policy. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of speaking and writing, critical thinking, research, collaboration, and the use of precedents in architecture; and by achieving understanding of formal ordering systems, western, non-western, national and regional traditions, human diversity and leadership skills in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Critical Thinking, Design, Building, Representation and Professionalism.

In the design studio, students study the architect’s leadership role in their community on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics through the study of urban design techniques and practices related to architecture and urbanism. A broad array of urban theories, tactics and strategies, building and space types, landscape and infrastructure design, and politics and policy making are explored through the dialectic between the private and public realms of the diverse urban culture. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of speaking and writing, graphics, collaboration, the use of precedents in architecture and site conditions; and by achieving understanding of western, non-western, national and regional traditions, human behavior, human diversity and leadership in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Critical Thinking, Design, Representation and Professionalism.

In an elective course, students continue developing expertise in a chosen MArch 1 concentration or emphasis.

**Summer 1 (fieldwork semester)**

In the fieldwork research studio 1, using a foreign or local host city as the classroom to begin thesis preparation, students examine the numerous factors that contribute to shaping the particular city or region. Through primary source readings and direct experiences, the students examine the urban environment of the host location historically and typologically. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of speaking and writing, critical thinking, research, collaboration, and the use of precedents in architecture; and by achieving
understanding of western, non-western, national and regional traditions, and human diversity in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Critical Thinking, Design, Representation and Professionalism.

In fieldwork research studio2, students study 'new' and 'old' existing buildings and sites within the host city, exploring them tectonically through program, structure, materials and details. Design development is stressed, along with cultural/social concerns. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of speaking and writing, graphics, fundamental design, the use of precedents in architecture and site conditions in architecture; and by achieving understanding of western, non-western, national and regional traditions, human diversity and human behavior in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Critical Thinking, Design, Representation and Professionalism.

Fall 2 (fourth semester)
This is the semester when the students examine and establish their position or area(s) of expertise. All of the courses of this semester are chosen in support of that position.

In the elective course students deepen their expertise in the MArch 1 concentration or emphasis they have chosen.

In the systems integration class, the interrelationships of the properties of materials, structures, environmental systems, building envelope systems, construction technology, building cost control, and life-cycle costs as they influence design development and decision making are examined. A comprehensive and integrative process is presented. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of building systems integration, technical documentation and comprehensive design in architecture; and by achieving understanding of sustainable design, environmental systems, life safety, building envelope systems, building service systems, building materials and assemblies and construction cost control in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Design, Building, Representation and Professionalism.

In the design studio, students produce a comprehensive architectural project based upon a building program and site that includes the development of programmed space, demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections, building assemblies and the principles of sustainability. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of speaking and writing, critical thinking, graphics, collaboration, use of precedents, designing for accessibility, site conditions, technical documentation and comprehensive design in architecture; and by achieving understanding of western, non-western, national and regional traditions, sustainable design, environmental systems, life safety, and building materials and assemblies in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Critical Thinking, Design, Building, Representation and Professionalism.

In the thesis preparation course, theory and techniques for analyzing and integrating design methodologies, client or user needs, and site conditions into criteria for preparing for an architectural project are studied. The theoretical and practical context for the thesis project is researched and developed. Along with the completion of a substantiated written position of intent, a project site is selected, program written and design methodology articulated. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of speaking and writing, critical thinking, research, program preparation and site conditions in architecture; and by achieving understanding of legal responsibilities and ethics and professional judgment in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Critical Thinking, Design, Representation and Professionalism.
Spring 2 (fifth semester)
In the second professional practice course, design delivery and project and firm management are studied, including understanding the client role in architecture, program preparation, an analysis of documents, services, professional contracts and fees, project budget and cost estimating, global markets, and professional ethics. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of collaboration and program preparation in architecture; and by achieving understanding of client roles, architect’s administrative roles in architectural practice, professional development, legal responsibilities, and ethics and professional judgment in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of the School of Architecture track in Professionalism.

In the graduate thesis studio, students must demonstrate the application of theoretical research and critical positioning, plus the ability to integrate site, program and other design issues of architecture including space, time, aesthetics, context, inhabitation, and systems in a self-initiated architectural design project. The finished thesis project must demonstrate an advanced degree of critical thinking, technical skill, and knowledge of the craft of building through a rigorous and highly resolved level of work. Students meet NAAB criteria by demonstrating ability in the skills of critical thinking, graphics, research, use of precedents, program preparation, site conditions, and comprehensive design in architecture; and by achieving understanding of western, non-western, national and regional traditions in architecture. Students demonstrate mastery of the School of Architecture outcomes in Critical Thinking, Design, Building, Representation and Professionalism.

In the one or two elective courses students complete their study of the concentrations or emphases they identified with the MArch 1 program – landscape urbanism, building technology or entrepreneurship.

The matrix cross-referencing each required course with the performance criteria it fulfills is at the end of this section.

In an era when architectural production and communication are characterized by ever-increasing reliance upon the computer, Woodbury’s MArch 1 program will heartily embrace new technologies and explore the wide panorama of the digital revolution. With recent advances in digital information systems having made the global classroom a real possibility, new models of teaching allow us to conduct media-driven lectures in airports or on archaeological sites as well as in the traditional university. This freedom from site-restricted teaching also increases the tensions between a mediated world and the immediate environment, presence and distance, the virtual and the actual. Fieldwork takes advantage of these tensions by translating them into learning experiences that are hyper-immediate and remote only to the touch.

We also want to spend some time “unplugged.” Among many distinguishing characteristics of Los Angeles and Southern California are the intricate and tightly knit intersections of the urban with the wild. Combined with the vast array of micro economies and diverse communities that remain tucked away within this sprawling acreage, Southern California offers an incredibly rich array of topics for architectural research.

Fieldwork
The emphasis on fieldwork in the MArch 1 program asserts that, despite the bounty of information provided by the internet and digital information systems, mining the physical terrain of Los Angeles, Southern California, and other distant sites allows students to collect data, work in situ, and develop observational skills about the physical environment that can be translated into thinking about critical spatial practices. In this sense then, as students undertake their summer of fieldwork, this approach to interrogating the built environment characterizes the
ethos of the entire graduate program and demonstrates our commitment to engaging real world problems, developing international connections, and quickly responding to global transformations.

Fieldwork is summer study in which students complete six units of directed research about a specific geography or topic where they apply theory to practice. To fund the fieldwork, a nominal additional fee is built into the annual per-unit tuition. When compounded across the student’s entire tuition this amounts to enough revenue to fund her or his travel away. Each student receives a fieldwork stipend of $4000 to be used during the summer between the first and second year of enrollment. A student may travel with one of the established programs, work with a faculty member to set up a directed study elsewhere, or find an overseas program to attend. He or she may even remain in Southern California and apply this voucher to funding experimental research with such institutions as Cal Tech or UCLA, as long as a Woodbury faculty member maintains fiscal and scholarly oversight of the student’s research project.
### NAAB Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Level of Accomplishment</th>
<th>Fall 1</th>
<th>Spring 1</th>
<th>Summer 1</th>
<th>Fall 2</th>
<th>Spring 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Speaking and writing Skills</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Critical Thinking Skills</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Graphic Skills</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Research Skills</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Formal Ordering Systems</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fundamental Design Skills</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Collaborative Skills</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Western Traditions</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Non-Western Traditions</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Use of Precedents</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Human Behavior</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Human Diversity</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Accessibility</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sustainable Design</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Program Preparation</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Site Conditions</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Structural Systems</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Environmental Systems</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Life Safety</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Building Envelope Systems</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Building Service Systems</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Building Systems Integration</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Building Materials &amp; Assemblies</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Construction Cost Control</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Technical Documentation</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Client Role in Architecture</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Architect’s Administrative Roles</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Professional Practice</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Architectural Practice</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Leadership</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Ethics &amp; Professional Judgement</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School of Architecture Tracks

| 1 Critical Thinking          | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      |
| 2 Design                    | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      |
| 3 Building                  | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      |
| 4 Representation            | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      |
| 5 Professionalism           | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      | ☑️      |

**Legend:**
- ☑️: Understanding
- ◆: Ability
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