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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments

The Team expresses its deep appreciation to President and Mrs. Nielsen, Vice President Rosen, faculty, staff, and students of Woodbury University’s School of Architecture for their hospitality, patience, good humor, and commitment to the accreditation process. The Team offers a special note of thanks to Norman Millar and his dedicated faculty and staff for their passionate commitment to this process and the students of Woodbury. Most importantly, the Team thanks the Woodbury students for their candor, enthusiasm, passion for architecture and the Woodbury family. We are honored to chronicle your achievements.

In its 24th year, Woodbury University’s School of Architecture finds itself in the midst of an institutional growth cycle along with moderate pains expected in any process of transformation. With the outcomes of the faculty retreat, recent commissioning of a new studio building in Burbank, and plans to relocate the San Diego program, the school is positioning itself to achieve its goal of becoming recognized nationally for its unique architectural education offering.

Academically, the Team saw emerging signs of excellence as evidenced by the strong student work and a dedicated faculty. Most of the NAAB student performance criteria are met; and in areas where they are unmet, there is clear commitment to correct the shortcoming.

Woodbury is creating a unique identity within the architectural landscape of Southern California through creative delivery of the educational experience; and more importantly, engaging and celebrating diversity by creating an environment for growth and achievement.

Student enrollment in the program has grown 50% from 336 in 2000-1, to 506 in 2006-7. The full-time faculty has grown from 8 to 10 during this 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. Several of these concerns have now moved to deficiencies, particularly Condition 6 – Human Resources and Condition 10 – Financial Resources; additional commentary is provided under the two conditions noted. The program would benefit from the development of a deliberate plan by university administration to address these problems. To be successful, commitment should also be established at the trustee level. The program has been authorized to hire two new full-time faculty members, but at the time of the APR and visit, these faculty members have not been retained.

Not only are more robust financial and human resources support necessary for accreditation to protect the integrity, health, and viability of the architecture program, it should be viewed as a good investment by the university. This is a very strong program, one that is clearly on a dramatic rise in regional and national prominence. Yet there is a fragile stability in place and there are increasing signs of burnout, early and quick departures of many adjunct faculty, and students who are not getting consistent, thoughtful support through advising (given the paucity of full time faculty and staff in relation to total student numbers).

In other words, there is quantitative and qualitative evidence of “slippage” since the last visit, and this requires immediate attention. There are several unmet Student Performance Criteria at this time; there were none six years ago. The Visiting Team believes that there is at least an indirect relationship between this fine faculty’s ability to provide an excellent program and the unusual and serious limitations under which they have been operating.
2. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

[Conditions Not Met and Causes of Concern taken from VTR dated March 14, 2002]

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

Condition 5, Human Resources (2002): The minimum condition is met at the present time as the program is the beneficiary of a unique and dynamic architectural professional environment within the region. As present, there is a small full-time faculty and a high dependence on an adjunct faculty. This environment creates an interactive student-faculty relationship that enhances the quality of the professional and academic goals.

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

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

2008 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is now not met.

Condition 6, Human Resource Development (2002): The opportunities for the development of the program’s human resources are clearly outlined in the APR and have been verified to be adequate through the site visit by the team. There are several issues, however, regarding the clarity and distribution of resources given the multiple-campus operations of the program. This lack of clarity is based on the historic evolution of the programs; the individuals involved; previous agreements regarding position, title, and academic responsibility; and fiscal management.

Every effort must be made to balance the resources for the parallel programs on the multiple campuses especially with regard to the issues of human resources development. The facet must be clear that although there are differential resource investments, such as the new facilities in San Diego, these must be balanced with the facility investments throughout the program.
The focus must be on the equitable distribution of resources for both institutional and individual programs to support their development based on basic needs and in special recognition of exceptional achievement. Given the quality of the program, there should be numerous opportunities for the enrichment of resources for the students, faculty, and staff.

2008 Visiting Team Assessment This condition has been met.

Condition 9, Financial Resources (2002): The information provided with the APR does not provide for a definitive comparison of expenditures within the two architectural programs (Burbank and San Diego) or the professional programs within the university. Therefore, a detailed and direct comparison cannot be determined as was discussed with central administration. The issues outlined are fully understood as needing clarification and development by all administrators involved. Endowments are held only at the university level. The board has established a goal to expand the endowment to twice the university’s annual operating budget (an endorsement of approximately $50 million). The current level is reported to be $7 million and no disbursement is planned until at least $25 million has been accumulated.

It is recommended that a collaborative effort with the department be instituted to achieve more aggressive fund-raising by utilizing the exceptional outreach potential of the programs to reach critical institutional and community needs as well as private sector corporate industries.

The following needs are Causes of Concern to the visiting team:

To clarify the role of the School of Architecture and Design within the context of the Woodbury University as to the aspirations of the institution with regard to enrollment goals and resource and development potential.

To recognize that the Department of Architecture must have clear lines of academic and administrative responsibility. As stated by the President, the Dean and Department Chair must be fully responsible for their respective programs including academic and administrative issues.

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

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

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

2008 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is now not met.
3. **Conditions Well Met**

2. Program Self-Assessment Procedures  
4. Social Equity  
5. Studio Culture  
13.7 Collaborative Skills  
13.8 Western Traditions  
13.17 Site Conditions

4. **Conditions Not Met**

6. Human Resources  
10. Financial Resources  
13.14 Accessibility  
13.23 Building Systems Integration  
13.28 Comprehensive Design

5. **Causes of Concern**

A. Digital technologies have evolved in both Los Angeles and San Diego over the past several years, and are very well received by students and faculty. However, there are unmet needs specific to each location. Further, the Team suspects that there are basic infrastructure issues with the network and staffing that will be necessary to support and maintain a robust delivery. These are vitally important tools for the practice of architecture that require attention.

B. 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 student’s abilities is not consistently reinforced by the faculty. Licensure should be a clear prospect for all Woodbury alumni.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

Schools must respond to the interests of the collateral organizations that make up the NAAB as set forth by this edition of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Each school is expected to address these interests consistent with its scholastic identity and mission.

1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it benefits from and contributes to its institution. In the APR, the accredited degree program may explain its academic and professional standards for faculty and students; its interaction with other programs in the institution; the contribution of the students, faculty, and administrators to the governance and the intellectual and social lives of the institution; and the contribution of the institution to the accredited degree program in terms of intellectual resources and personnel.

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

The School of Architecture plays an important role within Woodbury University as a stellar example of what a dedicated faculty can do even with serious financial and space limitations. There is an emerging model of transdisciplinary collaboration that holds excellent promise for the school, with several initiatives already underway. There is hope that this model will continue to strengthen general education for architecture students. Faculty members from the school perform important committee and leadership responsibilities at the university level.

The growth and strong stature of the architecture program should be more fully recognized and embraced by the larger university community. There is certainly general appreciation and enthusiasm for the program at the central administration level. The president and vice president understand the dramatic emergence and importance of architecture to Woodbury’s identity, but more tangible institutional commitment and investment is needed. While the university continues to develop other programs such as business, there is an excellent opportunity for the University to support and recognize that Woodbury is increasingly seen as a “design school”, which is a direct result of the excellence and accomplishment of the School of Architecture. The school has an emerging regional and national identity that should continue to be nurtured.

1.2 Architecture Education and Students

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides support and encouragement for students to assume leadership roles in school and later in the profession and that it provides an environment that embraces cultural differences. Given the program’s mission, the APR may explain how students participate in setting their individual and collective learning agendas; how they are encouraged to cooperate with, assist, share decision making with, and respect students who may be different from themselves; their access to the information needed to shape their future; their exposure to the national and international context of practice and the work of the allied design disciplines; and how students’ diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The atmosphere at Woodbury University embraces cultural differences and encourages students to share and grow from each other. This diverse environment has created students whom respect these differences and encourages them to embrace their individual creative voice in the design world. Student organizations such as CLEA (Council of Latin American Architecture Students) are beginning to grow because of this renewed appreciation for their diverse learning environment. CLEA is one outlet that may allow the university to be known nationally and even internationally. Student interest in other nationally-known student organizations such as AIAS (American Institute of Architecture Students) was mentioned; it would require student initiative and faculty support to get started.

Campus divisions of the Architecture Student Forum and a new organization founded on the San Diego campus called SOS (Society of Sustainability) act as the student voice to the faculty and administration. With the ease in accessibility to reach faculty, each student is able to personally express concerns. Communication on each campus seems successful, but further efforts to coordinate communication between the students and faculty of the two campuses should be considered.

Collaboration is key to both professional practice and educational learning. This seems to be a strong component to the curriculum set up in the architecture program. Faculty is responsive to changes to benefit the students and their education which has led to a well rounded and updated program. All the work put forth by the faculty is well received by the students and has created a superb architecture program.

1.3 Architecture Education and Registration

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides students with a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure. The school may choose to explain in the APR the accredited degree program’s relationship with the state registration boards, the exposure of students to internship requirements including knowledge of the national Intern Development Program (IDP) and continuing education beyond graduation, the students’ understanding of their responsibility for professional conduct, and the proportion of graduates who have sought and achieved licensure since the previous visit.

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

Students are exposed to the professional credentialing process through courses AR 250, AR 448, and AR 450 (Professional Practice I, II and III). Professor Nick Roberts is the faculty Intern Development Program advisor. In Team interviews with students, the majority want to become licensed; however only a few are actually enrolled in the IDP or have started files with NCARB. Architectural Registration Exams pass rates stated in the APR range from 15% to 44% below the national average (NCARB website). Alumni tracking seem to be inconsistent which may slightly skew reported statistics.

Tracking pass rates, consistent with the accepted standards, and raising the Woodbury alumni pass rate to meet the national average should be an institutional goal. A more rigorous effort to insure a smooth transition from graduation to internship and success on the examination would enhance the student’s value thereby fulfilling a vital component of the school’s mission: transformation of the Woodbury student to the citizen architect.
1.4 Architecture Education and the Profession

The accredited degree program must demonstrate how it prepares students to practice and assume new roles and responsibilities in a context of increasing cultural diversity, changing client and regulatory demands, and an expanding knowledge base. Given the program’s particular mission, the APR may include an explanation of how the accredited degree program is engaged with the professional community in the life of the school; how students gain an awareness of the need to advance their knowledge of architecture through a lifetime of practice and research; how they develop an appreciation of the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; how they develop an understanding of and respect for the roles and responsibilities of the associated disciplines; how they learn to reconcile the conflicts between architects’ obligations to their clients and the public and the demands of the creative enterprise; and how students acquire the ethics for upholding the integrity of the profession.

Woodbury students are surrounded by many creative, energetic, and dedicated faculty, both full-time and adjunct, who are excellent ambassadors of the architecture profession and clearly demonstrate the architect as someone dedicated to serving the public. These professionals serve as important mentors to the students. The program relies heavily on adjunct instructors to lead both studio and non-studio courses; their interaction with the students sets a positive example of the care, hard work, and integrity that makes the architect of value to society. Full-time faculty also remain actively engaged in practice.

The studio topics cover housing; design for wet and dry climates; sustainable design with a focus on natural ventilation and appropriate building orientation; and projects informed by the border condition with neighboring Mexico. All of these topics are of increasing importance to a global society and their exploration will serve the students well as they professionally engage with the world around them. The roles and responsibilities of the architects are addressed by three required Professional Practices courses that cover the full range of practice, contractual, and regulatory issues.

The strategies listed above prepare students with both the practical knowledge and the creative vision to practice with skill and enthusiasm.

1.5 Architecture Education and Society

The program must demonstrate that it equips students with an informed understanding of social and environmental problems and develops their capacity to address these problems with sound architecture and urban design decisions. In the APR, the accredited degree program may cover such issues as how students gain an understanding of architecture as a social art, including the complex processes carried out by the multiple stakeholders who shape built environments; the emphasis given to generating the knowledge that can mitigate social and environmental problems; how students gain an understanding of the ethical implications of decisions involving the built environment; and how a climate of civic engagement is nurtured, including a commitment to professional and public services.
The aspect of the curriculum is delivered in both seminars and studio. Architecture in the context of society and the role of the architect are addressed early in a structured way, in the education process and reiterated in a more generalized way as the students progress through the curriculum. In first and second year studios and seminars, this is introduced in World Architecture 1 and 2 in the conceptual format of ‘timetables of history.’ Architecture is presented as a significant part of the human enterprise, a depository, on parallel developmental tracks with arts, humanities, and science. Studios in the core years introduce poetic and practical interpretations of land and physical elements, earth, water, air, fire, and metal. This is an introduction to the subsequent semester’s studio assignments of culturally and ethnically rich program intentions. The assignments include analytical, critical, and generative expression with verbal and visual thinking skills required.

2. Program Self-Assessment Procedures

The accredited degree program must show how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives and how it assesses the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The assessment procedures must include solicitation of the faculty’s, students’, and graduates’ views on the program’s curriculum and learning. Individual course evaluations are not sufficient to provide insight into the program’s focus and pedagogy.

This condition is well met and there is an active process of self-assessment with faculty involvement at the university level. The program faculty and leadership have demonstrated consistent and thoughtful attention to program planning and self-assessment. The curriculum and advising process work well and there is a great deal of concern for calibrating the program to achieve its goals. Through their consistent attention to self-assessment, they present a compelling case for the urgent need for additional support from the university.

Notwithstanding all of the fine work that has gone into internal planning, aside from the buildings in Burbank and San Diego, this has not yet permeated the decision-making at the highest levels in the university. There is talk of additional support, but at the time of the visit, it is not in place.

3. Public Information

To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

Exact language found in Appendix A of the Conditions for Accreditation was not found in the 2007-2008 Woodbury University Course Catalog; however the Team felt the intent of the requirement was met. In fact, the program corrected the website text during the visit and will be correcting the minor errors in the printed versions for next year.
4. **Social Equity**

The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with an educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. The school must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources. Faculty, staff, and students must also have equitable opportunities to participate in program governance.

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

The university has a clear policy on diversity. The architecture program in particular has a diverse student population and a high percentage of Hispanic and Asian students: representative of the surrounding community. A high percentage of the full-time and adjunct faculty are women, and the faculty include a broad range of ethnicities. The architecture curriculum celebrates this diversity through studio projects that study regional planning issues (for example, the Embudo/Dixon and Hollywood Boulevard projects in AR 489) and housing needs (Tijuana, Mexico project also AR 489). The school also reports there is an active chapter of the Congress of Latin American Students of Architecture (CLEA).

5. **Studio Culture**

The school is expected to demonstrate a positive and respectful learning environment through the encouragement of the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff. The school should encourage students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers.

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

The passionate and creative spirit behind design generated by both the students and the faculty is at its best in the Woodbury studios. A high level of respect between the faculty and students has created an ease of communication between the two resulting in an optimistic and engaging learning environment. Written with input from the students and faculty, the studio policy has been approved by the administration and is recognized by both the faculty and students to ensure a safe, respectful studio environment. A diverse student population encourages competition between students from different backgrounds as well as different levels of study. Located in a rich cultural environment and accompanied by an equally diverse faculty, the program is able to thrive and encourage innovation and creative thought. Professional practice courses in the curriculum address the continuation of the fundamental values set up in the studio culture to be continued once in professional practice.
6. **Human Resources**

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, and adequate administrative, technical, and faculty support staff. Student enrollment in and scheduling of design studios must ensure adequate time for an effective tutorial exchange between the teacher and the student. The total teaching load should allow faculty members adequate time to pursue research, scholarship, and practice to enhance their professional development.

Met Not Met

[ ] [X]

See prior commentary under Team Comments. Notwithstanding the serious concerns, it is important to note that the school is held together by its extraordinarily 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 also 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 continuing concern about burnout among the full-time faculty given their numbers in relation to the dramatic increase in student numbers. This important picture of a program’s health is seriously out of balance, especially when the team sees the disconnect between dramatic growth in student numbers in the last six years and only two new full-time faculty hired during this period.

7. **Human Resource Development**

*Schools must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth inside and outside the program.*

Met Not Met

[X] [ ]

This condition is minimally met. There is a clear need for additional support to allow adjunct faculty greater opportunity for academic growth and to accommodate what should be a growing number of full-time faculty as well. While adjunct faculty are annually awarded Mazine Frankel grants and university faculty development grants, there is a sense among some of them that adjunct faculty will routinely be turned down for development opportunities because full-time faculty are perceived to have a higher priority; this is one contributing factor to the turnover among adjuncts and lower morale. Additionally, the potential value that Woodbury should be realizing from the creative work and teaching of this important group of adjuncts in the school needs to be better acknowledged and supported wherever possible.

There are excellent opportunities for students including a lecture series and numerous summer study programs abroad and in the southwest.
8. **Physical Resources**

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

A new 19,000 square foot design studio for fourth and fifth-year students recently opened on the Burbank campus and; plans are in progress to improve academic support spaces and faculty office spaces on this campus in the near future.

A ten-year lease has been signed in San Diego to move the program to a 25,000 square foot, single level warehouse in the Barrio Logan, a district with re-development potential, close to downtown. This move will be a dramatic improvement in facilities and will serve as a working/learning opportunity for the students.

9. **Information Resources**

Readily accessible library and visual resource collections are essential for architectural study, teaching, and research. Library collections must include at least 5,000 different cataloged titles, with an appropriate mix of Library of Congress NA, Dewey 720–29, and other related call numbers to serve the needs of individual programs. There must be adequate visual resources as well. Access to other architectural collections may supplement, but not substitute for, adequate resources at the home institution. In addition to developing and managing collections, architectural librarians and visual resources professionals should provide information services that promote the research skills and critical thinking necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

The main library located at the Burbank/LA Campus complies with the required number, type, and variety of resources. There is a reference librarian who, as the designated architecture librarian, is responsible for collection development; he is also a popular resource for architecture students in the development of their 5th year studio projects.

The current library building is lacking in sufficient space to accommodate the amount of group study tables or class meeting areas that are desired by faculty (including the architecture faculty) and that are an integral part of a contemporary library. In creating this type of space, a future addition may allow the library to be a stronger partner in the School of Architecture’s mission to educate knowledgeable and articulate design professionals.

The library at the San Diego campus is significantly smaller and is without professional staff. By the school’s own admission, it is barely adequate. The new architecture building planned for occupation in Fall 2008 creates the opportunity to correct this deficiency.

10. **Financial Resources**

An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.
The program accomplishes a great deal with a very tight budget. They should be commended for their ingenuity and enthusiasm. Nonetheless, as with Human Resources, 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 with the projected new space for San Diego opening this summer), operating funds have not kept pace. Comparative data in the APR show clearly that architecture has slipped on a per-student funding basis, and this situation needs to be corrected.

11. Administrative Structure

The accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The accredited degree program must have a measure of autonomy that is both comparable to that afforded other professional degree programs in the institution and sufficient to ensure conformance with the conditions for accreditation.

Woodbury University is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The School of Architecture is accredited by the National Architectural Accreditation Board. It is one of three schools within the university; the others being business and media, culture, and design.

New instructional facilities have been built for the Schools of Architecture and Business within the past year. Recent growth experienced by the School of Architecture has been possible due in part to autonomy afforded the program by administration. The School of Architecture is also active in campus faculty leadership; associate professor Vic Liptak serves as president of the faculty senate. The team believes that the director should hold equal status as a dean with the School of Business, and this would be a logical development in the continuing evolution of the program’s relationship to the university administration.

12. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

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

A minimum of 150 hours is required for this degree, and the program requires 160 credit hours. A substantial yet diminishing number of students transfer into the program after completing all or most of the general education requirements at another post-secondary
institution. This may lead to some ‘unevenness’ in meeting a standard set for prerequisites. As the school transitions in growing the population of the first two years, and decreasing the number of transfers, this potential problem will also decrease. It is stated that general education is the business of the whole university.

Faculty currently teaching have diverse interests and varied expertise that broaden the scope and deepen the intellectual intentions of the curriculum. An architectural curriculum, which includes the arts, science, and humanities, is a complete education. Woodbury has a well-integrated and growing curriculum in place.

13. **Student Performance Criteria**

The accredited degree program must ensure that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the criteria set out below. The knowledge and skills are the minimum for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice.

13.1 **Speaking and Writing Skills**

Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

Met Not Met

[X] [ ]

Generally, this seems to be embedded in the culture of the education system. In particular there are several faculty who are very clear about the importance of these skills and they have incorporated these requirements into both studio and seminar/lecture courses. Evidence of competent writing can be found in several of the required courses. The students present themselves verbally with great clarity. For some students, the transition into a studio culture, with repeated review presentations, presents an initial challenge. Yet they also comment on the way that they grow into the culture of verbal presentation, and this process of faculty and student support in building these skills is very positive.

13.2 **Critical Thinking Skills**

Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test them against relevant criteria and standards

Met Not Met

[X] [ ]

Evidence of skill in this area was found in AR 330 and AR 366 Contemporary Issues, where theoretical concepts of architectural expression and precedent are explored. Students embrace the dialogue and polemic as evidenced in their written essays and opinions on assigned topics. The students are responding positively to this topic and it has growth potential within the curriculum.

13.3 **Graphic Skills**

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

Met Not Met

[X] [ ]
13.4 Research Skills

Ability to *gather, assess, record, and apply relevant information in architectural coursework*

- Met
- Not Met

[ ] [ ]

Research plays an important role in several design studios in AR 366 Contemporary Issues, AR 448 Professional Practice 2 and in other courses as well.

13.5 Formal Ordering Skills

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

- Met
- Not Met

[ ] [ ]

These skills are evident in first and second year studio work.

13.6 Fundamental Skills

Ability to *use basic architectural principles in the design of buildings, interior spaces, and sites*

- Met
- Not Met

[ ] [ ]

This is embedded in the curriculum beginning with first year. Throughout the core years (1, 2, and 3) this is taught in various ways. The students learn about and are required to apply historical traditions of constructed systems of geometry, proportioning, scale in relationship to size and dimension. Also, there are exercises that present ways of “seeing” the orders that reside within nature and natural systems. There is evidence of the knowledge being applied in their projects.

13.7 Collaborative Skills

Ability to *recognize the varied talent found in interdisciplinary design project teams in professional practice and work in collaboration with other students as members of a design team*

- Met
- Not Met

[ ] [ ]

AR 243 - Materials and Methods course provides one excellent example of a collaborative project, and there are other wonderful examples of student collaboration in the San Diego program both within coursework and beyond. There is a very positive spirit among the students in both programs, but San Diego has a special feeling of a living laboratory, providing the students with valuable insights into the nature of work in a contemporary society.
13.8 Western Traditions

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

The history and theory courses are superb. They explore Western Traditions in great depth. Both historical and contemporary issues are contributing to the strength of teaching and student work in this area. Western and non-Western uses of precedent are inter-twined in their research and the reading list for second year design.

13.9 Non-Western Traditions

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

This criterion is minimally met. Although the program professes to be interested in divergent canons as they relate to marginalized groups, the evidence of such interest is virtually non-existent. Evidence of “traditional” non-Western topics and student work involving the architectural history in India, Persia, and Asia can be found, but it is rather thin. Some studios explore non-traditional topics and diverse communities, but this is not the same as “architecture and urban design in the non-Western world”.

Part of this may be the result of the program’s own re-definition of “Non-Western Traditions” in a way that may actually make a good deal of sense in the unique context of Woodbury and its mission.

13.10 National and Regional Traditions

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

13.11 Use of Precedents

Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

Historical and contemporary precedents are evident in many of the design studios. AR 330 is strong in the area of precedents and it provides one foundation of integration in studio as well.
13.12 Human Behavior

Understanding of the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationship between human behavior and the physical environment

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

Understanding of historical and contemporary theories of the human condition in general and design in particular is presented in AR 330 Theory of Architecture. Students are required to write a critical essay describing their point of view towards culture and design.

13.13 Human Diversity

Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical ability, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects

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

An understanding of the characteristics of culture is demonstrated in AR 330 Theory of Architecture through multiple course readings covering theory, design, practice, public space, politics, technics, nature, and sustainability. This understanding is further developed as related to cities in AR 334 Urban Design Theory. In AR 383 Design Studio 3A, students analyze the behavioral, cultural, and spatial implications of housing, and respond to these needs in their design projects.

13.14 Accessibility

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

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

The Team found evidence of this criterion in coursework at the understanding level but did not find consistent evidence of an ability in the design studios.

13.15 Sustainable Design

Understanding of the principles of sustainability in making architecture and urban design decisions that conserve natural and built resources, including culturally important buildings and sites, and in the creation of healthful buildings and communities

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

Sustainable design is embedded within the studio and seminar curriculum as an ethos. It is addressed directly in studios, with a “roaming” faculty member, who has built a respected practice around this topic. This subject has almost equal status in this curriculum as “gravity” in other schools of architecture.
13.16 Program Preparation

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

Professional practice is a three semester sequence. This criterion is met in AR 448 Professional Practice 2 as part of the precursor work to the Terminal Degree Project. This area needs to be strengthened within the teaching, but expectations in the student work should also rise.

13.17 Site Conditions

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

The ability to respond to site characteristics is very well met in this program as projects for all studios embrace a variety of sites. The projects developed for AR 283 Design Studio 2B are set in a broad extreme of sites: Desert Mountains, Spanish cemeteries, port terminals, canyons, and urban parks. For all sites there is careful exploration, study, and analysis that results in creative and responsive concept designs for the various terrains. In AR 487 Design Studio 4A, the site is understood not only physically but also sociologically and politically (as seen in the Iraq projects) and environmentally (air quality, light, traffic issues of the Sunset Boulevard projects). In a variety of building types (housing, transportation, office, and educational facilities), the students are able to propose how these issues might be solved programmatically and technically. The site conversation is continued in AR 489 Design Studio 4B where larger urban and regional issues challenged, including economics and water resources. In all of these courses, students prove the ability to thoroughly consider many complex issues of site and reach beyond a simple definition of "site" that only relates to its physical qualities.

13.18 Structural Systems

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

Students gain an understanding of structural behavior, force systems, and analysis in Associate Professor Smulevich’s design studio and Adjunct Professor Shoraka’s structures course AR 327. Woodbury has become a perennial winner of the ACSA/AISC National Design Competition under Professor Smulevich’s sponsorship and guidance.
13.19 Environmental Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of environmental systems, including acoustical, lighting, and climate modification systems, and energy use, integrated with the building envelope

Understanding environmental systems is evident in AR 425 Environmental Systems. Lectures, handouts, and exams cover mechanical and lighting systems as well as their energy use implications; students must also perform wall assembly R-value calculations.

13.20 Life-Safety

Understanding of the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress

This is met in AR 250 Professional Practice 1, especially in the exit analysis project required for this class.

13.21 Building Envelope Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building envelope materials and assemblies

Building envelope systems develop in the lectures, handouts, and exams for AR 425 Environmental Systems through the wall assembly R-value calculations and an analysis of the climate to which the assemblies must respond. A consideration of glazing types and placement is also performed in this course.

13.22 Building Service Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems

Basic principles and application of building service systems are presented in AR 425 Environmental Systems. Lectures, handouts, and exams cover plumbing fixtures and piping; building power; vertical transportation types and terminology; telephone, data, and security systems; and fire alarm and sprinkler components.
13.23 Building Systems Integration

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

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

Courses in building systems integration are good; however evidence found at the ability level is sketchy and incomplete. This ability should permeate each degree project (AR 492) and represent a skill in synthesis of integrating building systems in the design solution. This is a crucial skill in leading the design process. Consistent evidence of this ability was not found.

13.24 Building Materials and Assemblies

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse

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

13.25 Construction Cost Control

Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

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

Understanding building costs and estimating is evident in AR 450 Professional Practice III through lectures and course material, however it is minimal. Significant emphasis should be placed on this criterion and infused as an integral part of the design process.

13.26 Technical Documentation

Ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

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

Student ability in the area of technical documentation is demonstrated in AR 250 Professional Practice I and in several other areas of the studio curriculum as well. For one assignment, students construct a small set of working drawings for an existing building. The assignment is evaluated for organization, clarity, completeness, and use of drafting conventions (dimensions, text, symbols).
13.27 Client Role in Architecture

Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and resolve the needs of the client, owner, and user

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

Understanding the responsibility of an architect to the needs of the client is demonstrated in AR 450 Professional Practice III. Exams cover the Owner/Architect Agreement and General Construction contracts. Students also prepare marketing materials for a hypothetical client.

13.28 Comprehensive Design

Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability

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

Although this criterion is not currently met, the program is moving in the right direction with necessary pre-requisite technical courses in place prior to fourth year. The comprehensive project has been identified as a fall semester, fourth year element of the curriculum. However, at this time, only a few select studios are approaching compliance with this criterion. The team is impressed with planning in place to correct this deficiency, and we are confident that an effective approach will be in place starting next year. There are some specific challenges with respect to transfer students and their ability to realize all of their pre-requisites for the comprehensive project before the fall of their fourth year.

13.29 Architect’s Administrative Roles

Understanding of obtaining commissions and negotiating contracts, managing personnel and selecting consultants, recommending project delivery methods, and forms of service contracts

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

Administrative roles are demonstrated in the coursework for AR 450 Professional Practice III. Students must prepare a resume, a business plan for a new office, and marketing materials for a hypothetical client. Forms of service contracts are covered in AR 250 Professional Practice I.
13.30 Architectural Practice

Understanding of the basic principles and legal aspects of practice organization, financial management, business planning, time and project management, risk mitigation, and mediation and arbitration as well as an understanding of trends that affect practice, such as globalization, outsourcing, project delivery, expanding practice settings, diversity, and others

Met | Not Met
--- | ---
[X] | [ ]

Understanding practice organization is demonstrated in the coursework for Professional Practice classes AR 250 and AR 450, particularly in the Case Study Project for AR 450 in which the students interview a local architectural firm and document its business and organizational structure.

13.31 Professional Development

Understanding of the role of internship in obtaining licensure and registration and the mutual rights and responsibilities of interns and employers

Met | Not Met
--- | ---
[X] | [ ]

There is some concern about the timing of Professional Practice 3. This is where IDP is introduced, but it is during the fifth year. Many students believe that it needs to occur earlier in the sequence, since traditional 5-year BArch. students may begin enrolling in IDP following their third year. Transfer students may have a slightly different time-line, but this is an issue that should be examined by the faculty.

13.32 Leadership

Understanding of the need for architects to provide leadership in the building design and construction process and on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics in their communities

Met | Not Met
--- | ---
[X] | [ ]

The architect’s leadership role comes through in several ways, including content and student work in AR 334 Urban Design Theory and in several of the design studios.

13.33 Legal Responsibilities

Understanding of the architect’s responsibility as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, historic preservation laws, and accessibility laws

Met | Not Met
--- | ---
[X] | [ ]

Understanding the architect’s legal responsibilities is evident in the coursework for all three Professional Practice courses.
13.34 Ethics and Professional Judgment

Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment in architectural design and practice

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

1. History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2008 Woodbury University Architecture Program Report:

In the late 19th century, Los Angeles was a rapidly growing city with a population of approximately 11,000. 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.

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. 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, which had departments of Architecture, Fashion Design, Graphic Design, and Interior Design; the School of Business and Management, which had departments of Accounting, Business and Management, Computer Information Systems, and Marketing; and the School of Arts and Sciences, which had departments of Humanities and of Natural and Social Sciences and provided all university departments a full range of general education courses. 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. 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 include a complete renovation of the institution's management information system, funding for improvement in the teaching of basic skills and foundation courses, and support for faculty development and technology in the classrooms. 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 the Council for Interior Design Accreditation), and anticipating a bid for AACSB accreditation, the School of Business and Management refined its name to become simply the School of Business, which included the Departments of Accounting, Business and Management, and Marketing. Kirby Hall, a new sprung 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 within 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, and Politics and History. A continued surge in enrollment justified the decision to build a new 20,000 sq ft School of Business building with a 250-seat auditorium on the main quad, a new 15,000 sq ft architecture studio building parallel to Glenoaks Boulevard in the architecture complex, and a new 340-car parking lot on the upper campus. The parking lot was completed in summer 2006 and completion of the two new buildings is expected in spring 2008.

As of January 2007, the School of Architecture and Design was reorganized into two new schools: the School of Architecture, and the School of Media, Culture and Design (MCD) which includes the Departments of Animation, Communication, Fashion Design, Graphic Design, Interior Architecture, and Psychology. The Departments of Animation, Fashion Design, Graphic Design and Interior Architecture in the School of Media, Culture and Design have applied for accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD). A NASAD team will be visiting in fall 2007 with accreditation anticipated in spring 2008. Woodbury University has been immersed in an extensive process in preparation for renewal of its accreditation by the regional accrediting body, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The first WASC accrediting team visit is scheduled to end the day before the NAAB visiting team arrives in spring 2008. Woodbury has a current graduate and undergraduate enrollment of over 1400 students with roughly a third of those in the School of Architecture, a third in the School of Business and a third in the School of Media, Culture and Design and ITS. The university, responding to its mission of professional and liberal arts education, now anticipates growth to 2,000 students.

2. **Institutional Mission**

The following text is taken from the 2008 Woodbury University Architecture Program Report:

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 what is necessary for the university to achieve its mission:

- Academic Quality
- Innovation and Creativity
- Communication
- Transdisciplinarity
- Social Responsibility
- The Integrated Student
3. Program History

The following text is taken from the 2008 Woodbury University Architecture Program Report:

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. 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. 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 a facility located in San Diego, in a joint effort with Mesa Community College. Geraldine Forbes was promoted to assistant dean of Architecture and Design and director of the newly forming San Diego campus. Stan Bertheaud assumed the position of interim chair and Jay Nickels was hired to fill the newly created administrative position of assistant chair for the department. The architecture library holdings were greatly increased for the new San Diego location. The department opened up the Hollywood Community Design and Urban Research Center (CD+URC) on Hollywood Boulevard under the 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. In fall 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 in 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 the chair of the Department of Architecture in the fall of 1999 and filled a newly added full-time faculty position. Under his direction, the full-time faculty further refined the curriculum and began to develop a new program mission and strategic plan. To more fully assure the successful implementation of the new curriculum, a full-time 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 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 full-time faculty positions, bringing the total to three in San Diego and six in Burbank/LA. Woodbury faculty and students won national and local design awards in growing numbers, and our graduates have 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 assumed the position of interim assistant chair of the department. During the summer of 2001, the San Diego program was moved to a new, larger 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, Woodbury signed a memorandum of understanding with Woosong University in Daejon, 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 accommodate student and faculty needs.

Also in the fall of 2002, a new administrative assistant position was established in the Faculty Center at Burbank/LA to directly support the architecture program. In fall 2002, the computer labs in San Diego and LA were expanded to have 17 and 20 stations each. In spring and summer 2003, tenant improvements were made to the second and third floor corridors of the San Diego facility. During the spring of 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 full-time position for the department in LA, which began in the following fall with an interim appointment and was permanently filled a year later after a national search. In the summer of 2004, the architecture study-away programs open to both San Diego and Los Angeles students expanded dramatically with programs in Korea, Rome, Barcelona/Paris, a sustainable topic studio in Chile, and the American West.

In the fall of 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 our downtown architecture facility. The newly remodeled teaching computer lab was introduced to SD faculty and students. Woodbury's outstanding San Diego lecture series continues to serve the entire regional architectural community extending from Tijuana to Orange County. 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 R. Woodbury estate, the university has established a portion of its endowment to be earmarked specifically for the architecture program for scholarships. During the 2004-05 academic year, the architecture enrollment in San Diego surpassed all other undergraduate programs. During that year, the architecture faculty approved the curriculum for the new Master of Architecture in Real Estate Development for Architects (M.Arch.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 is open to individuals with a professional degree in architecture. During the summer of 2005, improvements were made to the north side of 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 eight students. The main interrelationship between the B.Arch program and the M.Arch.RED program is that to date, the B.Arch program is a primary feeder to the RED program providing about 30-40% of its students. B.Arch students and faculty also informally sit in on reviews and discussions in the RED program.
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. Also in 2005 the Raymond and Maxine Frankel family 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 is 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 19,000 square foot two-story studio building at the Los Angeles facility. Completion of the highly anticipated project is expected for January 2008.

Jay Nickels stepped down from his position as assistant chair of Architecture in July of 2006 and Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter was appointed assistant chair. 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 in order to allow for planning that would alter the organization of the school. During the ensuing months, chairs of the five departments of the school and the architecture faculty agreed that the Department of Architecture (now 500 strong) and the programs in design would be better served if they were housed in separate units. As a result, the School of Architecture and Design was dissolved and the concept of the School of Architecture came to life. It was hoped that this new independent structure would allow the architecture programs to follow a critical path that would lead to greater success. Following a fall 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. Please refer to the Organizational Chart on page 19.

In 2007 the Frankel family 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 endowment to fund the Raymond Frankel and Maxine Stussy Frankel Chair in Architecture by the year 2010.

4. Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2008 Woodbury University Architecture Program Report:

Current Mission Statement
Adopted fall 2006.
University endorsement, winter 2007.

WOODBURY : ARCHITECTURE : TRANSFORMS

We believe in architectural education as transformative.
We believe in the radical possibilities of architecture’s relevance, socially, environmentally, and formally.
We are architects and critical thinkers who produce other architects and critical thinkers. Woodbury’s students, faculty, and graduates are committed to architecture 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.

5. Program Self Assessment

The following text is taken from the 2008 Woodbury University Architecture Program
Report:

FACULTY
Strengths:
Woodbury School of Architecture maintains an energetic and devoted faculty, both
full-time and adjunct, representing diverse interests and strengths.

Challenges:
The School of Architecture is committed to expanding the numbers of our full-time
faculty, deepening the faculty-development opportunities, and increasing the
retention rates of our excellent part-time faculty. However, the greatest threats to the
quality of the school's faculty are the current salary levels, workloads (especially
student: faculty ratio), and lack of faculty development opportunities. Together,
these hamper the school's ability to retain faculty.

Faculty Compensation:
Current salaries, for full-time and particularly for adjunct faculty members, are the
greatest threat to retaining depth and continuity on our faculty. In order to attract
and retain the highest quality faculty, we are committed to offering compensation
for full-time and adjunct faculty that is competitive with other schools in the
region. The school is currently undertaking a study of its salaries, benefits, and
faculty course loads in comparison with other schools of architecture, locally and
nationally.

Faculty Workload: Faculty: Student Ratio
Students and faculty are in strong agreement that many non-studio class sizes at
Woodbury are too large. During the 2006-07 year including the summer semester,
the Woodbury School of Architecture had 506 students and 10 full-time faculty
members, an FTE student to full-time faculty ratio of 50.6:1. For the School of
Architecture to attain the university's stated enrollment goal of 600 students at an
appropriate student FTE:FT faculty ratio, we will need to, at minimum, double the
number of current full-time faculty. In order to ensure appropriate workloads and
quality instruction, while at the same time accommodating expanded enrollment, the
school is committed to adding at least one full-time faculty member to the faculty every
year until we reach 20 full-time faculty.

STUDENTS
Strengths: Students at Woodbury's School of Architecture are culturally, ethnically,
economically, and academically diverse, many of them first-generation Americans
and/or first-generation college-educated. The student body is marked by a commitment
to and passion for education, as well as markedly uneven skills, a wide range of
academic preparedness and habits, and varying degrees of intellectual sophistication
upon arrival.
Challenges: While the school remains committed to serving a student body representative of the population of Southern California, including a wide range of academic backgrounds, the greatest threats facing the School of Architecture with regard to the student body involve the qualitative and quantitative management of a liberal admissions policy:

- articulating and exercising admissions standards;
- cultivating uniformly high standards of work and study habits;
- maintaining and enforcing curricular "gateways" — from consistent grading policies to portfolio reviews — to ensure increasingly high standards are met as students progress;
- regulating class size in the face of a growing student body;
- measuring "success" of our students before and after graduation in order to better evaluate our effectiveness as educators.

Admissions: Quality of Student Body
Currently, 300 students apply each year for 100 openings in Burbank/Los Angeles; 100 students apply for 50 openings in San Diego. As the School of Architecture matures and the applicant pool continues to increase, liberal admissions policies will ultimately have to be balanced with selection standards.

Admissions: Quantity and Class Size
By fall 2008, with completion of its new building, the School of Architecture expects to be able to accommodate 550 students: 150 in San Diego and 400 in Burbank/LA. While the new building will alleviate current space shortages, the school will still face the challenges of class size and student: faculty ratios, while at the same time falling short of the university's target enrollment for the school of 600. While the school is committed to increasing the number of full-time faculty (see Faculty Targets), until it achieves a more appropriate student: faculty ratio, it is unlikely that such hiring targets can be met as rapidly as enrollment targets. This is an ongoing threat to quality instruction and student and faculty satisfaction in the program.

Studio Culture:
The School of Architecture is committed to cultivating a studio culture that is honest, open, committed, fair, and respectful.

Standards: Nurturing, Support, Retention
The School of Architecture is committed to providing rich academic support resources through the university, at both its Burbank/LA and San Diego facilities.

Standards: Excellence, Expectations, Enforcement
The school is committed to vigilantly guarding curricular "gateways" throughout the curriculum, including a revised format for portfolio reviews and tighter restrictions on the combination of mini-studios and traveling studios that are permitted before advancing to 5th year.

Measures of Success: Life after Graduation
The School is committed to undertaking an evaluation of School of Architecture alumni's post-graduate success, including implementing a more thorough tracking of our alumni, in order to understand how well they were prepared by Woodbury for graduate school, paying off student loans, licensing, gainful and/or meaningful employment as professionals and/or educators, alternative careers, etc.
CURRICULUM
Strengths: Woodbury’s School of Architecture offers a comprehensive curriculum with a clear set of learning objectives that aligns with the guiding principles of the university and fulfills and surpasses NAAB requirements. The school is committed to exploiting the regional laboratory that is Southern California, taking full advantage of its proximity to centers of fabrication, industry, media and entertainment, as well as natural, cultural, and academic resources.

Challenges: According to recent faculty and student assessments of the program, the greatest threats to the vitality of the curriculum include:

- need more coherent coordination of the technology and representation courses;
- need greater investment in digital fabrication technologies, and the development of advanced software skills;
- need stronger focus in design development;
- need stronger emphasis on process;
- greater use of the Hollywood facility;
- need greater alignment, communication and consistency between SD and Burbank, LA;
- need more oversight into content of GE courses;
- need to raise the level and consistency of student communication skills at conclusion of studies (drawing, model-making, writing).

In response to this critical self-evaluation, the School of Architecture’s faculty have recently re-aligned the core programs of the curriculum and designed an organizational structure to support it. At the heart of this revised curriculum are five programs:

- History and Theory
- Building Technology
- Representation
- Urban/Landscape Studies
- Practice and Professional Studies

These five programs weave together the undergraduate curriculum, and are supplemented by graduate study, traveling study (Europe, Asia, the Americas), and the Hollywood Center for Community Research + Design (CCRD).

Coordination of the History and Theory program has a strong track record and a program head in place. Each of the other programs awaits the appointment of a program head. The faculty is currently working to prioritize the school's next appointments.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS + NEXT STEPS

Beginning in fall 2007, four faculty working groups will focus on each of the four target areas of faculty, students, curriculum, and school. Each working group will generate concrete proposals that address each of the areas detailed above. Proposals will be considered and voted on by the School of Architecture faculty as a whole.

Each working group will include with its proposals detailed evaluations of the following resource implications:

- human resources: personnel/salaries + benefits
- physical resources: space
- information resources: technology/equipment
- other
This page is left blank intentionally
Appendix B: The Visiting Team

Team Chair –
Representing the NCARB
Marzette Fisher, NCARB, AIA, NCIDQ
Marzette Fisher and Associates, LLC
P.O. Box 130991
Birmingham, AL 35213
(205) 515-4882
marzettefisher@gmail.com

Representing the ASCA
Kenneth A. Schwartz, FAIA
Professor
School of Architecture
Campbell Hall – Second Floor
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22904
(434) 924-6468 (ofc)
kas7v@virginia.edu

Representing the AIA
Lisa Chronister, AIA, NCARB
214 Foster Avenue, #2
Brooklyn, NY 11230
(347) 581-2240
lchronister@verison.net

Representing the AIAS
Merritt Ertl
3885 N. Marleon Drive
Muncie, IN 47306
(812) 498-4698
merritt.ertl@gmail.com

Observer
Michael Rotondi, FAIA
ROTO Architecture
Los Angeles, CA 90043
(323) 292-2221
jamessil@aol.com
This page left blank intentionally.
Appendix C: Visit Schedule

Sunday, March 2, 2008

7:00  Team breakfast – Millar - hotel
8:00  Team Room orientation
9:30  Initial Review
11:00  Team Lunch - Administrators
12:00  Tour LA Facilities
1:00  Faculty entrance meeting
2:00  Continue work
4:00  Faculty reception
5:30  Team only dinner
7:00  Team to SD

Monday, March 3, 2008 – SD Campus

7:00  SD Team - Breakfast - SD Administrators
8:30  Tour San Diego facility
9:00  Meet San Diego faculty
10:00  Meet San Diego students
11:00  Lunch reception
12:00  Return to LA – w/ driver; visit new facility
3:30  Arrive in LA; continue work - Team Room
5:30  Team Dinner - selected faculty

Tuesday, March 4, 2008

7:00  Team breakfast - Millar – hotel
8:30  Entrance meeting - Ken Nielsen, President and
     David Rosen, Senior Vice-President, Academic Affairs
9:30  Continue work - Team Room
11:00  Team only lunch – Team Room
1:00  School-wide entrance meeting - LA students
2:30  Meet with Administrators (Christ, Kraus, La Source)
2:30  Meet with Architecture Librarian (Nedra Peterson)
2:00  Continue work - Team Room
5:30  Team-only dinner catered - Team Room

Wednesday March 5, 2008

8:00  Team breakfast - Millar – hotel
9:00  Drive to main campus; continue work – Team Room
11:00  Team lunch - SD and LA students [Schwartz leaves]
12:30  Visit Center for Community Practice and Design (CCRD) – Hollywood
2:00  Drive to main campus
2:30  Complete work – Team Room
6:00*  Team-only dinner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Hotel check-out Chronister - team only breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Exit meeting - School Administrator(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norman Millar, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catherine Herbst, Associate Director, San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, Associate Director,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Exit meeting - Chief Academic Officers of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Nielsen, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Rosen, Senior Vice-President, Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>School-wide exit meeting - faculty and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Team lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signatures]

Marzette Fisher
Team Chair
Representing the NCARB

Kenneth A. Schwartz, FAIA
Team member
Representing the ACSA

Merritt M. Ertel
Team member
Representing the AIAS

Lisa Chronister, AIA, NCARB
Team member
Representing the AIA

Michael Rotondi, FAIA
Observer
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