A. Response to each condition identified as not met in the VTR

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/fulltime 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.

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
[

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, Ingadill 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.

RESPONSE

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 fulltime faculty position per year until we reach 20 and approach a student:fulltime faculty ratio of 25:1. Since the 2007 APR there has been an FTE student growth of 6% and a growth of 50% in fulltime faculty. Since 2000-2001, there has been an FTE student growth of 60% and a growth of 88% in fulltime 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.

New Faculty Positions
We have added two more fulltime faculty lines since our 2008 annual report, so that we have 50%
more fulltime faculty lines than when our 2007 APR was written (Fall 2009: 15 faculty; Fall 2007: 10 faculty). We anticipate adding two more permanent fulltime positions in 2009-10, beginning a national search to fill them in December.

Total Fall 2009 enrollment in the BArch program is 508, very similar to our enrollment in 2008 (505) and 2007 (506). The current ratio of undergraduate architecture students to fulltime faculty is now down to below 34:1 (33.866:1); even with the inaugural cohort of 8 professional MArch students factored in, the ratio is still 34.4:1.

PPOHA Grant Impact on Human Resources
In early October the Woodbury University School of Architecture received a federally funded grant targeted at our post-professional programs but with essential benefits for the entire school, its faculty, and students in all Architecture programs. The Department of Education’s initiative, Promoting Post-baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans (PPOHA), will provide $2.8 million over five years, for additional staff positions, new technologies and equipment, construction of labs for the equipment, and curricular development.

Arid Lands Institute
Last year’s annual report described the founding of a new academic research center, the Arid Lands Institute (ALI), directed by two active members of the adjunct faculty, Peter Arnold and Hadley Arnold. In early October the Arid Lands Institute was awarded a 3-year HUD grant of $600,000 accompanied by in-kind services of over $100,000 from the communities of Burbank, California and the lower Embudo Valley in New Mexico, to develop sustainable infrastructure for these communities. The co-directors each have a half-time teaching appointment at the university, most of which is delivered directly within the BArch curriculum (a small part of their course load supports BArch students through delivery of upper-division General Education requirements). Peter Arnold regularly teaches a comprehensive studio (ARCH 487) and Hadley Arnold regularly serves as primary degree project (ARCH 492) advisor for three to five students.

New Staff Positions
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. The PPOHA grant funds at least three new positions in the 2009-2010 year. This will be an increase of six and a half (6.5) positions over 2007. The university plans to add at least one and a half more staff positions by the start of the 2010-11 academic year, more than doubling the number of administrative support positions in the 2007 APR.

Among the new staff positions we filled this summer are a half-time assistant chair for the Burbank facility (a position held by participating adjunct faculty Andrea Dietz) and a fulltime admissions/enrollment position for the San Diego facility. Because of the economic downturn, the creation of new internally-funded staff positions has been postponed for the remainder of Fall 2009. The university remains committed to hiring a communications director to work with the Dean’s office and a student development ombudsman for the San Diego facility.

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.

Faculty Salary Increase Commitment
In Spring 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 2008-09. The board agreed to a 10% raise in fulltime salaries over the cost of living over a five-year period, with a 3.5% raise implemented in January 2009. Both long-term salary increase plans are temporarily on hold for this academic year until Spring 2010 enrollment figures are finalized.

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.

Met [X] Not Met []

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.

RESPONSE

As the university devotes increased resources to new and expanded facilities, equipment, and personnel budgets, and with the commitment of $2.8 million in federally funded PPOHA grant monies to the School of Architecture over the next five years, we are on track for meeting this condition prior to our 2011 Focused Evaluation.

As with Human Resources, the 2008 VTR comments on this condition “Not Met” resonated strongly 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 LA in August 2009.

PPOHA
Receiving the Department of Education’s PPOHA grant is a significant milepost in improving our financial resources. The university first demonstrated its commitment to the School of Architecture and its strategic plan by devoting the necessary resources to securing the grant through the services of a grant-writing consultancy. With the receipt of the $2.8 million grant, the university administration acknowledges both the great potential of the school’s undergraduate and graduate programs as well as the need to support development and growth beyond the five-year grant period. Because the grant was received in October 2009 and will have a major impact over the next five years, it is described in greater detail in section C below.

Marketing and Advancement
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.

Increased Personnel Budgets
The School of Architecture’s operational budget increases with the addition of each new fulltime position. In 2007-08 it increased approximately $87,000 for one faculty position in LA. In 2008-09 it increased approximately $148,000 for one faculty position in LA and one in San Diego. The 2009-10 pre-fall budget includes an increase of approximately $180,000 for two faculty positions in LA and approximately $25,000 for the new half-time assistant chair. The School of Architecture is the primary beneficiary of the two half-time faculty positions in the Arid Lands Institute, whose co-directors teach in the BArch curriculum. The salary increases identified in Human Resources above also add to the operational budget.

Annual Budgets
The annual operating budget for the Bachelor of Architecture program has increased 13.8% from 2006-07 to 2008-09, while the FTE student enrollment including summer semester has increased 1% in that same time period. The budget per FTE undergraduate architecture student has risen 12.7% in this period.

The undergraduate architecture budget rose from $2,697,684 in 2006-07 to $3,070,689 in 2008-09. Looking at each location for that period, the San Diego budget rose 7.3% from $1,189,914 serving a student FTE (including summer enrollment) 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 a total increase of only 1% in undergraduate architecture student FTE.

The BArch program budget per FTE student including summer enrollment has risen from $5,331 in 2006-07 to $6,009 in 2008-09, or 12.7% overall.

In 2008-09 the average annual expenditure per FTE undergraduate student in a professional program at Woodbury was $5,613. At $6,009 per FTE, the undergraduate architecture program is now over that average, but the 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 has gone 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%).

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 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 any other Woodbury program's budget. The Burbank/LA budget includes the academic expenses and the expenses associated with the Hollywood facility, 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.

Budget Centers
The university continues to weigh a business model in which each academic unit is seen as a budget center that generates enough revenue to support its needs and contributes a percentage of that revenue to the general fund of the university. The dean of the School of Architecture serves on the president’s Budget Advisory Committee and is promoting a transition to this model within the next five-year planning cycle. The School of Architecture will benefit from this move, with an expanded operational budget more in line with the tuition revenue it generates.

13.14 Accessibility
Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities
Met Not Met

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.

RESPONSE
Since fall semester 2008, one faculty member at each location, LA and San Diego, has coordinated all sections of Comprehensive Design Studio (formerly AR 487, now ARCH 487). Students in ARCH 487 must demonstrate graphically for each project their ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities. The syllabus template for ARCH 487 is attached at the end of this report.

Vic Liptak and Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter organized a Universal Design Workshop in Spring 2009, which was required for all studio instructors and students. It was moderated by Nick Roberts and featured presentations by architect Arnie Levitt of the Levitt Group (a Friend of the School of Architecture) and our wheelchair-using students Vahe Essaghilian and Marvin Alexander Huezo. Arnie discussed the challenges and possibilities of designing for universal access, while Vahe and Marvin spoke of the need for greater awareness about access issues on campus and in the design community. A required Universal Design Workshop will be held at both locations every spring.

At both the LA and San Diego locations the chair is appointing a faculty member this semester to develop graphic representation of accessibility standards on the floors and walls to remind students of these principles on a daily basis as they use the buildings.

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.
Met Not Met

[ ] [x]
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.

RESPONSE

Woodbury has a strong academic advising process that relies on faculty in each major to advise the students of that major. Since Fall 2008 architecture’s faculty advisors have been informing students that ARCH 487 Studio 4A Comprehensive Design would soon be co-requisite with ARCH 464 Systems Integration. The university’s Curriculum Committee is reviewing this curriculum change, and as soon as it is officially approved these two courses will appear as co-requisites in the 2009-10 online catalog and Architecture’s academic worksheet will be re-published to reflect this course sequence change. In the meantime faculty advisors are strongly encouraging their advisees to plan to take the two courses together; nearly every student enrolled in ARCH 487 this fall who had not already taken Systems Integration is co-enrolled in that course. The syllabus template for ARCH 487 is attached at the end of this report; the ARCH 464 syllabus template also has ARCH 487 listed as its co-requisite.

BIM (Building Information Modeling) software is being introduced into Systems Integration, starting in Spring 2009 and continuing this fall. The idea is to reinforce students’ ability to integrate building systems as a critical part of the building design process. Faculty in both ARCH 464 and ARCH 487 coordinate their assignments and due dates, and review each other’s student work.

The new architecture building in LA and the new facility in San Diego are being used as teaching tools. As described in last year’s report, exposed building components reduced the amount of finish materials required and provide direct visual access to the way buildings work. Lighting and mechanical systems adhere to the California Energy Code’s Title 24 standards for energy efficiency (required by code). Studio instructors point to building and mechanical systems during critiques to illustrate successful systems integration. For the foundation studios in LA, the new studio building provides an on-site field trip to develop a beginning understanding of how a building goes together and works as an integrated system.

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

Met Not Met
[X]

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.

RESPONSE

ARCH 487 Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design is a vertical studio with Studio 5A, so all Studio 4A/5A sections are comprehensive. Students must demonstrate in each project evidence of
ability in accessibility, building systems integration, structural systems, environmental systems, building envelope design, life safety, and sustainable strategies. The syllabus template for ARCH 487 is attached at the end of this report.

Nick Roberts has been coordinating Studio 4A sections in LA since Fall 2008; in San Diego the coordinator position rotates each semester among the fulltime and participating adjunct faculty teaching at that level.

Since each fall semester offers up to ten sections of Studio 4A/5A, students are able to investigate different systems and different focuses while still developing comprehensive architectural design projects. Gerry Smulevich’s section studies steel moment frame construction each fall, Nick Roberts’s section has studied folded plate, concrete moment frames and steel braced frames, Peter Arnold’s section studies infrastructure and sustainable systems of building, and Jeanine Centuori’s typically focuses on Type V construction and universal access.

Co-requiring ARCH 487 Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design and ARCH 464 Systems Integration should improve student learning outcomes in both courses and reinforce for students the important and necessary relationship between them.

B. Response to each of the causes of concern in the VTR

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.

RESPONSE

The PPOHA will have a strong and positive impact on digital technologies available to faculty and students in the Architecture programs beginning with the construction of a digital fabrication lab in LA this spring and continuing over five years with improvements in digital fabrication in San Diego and with new technologies in both locations. The outline of the five-year plan is included in section C of this report.

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 in both locations.

Woodbury University has been behind many of the other architecture programs in Southern California in terms of providing digital fabrication technologies such as CAD/CAM milling tables, laser cutters, and 3-D printers. One focus of the PPOHA grant we received is digital fabrication equipment and staffing to operate it; we are building the LA digital fabrication lab this academic year, and the grant provides funds to staff it for its first years of operation. In the meantime, our LA students have made use of the digital fabrication equipment at nearby Glendale Community College. Digital Fabrication is a popular 3-unit studio we offer nearly every semester; we expect to accommodate not only the instruction and design aspect of this course but also the fabrication on the Burbank/LA campus within the year. San Diego already has a CAD/CAM milling table and uses it in both 3-unit elective studios and 6-unit design studios.
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; highlights are included here to demonstrate IT sensitivity and commitment to the needs of the architecture programs and our students:

"Computer Labs – Hardware, Software, and Printing/Plotting
-- 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.

"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."

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.

RESPONSE

An increasing percentage of our fulltime and adjunct faculty members are licensed; all four new fulltime faculty members (two in new positions, two in existing positions) are licensed. The informational panel of Woodbury Architecture Alumni, successfully introduced in Fall 2008, was repeated this year and attracted many of our new students. The alumni panelists publicly agreed that licensure had opened doors, created opportunities, and increased their responsibilities and earning power, and they encouraged students to open IDP files before graduating. The alumni panel is likely to become an annual event.

Tracking our alumni and communicating with them regularly will enable us to encourage their
pursuit of licensure as well as measure their success at becoming licensed. The Careers and Alumni Office, formed two years ago from two separate offices, is eager to work with the School of Architecture to develop a stronger relationship with our alumni and facilitate communication.

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  Not Met
[X]  []

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. 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.

RESPONSE

As noted in the response above, the School of Architecture is developing a strong working relationship with the Careers and Alumni Office. Better tracking of our alumni is an important part of our educational mission and of our own assessment. Regularly surveying our alumni to determine where they are in the IDP and licensure processes – and to encourage them to continue through alumni outreach, exam study groups, and other professional opportunities – is an important step in the maturing of the School of Architecture.

Nick Roberts, as our IDP advisor in LA, began in Fall 2008 to integrate IDP discussions at more points in the curriculum. He continues to coordinate IDP presentations in ARCH 450 Professional Practice 3, but also presents IDP information in ARCH 464 Systems Integration. He has asked Linda Taalman to make a presentation in ARCH 384 Studio 3B in Spring 2010 (Nick will be on sabbatical that semester) to encourage third-year students to open IDP files as soon as they are eligible. Catherine Herbst performs parallel responsibilities as the San Diego IDP advisor.

The Architecture faculty as a whole is encouraging students to seek out professional opportunities, including national competitions, local AIA chapter scholarship opportunities, and appropriate internships to meet their 300 hours of work experience requirement. Michael Rucinski, a graduate student in our new MArch program, is spearheading the revival of a Woodbury AIAS chapter, open to students in both undergraduate and graduate programs. The School of Architecture is committed to supporting this chapter, including sending student representatives to the national forum.

The School of Architecture continues to strengthen its working relationships with our local AIA chapters, including AIA/LA, AIA San Diego, AIA Pasadena/Foothill and AIA San Fernando Valley. The university hosts ARE seminars in both LA and San Diego, and we promote these opportunities among our alumni. Dean Norman Millar represents Woodbury on the board of the
AIA/LA, and both he and San Diego Chair Catherine Herbst are regents of the board of the California Architectural Foundation.

**13.9 Non-Western Traditions**

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

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

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.

**RESPONSE**

Our History/Theory Program embraces the concept of “Nonwestern=Diversity”. Students engage multiple canons and traditions of architecture and urban design throughout the History/Theory sequence, beginning with ARCH 267 World Architecture 1 and ARCH 268 World Architecture 2, in which they investigate architectural traditions around the world and throughout history, to ARCH 330 Theory of Architecture, in which they encounter non-dominant theories of culture and architecture alongside the dominant, through ARCH 334 Urban Design Theory, where varieties of city-making throughout the world are introduced and studied. Since we hold the diversity of our student body to be one of our most important assets, we try through the history and theory sequence to build connections between each student’s individual identity and background, the multiplicity of identities and backgrounds present in any studio or classroom, and the influence of and response to differing architectures and urban traditions when confronted with something “other”.

Understanding “otherness” or the non-familiar is part of core design studios, notably ARCH 283 Site Orders, where influences of site and context, including nonwestern approaches to both, are introduced and tested. As a new effort to introduce nonwestern approaches early in the core sequence, in Spring 2010 one of the five projects in ARCH 183 Studio 1B: Natural Tendencies will require students to seek inspiration from a nonwestern architectural precedent.

**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.

**RESPONSE**

In Fall 2008, ARCH 243 Materials and Methods began to incorporate an investigation of material costs with students’ material experiments. ARCH 425 Environmental Systems, as taught by Peter Simmonds in LA and Scott Glazebrook in San Diego, covers financial and natural costs, legal, social and environmental responsibility, and design value in delivering appropriate environmental systems.
Also beginning in Fall 2008, cost control has been stressed as important to decision making in ARCH 487, the comprehensive design studio, which is now co-requisite with ARCH 464 Systems Integration, in which cost control is a major learning outcome. Supporting a learning outcome from a lecture course with its application in a design studio is perhaps the most effective way we have to get students to engage it. With the challenges raised by both the current economy and growing support for sustainable technologies and processes, faculty and students are finding new interest in material sourcing and production, building construction, and building life-cycles, and this is beginning to manifest itself in studio design projects.

Several studio faculty have experimented with requiring a partial construction cost analysis for studio. Studio instructors Steve Rosenstein and Hector Perez in San Diego required this in a 3A Housing studio in Fall 2008 for a wall section, and Jeanine Centuori has asked her 5A topic studio students for construction cost estimates for non-profit Type V development projects in the San Fernando Valley. Peter Arnold requires in his 4A studio that students take into consideration the embodied energy impacts of specified material over the building life-cycle.

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.

RESPONSE
The faculty have looked at the location of Professional Practice 3 in the curriculum and determined that, instead of moving ARCH 450, we need to more effectively and repeatedly introduce IDP earlier in students’ education, so that by the time students are in Pro Practice 3 they are not only familiar with it but a significant number may have begun the process. This can and should be accomplished both by embedding presentations in the curriculum, such as those discussed above in 1.3 to be presented during ARCH 384 and ARCH 464, as well as using co-curricular events such as the alumni panel to highlight the benefits of early engagement with the IDP. The revitalization of the AIAS at Woodbury should also have a strong positive effect on our students’ attitudes toward IDP and professional development.

Nick Roberts and Catherine Herbst are working on a handout for faculty to distribute to students during academic advising each semester that will carry key information on IDP and licensure. Faculty advisors have always asked their advisees about the status of their required work experience; advisors can begin to do the same and inquire after students’ IDP status.

C. A brief summary of changes in the accredited program

Interior Architecture move complete
Following up on our 2008 annual report, the Department of Interior Architecture has successfully completed its official move into the School of Architecture from the School of Media, Culture & Design. We have been testing the co-offering of some topic studios, and a few faculty from both departments are experimenting with teaching appropriate courses in the sister department.

Associate dean position created
The School of Architecture has created the new position of associate dean, 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. Associate Professor Vic Liptak has been appointed to this position.

Curriculum workgroup created
The School of Architecture faculty has developed a Curriculum Workgroup subcommittee, consisting of the chairs of the programs, the associate dean, the assistant chair of Burbank/LA, and other interested faculty members.

Common AR-IA foundation sequence proposal under development
The Curriculum Workgroup is developing a proposal for a common foundation design studio and design representation sequence for undergraduate architecture and interior architecture students. The proposal requires approval of the School's faculty, and then will be sent to the Curriculum Committee and Educational Planning Committee for review. The earliest implementation of a common foundation curriculum would be Fall 2011.

University-wide course designation changes
The designations for all courses are changing from two letters to four. Architecture courses that had been identified as, for example, AR 183 or AR 450 will now be identified as ARCH 183 and ARCH 450.

PPOHA grant received
In October 2009 the School of Architecture received a Title V grant from the Department of Education to Promote Post-baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans (PPOHA). Over five years, this $2.8 million grant funds expansion of our MArch programs and in doing so provides resources and support for all Woodbury Architecture programs.

The grant covers the following new initiatives. In the first year of the PPOHA grant, we are constructing, equipping, and staffing the digital fabrication lab in Burbank/LA. The grant supports the technical staffing for the first three years, after which Woodbury begins assuming the position’s cost and fully funds it when the grant ends. Also in the first year, we hire a research specialist in San Diego who will develop library and academic research support for faculty and students and coordinate the research center in San Diego. Woodbury begins assuming the cost of this position in year four and funds it fully when the grant ends.

In the second year of the grant, we set up TRANSIMS computing capabilities in LA in support of architectural research; we construct and equip an environmental laboratory and a research center in San Diego to support both graduate and undergraduate research there; and we acquire ArcGIS capabilities in both LA and San Diego, which are supported throughout the grant period.

In the third year, we upgrade our digital fabrication laboratory in San Diego. In the fourth year, we acquire additional new equipment for digital fabrication in San Diego; we upgrade our videoconferencing capabilities connecting the two locations; and we hire an outreach specialist to coordinate architecture program opportunities and to direct outreach to prospective students. Woodbury begins assuming the cost of this position in year five and fully funds it at the completion of the grant. In year five, the grant allows us to upgrade architecture computing facilities in both LA and San Diego.

First professional Master of Architecture program admits inaugural cohort
Finally, after receiving internal approval from faculty committees, the administration, and the Board of Trustees in Fall 2008, our proposal for a first professional Master of Architecture degree program was approved as a substantive program change by Woodbury’s regional accrediting body, WASC, in Spring 2009. With that approval, we submitted to the NAAB a Proposal for
Achieving Initial Accreditation, which was accepted in July 2009. We admitted our inaugural cohort of 8 graduate students in August 2009 to a two-year professional program completing their pre-professional architectural design degrees, and submitted a Candidacy Architecture Program Report in September 2009. Excerpts from this report form are included at the end of this narrative. We have a candidacy visit from a NAAB team led by Gregory Palermo scheduled for early April 2010. We plan to admit graduate students with non-architecture bachelor degrees to the three-year professional MArch program next fall. We plan to meet NAAB requirements for initial accreditation for the MArch in 2012, and reaccredit both undergraduate and graduate programs together in 2014.

Interim Graduate Program Department Chair named
Architect and educator Barbara Bestor has accepted a one-year appointment as interim chair of the Master of Architecture program in LA.

D. Other Information pertaining to the Statistical report
Clarification of Statistical Section 1F: Questions A and B
We base total revenue and expenditures (instruction, capital, overhead) on the university’s figures and divide by 33%, since the university has a total FTE of 1498 and an undergraduate architecture FTE of 490.

ARCH 487 Syllabus Template
On the following three pages is the syllabus template for ARCH 487 Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design, as requested in the NAAB response to our 2008 annual report.

Master of Architecture APR, abridged
Following the syllabus template is an abridged version of the Candidacy Architecture Program Report submitted in September 2009 for the new professional two-year Master of Architecture program at Woodbury University. It contains the program’s history, curriculum, and conceptual underpinnings in the form of the NAAB perspectives.
Woodbury University
Course Syllabus

ARCH 487.0
DESIGN STUDIO 4A: COMPREHENSIVE STUDIO

UNITS – 6
PREREQUISITE – ARCH 384, Design Studio 3B: Structure, Systems, Space and Form; Successful Portfolio Review; ARCH 326 Structures 1; ARCH 425 Environmental Systems
CO-REQUISITE – ARCH 464 Systems Integration

SEMESTER –
INSTRUCTOR –
DAYS/TIME –
ROOM –
REQUIRED TEXT –

COURSE DESCRIPTION
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. The studio is open to 4th and 5th year students. The last half of the semester is devoted to design development. Studio, twelve hours per week.

SPECIFIC LEARNING OUTCOMES

Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects

Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities
Ability to respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and the design of a project

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

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

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

NAAB PERFORMANCE CRITERIA
Levels of accomplishment
-Understanding: assimilation and comprehension of information. Students can correctly paraphrase or summarize information without necessarily being able to relate it to other material or see its fullest implications.
-Ability: skill in relating specific information to the accomplishment of tasks. Students can correctly select the information that is appropriate to a situation and apply it to the solution of specific problems.

NAAB CRITERIA SATISFIED
1 Speaking and Writing Skills ability
2 Critical Thinking Skills ability
3 Graphics Skills ability
4 Collaborative Skills ability
5 Western Traditions understanding
6 Non-Western Traditions understanding
7 National and Regional Traditions understanding
8 Use of Precedents ability
9 Accessibility ability
10 Site Conditions ability
11 Life Safety understanding
12 Building Materials and Assemblies understanding
13 Technical Documentation ability
14 Comprehensive design ability

School of Architecture Track Satisfied
1 Critical Thinking
2 Design
3 Building
4 Representation
5 Professionalism

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS -

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE GRADING -

POLICY OF PROJECT RETENTION
The university reserves the right to retain student work for archival purposes. Projects/models, assignments, and exams will be kept at the department’s discretion for this purpose.
STUDENT RESPONSIBILITY
It is the responsibility of the student to attend class/studio sessions and to work in class/studio. Woodbury University has established clear and appropriate grading and administrative guidelines. They will be followed in this class, except as amended. Students should be familiar with the various policies as stated in the Woodbury University catalog.

POLICY ON ACADEMIC HONESTY
Woodbury University faculty and students have adopted an academic honesty policy that reflects and sustains the integrity of our work and the University. You are expected to know the policy and uphold it in practice and in spirit. The Academic Honesty Policy may be found in the current student handbook and the course catalog.
Excerpts from the
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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, Southern California and the American West. 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 more than 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
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.

We raise the profile of the school by introducing a graduate program.

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 Clementi Hale 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.
- The successful pursuit of a five-year $2.8 million Department of Education grant available to Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) to Promote Post-Baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans (PPOHA). The PPOHA grant supports planning and extending the graduate program to a three-year MArch at our Los Angeles facility, with admission of its first class planned for Fall 2010, and planning and offering a series of one-year post-professional graduate degrees at both locations. The PPOHA grant also supports faculty development, new technology and graduate student assistance for the School of Architecture.
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 BArch 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, later becoming 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 respectively. 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 10.5% 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 students 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, adjunct architecture faculty members Hadley Arnold and Peter Arnold proposed to the board of trustees the establishment of the Arid Lands Institute (ALI) at Woodbury University to support teaching, research, public programming and communications that advance the conceptual and technical training of architects, designers, policy makers and informed citizenry working in water-scarce communities in the American West. The Board approved the proposal and ALI was established in November 2008, with Hadley Arnold and Peter Arnold serving as its fulltime directors, each with half-time teaching responsibility. Also in summer 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.

Subsequent to the September 8, 2009 filing of this report in its initial form, Woodbury was notified that it would receive two federal grants starting in October 2009 that will have a direct and immediate positive impact on the School of Architecture and its programs, including its physical, human and financial resources. The Arid Lands Institute was awarded a 3-year HUD grant of $600,000 accompanied by in-kind services of over $100,000 from the communities of Burbank, California and the lower Embudo Valley in New Mexico. The School of Architecture was awarded a 5-year D.O.E. grant of $2.8 million to develop its MArch program offerings,
expanding its digital fabrication and computing facilities, its administrative staff, its intercampus video-conferencing, and its graduate student scholarships.

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 support the graduate program. With the three fulltime members of the Interior Architecture faculty and counting the two half-time ALI positions, the School of Architecture has the greatest number of fulltime faculty in any of the university’s academic divisions (School of Architecture 19, 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 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 fulltime faculty Linda Taalman, Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, and Eric Olsen, these faculty and other adjuncts constitute a strong core for our graduate students to pursue an emphasis in Building Technology. Adjunct research faculty Hadley Arnold 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 that is crucial to visionary economic development. 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 graduate 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 graduate studios 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. We are developing a 3-year (seven-semester) first-professional Master of Architecture program for students with a non-architecture-related undergraduate degree that blends 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 will 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 MArc 1 program, as graduate students are expected to engage their education from an already accomplished intellectual position. For example, the final MArc 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 MArc 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, 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.

With the $2.8 million provided by the Department of Education PPOHA grant, the MArch 1 program is not only secure in its financial position for its first three years, it has the means to develop the vision proposed in the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation through its first five years. Section 3.10 presents a description of the initiatives funded by the PPOHA and an initial schedule for their development.
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 a three-semester 1-year post-professional MArch 2. 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 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 them 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 (equivalent to three years of 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 semi-autonomous 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 Design.

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 Arnold 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, a position previously held by Randy Stauffer, chair of Interior Architecture. She was re-elected in spring 2009 to a second two-year term. 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 and Jose Parral.

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, Gerard Smulevich and Stan Bertheaud 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 Gerard 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 Gerard 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 Nick Roberts represents the School of Architecture and Vic Liptak serves ex officio. Dean Millar has served on the Development Committee for the Strategic Plan, Academic Programs Committee for the Strategic Plan, the Space Planning Committee (a former convenor), numerous university-wide search committees, the Curriculum Committee and the former 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.

Barrio Scenario 2009
At Woodbury San Diego, faculty, students, and invited guests are organizing a three-day workshop in October 2009, Barrio Scenarios: The Post-Industrial Landscape, to begin developing
a philosophical and pragmatic vision for Barrio Logan, the new location of Woodbury Architecture in San Diego. The workshop concludes with a public roundtable discussion and a gallery exhibit of work produced in the workshop.

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, a 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, as well as in her book, Bohemian Modern: Living in Silver Lake, 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 moderated the panel discussion “Architecture and Seduction: Bachelor Pads and Sex Machines” at the UCLA Hammer Museum, for which Dr. Paulette Singley was a panelist, and was a panelist himself on Capitol Hill for the briefing “Examples of Excelencia in Education,” at a national symposium on architectural education at SCI-Arc, for 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; and 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 Arnold and Peter Arnold are developing funding for the Fellows Program and are encouraging proposals from adjunct faculty who seek to be inaugural fellows.

In October 2009 the Arid Lands Institute received a $600,000 HUD grant to fund three years of research, development, and educational opportunities in collaboration with low-income communities in Burbank, CA and in Embudo/Dixon, NM. The community partners have pledged $100,000 in in-kind support.

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 fulltime administrative coordinator, Galina Kraus, and one fulltime administrative assistant, Terry La Source. The university had committed to providing additional administrative support to the MArch 1 program with a new administrative assistant in its second year when the program achieves a positive revenue. However, the recent PPOHA grant allows us to add that position this year. 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. Burbank/LA and San Diego each have multiple dedicated admissions personnel 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. Now that the grant has been awarded, we have additional funding for digital fabrication managers in Burbank/LA and in San Diego, a librarian and writing instructor in San Diego, and an enrollment services staff member in San Diego. The grant should also allow us to move forward immediately with the Director of Communications position.

Importantly, the university has given us its commitment to provide needed fulltime 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 in 2012-13 to support the addition of post-professional graduate student cohorts. 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. Woodbury has become a member school and will send attendees to the annual December conference.

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 expressed a strong desire to become licensed and a unanimous desire 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 with the receipt of 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 Graduate Studio 3, AR 533 Graduate Theory, and AR 526 Graduate Structures 1) 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 or community chosen by the individual student.

In the *fieldwork* curriculum, 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. *Fieldwork* 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 Arnold 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.

During the summer studio in China, Woodbury students work side-by-side with Chinese students at Southeast University in Nanjing. The two groups are at the same level of architectural study but are separated by differences in values and expectations and by communication challenges. This experience models global practice, and brings our students face to face with the most pressing issues of the global built environment in the 21s century: economic, social and environmental sustainability, transportation, infrastructure, housing, hyper-density, the informal sector, and rapid urbanization.

Each summer, San Diego adjunct instructor Rene Peralta teaches a borderlands studio to graduate architecture students from Washington University in St. Louis. Students travel to Mexico City and the borderlands area straddled by the cities of Tijuana and San Diego, building a database and developing design solutions that are presented to planners and policy makers on both sides of the border.
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, arid lands and borderlands 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 2-year 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 2-year 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 2-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 most 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. As noted in section 3.1.2 above, AR 650 requires graduate students to design an individualized plan to achieve licensure following completion of the MArch 1.

**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 influence 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>Category</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>Category</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 build leadership, 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. 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 are 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 create their own relevance 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, and what emerges is a sense of architecture as the sort of challenge that one can reinvent across the course of a lifetime, keeping it newly relevant.
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, Dean Norman Millar was part of a ground-breaking generation of “everyday urbanists” in Los Angeles, for whom 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 private 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 a 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 architecture 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, MArc 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, MArc 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. MArc 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. A 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 Arnold 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: Case Studies in 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 changed 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 (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 Arnold 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 handbook 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. Dean 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 a 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 programs, 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 establish 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 post-graduate 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 the 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.

3.12 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. A student who enters with the minimum undergraduate credits will take 18 graduate elective units to reach the required total of 168.

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

Minimum undergraduate electives: 11

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

**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.

**Master of Architecture 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 Research and Design Studio</td>
<td>6 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>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2</td>
<td>ARCH 692 Graduate Thesis Studio</td>
<td>6 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 650 Professional Practice 2</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td>ARCH 550 + 648</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Off-campus programs – Fieldwork**
MArch 1 students are required to do six units of summer research studio before their thesis year.
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 ARCH 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study and ½ ARCH 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio for a total of 4½ credit-hours. (Equivalent to ½ ARCH 334 Urban Theory and ½ ARCH 489 Design Studio 4B: Urbanism or ARCH 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 ARCH 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study and ½ ARCH 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio for a total of 4½ credit-hours. (Equivalent to ½ ARCH 334 Urban Theory and ½ ARCH 489 Design Studio 4B: Urbanism or ARCH 591 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics Studio) Rather than ½ ARCH 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 ARCH 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study and ½ ARCH 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio for a total of 4½ credit-hours. (Equivalent to ½ ARCH 334 Urban Theory and ½ ARCH 489 Design Studio 4B: Urbanism or ARCH 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 ARCH 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study and ½ ARCH 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio for a total of 4½ credit-hours. (Equivalent to ½ ARCH 334 Urban Theory and ½ ARCH 489 Design Studio 4B: Urbanism or ARCH 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 ARCH 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study and ½ ARCH 475 Foreign
Study Summer Studio for a total of 4½ credit-hours. (Equivalent to ½ ARCH 334 Urban Theory and ½ ARCH 489 Design Studio 4B: Urbanism or ARCH 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: ARCH 489 Urbanism or ARCH 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 (ARCH 326/526 Structures 1 and ARCH 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 and design studio, 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 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, critical thinking, graphics, fundamental design, collaboration, the use of precedents, and program preparation in architecture; and by achieving understanding of formal ordering systems, western, non-western, national and regional traditions, and human diversity in architecture. Students satisfy outcomes of School of Architecture tracks in Critical Thinking, Design, Building, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAAB Criteria</th>
<th>Fall 1</th>
<th>Fall 2</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>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Critical Thinking Skills</td>
<td>●</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>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Research Skills</td>
<td>●</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>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fundamental Design Skills</td>
<td>●</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>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Western Traditions</td>
<td>●</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>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 National and Regional Traditions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Use of Precedents</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Human Behavior</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Human Diversity</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Accessibility</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sustainable Design</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Program Preparation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Site Conditions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Structural Systems</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Environmental Systems</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Life Safety</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Building Envelope Systems</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Building Service Systems</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Building Systems Integration</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Building Materials &amp; Assemblies</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Construction Control</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Technical Documentation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Client Role in Architecture</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Comprehensive Design</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Architect's Administrative Roles</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Architectural Practice</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Professional Development</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Leadership</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Ethics &amp; Professional Judgement</td>
<td>●</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

**University Goals & Principles**

1. Academic Quality
2. Innovation and Creativity
3. Communication
4. Transdisciplinarity
5. Social Responsibility
6. The Integrated Student

**Legend**

- ●: Understanding
- ○: Ability
- ■: Satisfied