**California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo**
**College of Architecture and Environmental Design**

# Visiting Team Report

**Bachelor of Architecture** (225 quarter credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
16 February 2011

# Table of Contents

I.     **Summary of Team Findings**

1.     **Team Comments & Visit Summary**

   A.  Administration

       The provost and the dean are knowledgeable and supportive of the program, and recognize the high quality and high value of architectural education delivered at Cal Poly.

       The department chair is an accomplished academic and highly praised for his administrative effectiveness, support of students and faculty, and accessibility.

   B.  Students

       Cal Poly's architecture program benefits from a high quality student body. The students are driven, dedicated, and proud of what they gain from the program. Student work displayed around campus showcases their talent, and exemplifies the quality of the program.

       Students are actively engaged and involved in their education, and are eager to be involved in curricular development, if allowed. They find the faculty and staff very accessible and supportive. They do, however, express the desire for the dean to be more fully engaged with them on a personal level.

   C.  Facilities

       Facilities available to faculty and staff support the program's mission well. A CNC router and laser cutting capabilities have been added since the last accreditation visit. These tools, paid for by college-based fees, are managed by the digital fabrication (d[Fab]) lab, giving students access to cutting edge technology and allowing them to push the limits of formal and conceptual thinking. Additionally, the CAED Support Shop is well equipped with tools for both wood and metal working, which helps continue the school's tradition of Learn by Doing.

       Classroom and studio facilities appear to provide adequate instructional and pin up space, and feature plenty of natural daylight. The recent renovation of the media resource center gives students quick access to recent periodicals and selected publications, as well as hands on ability to understand building materials. There is concern that reductions in budget may compromise availability to resources, with reduced investment in maintenance, equipment replacement, and hours of availability.

   D.  Faculty

       The superb tenured and visiting faculty constitutes a diverse and gifted group of educators. In recent years, strong new faculty members have alleviated the retirement concerns expressed in the previous VTR.

       The commitment by the faculty to the individual inspiration and academic success of all students is evident. This commitment to success and quality resonates with students, and is made consistently clear through, staff, faculty, and the department head's words and deeds. Continuing this student centric culture will be critical to the program's long-term success. Of particular note are the department's efforts to support those programs where faculty has intertwined their areas of expertise, research interests, and teaching.

Given the reduced number of available tenured faculty lines, due to budgetary constraints, faculty are spread thin with increasing student faculty ratios in major and elective courses, committee assignments, and other commitments. The team is encouraged that the department is currently in the process of completing the search for two or three new tenure tract faculty.

E. Communication

Interdepartmental communication between faculty, staff, and department heads appears to be collegial, solution-oriented and productive. However, there appears to be a significant breakdown in communication from the dean's office to the head of the architecture department, the dean's office to faculty and staff, and the dean's office to the provost.

This communication breakdown is resulting in angst regarding issues critical to the mission of the program, impacting morale of those associated with the program, including students, staff, faculty, and departmental leadership.

F. Learn-by-Doing Environment

As a polytechnic university, the "learn-by-doing" environment is a positive influence on the program. The collaboration between the students, staff, and faculty enrich the institutional mission and provide the students with a well-balanced education. Graduates from the architecture program are able to plan, design and construct with an awareness of social and environmental responsibility.

G. Architecture Alumni

The depth and devotion of the school's alumni is a true asset of the Cal Poly architecture program. Alumni not only provide a source of job opportunities for the students, but also provide students with opportunities for mentoring, professional practice, experiences, and financial support through charitable donations and scholarships. They are eager to be supportive. Relationships should be actively cultivated and maintained to encourage their involvement and support.

H. Multi-Disciplinary Education

Interdisciplinary opportunities and the multi-disciplinary departments that coexist within the college are considered one of its crucial assets. The thoughtful and collaborative nature of the allied departments, faculties and students provide a very rich educational environment for the architecture students and faculty. Although there has been progress regarding interdisciplinary program or cross-disciplinary minors, lack of availability of classes and difficulties in scheduling make participation difficult.

2. **Conditions Not Met**

    B.2.    Accessibility
    B.5.    Life Safety
    B.6    Comprehensive Design

3.     **Causes of Concern**

A.  Budget

Budget cuts are a reality facing the college and the department. The provost is requiring a balanced budget.

The team found that the department faculty and staff have been trying to address the budget cuts, but their efforts are not productive because the specifics of the new budget have not been available to them, or what has been available, has been to subject to constant change.

The cuts have the potential to negatively influence the program. The lack of budget clarity is creating uncertainty, anxiety, and a negative environment for faculty, staff, and students.

The team believes that this critical situation will require leadership from the administrators and faculty in order to make the necessary cuts. It will also require transparency and inclusionary processes. The dean, associate dean, department head, faculty, staff, and students have to work together and in a timely manner to develop long and short-term strategies for delivering the program within the new budget realities while protecting its quality to the highest degree possible.

Related to the budget and contributing to anxiety, and the need for the program department head, faculty, and staff to plan for change, is the issue of the new enrollment cap imposed by the university. The lack of transparency in decision-making regarding enrollment numbers is creating confusion for staff, faculty, and students.

Because of a very bleak funding trajectory, alternative funding methods are more important now than ever. Past funding levels will most likely not reappear from state sources.

B.  College-Based Fees (CBF)

The distribution and management of the college-based fees (CBF) have become confusing to students. They have seen tangible benefits in the equipment that a portion of those funds has purchased in the past. Students expressed distress that the entire fee is being used without their input. They would like a voice in the disposition of some of the funds. This has impacted their trust of administrative decisions and their commitment to supporting future student enterprises.

As stated in the previous NAAB team's VTR (2005), the CBF funding mechanism is considered problematic and non-sustainable. The college should consider putting in place and/or publishing guidelines regarding the allowable allocation of these funds. Greater budget and planning transparency should be made available to those participating in the process.

C.  Lack of Fiscal Planning

Faculty regularly expressed concern over inconsistent annual budgets. Over the past several years, the amount of available funds assigned to the college has continued to drop at irregular and irrational intervals, making it difficult for the staff to plan both annual budgets, as well as long term spending strategies. At the time of the visit, the team could find no documentation of a strategic budget plan that extended beyond the current academic year. This appears to be causing concern for faculty and staff, who find it difficult to plan for courses, off-campus opportunities, and maintenance of current equipment.

D. Continuing Education

Before implementing perceived methods for budget savings, such as the moving of courses in both summer and off-campus programs to continuing education, the full impact to the department, college, university, and students must be explored and accounted for. The school may utilize campus services and resources as needed to estimate the costs of all initiatives. What may appear to be beneficial in the short term could ultimately decrease the department and/or college's capacity to justify state financial investment in the department in terms of space, faculty, and other operational support in the short and long terms. In addition, the financial impacts to the students should be fully studied.

Additionally the lack of predictability and planning around these areas is creating undue uncertainty and impacts on those wishing to participate. The team noted that there was a lack of a discernable long-term financial plan or forecast.

E. Student Registration

Student mistrust regarding the fairness in the registration system is pervasive. The student perception is that the priority system of registration is inconsistently deployed between the university registration protocols and the timing of department level faculty assignments. This misalignment between university registration and architecture department class and/or faculty assignments, leads to students feeling there is no logical strategy available to them to reap the benefits of a 'priority' system established by the university, yet undermined by late department assignments.

4.    **Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (Year)**

**1998 Criterion 12.29, Comprehensive Design:** *Ability to produce an architecture project informed by a comprehensive program, from schematic design through the detailed development of programmatic spaces, structural and environmental systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections, and building assemblies, as may be appropriate and to assess the completed project with respect to the program's design criteria*

**Previous Team Report (2005):** So little evidence was found of the physical manifestation of mechanical systems required by the comprehensive design criterion that the team found this condition not met.

**2011 Team Assessment:** The team could not find this criterion met. While some of the 11 required SPCs of criterion B.6 could be easily found in the studio projects that were identified to meet this criterion, others were either not present in the student work, or if present, were not consistently integrated across the spectrum of course work. The team was unable to find that this criterion was consistently applied, and significant evidence was not found of work demonstrating all the SPC required to achieve the definition of Comprehensive Design.

**II.     Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation**

**Part One (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

**Part One (I): Section 1. Identity and Self-Assessment**

*I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission and culture and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context.*

*The accredited degree program must describe and then provide evidence of the relationship between the program, the administrative unit that supports it (e.g., school or college) and the institution. This includes an explanation of the program's benefits to the institutional setting, how the institution benefits from the program, any unique synergies, events, or activities occurring as a result, etc.*

*Finally, the program must describe and then demonstrate how the course of study and learning experiences encourage the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects.*

**[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Cal Poly, as identified in the APR, is a polytechnic institution that promotes the application of theory into practice, fostering a learn-by-doing environment. In addition, the APR provided a thorough description of the program, its history, its context as a program in the College of Architecture and Environmental Design, and past recognition as a top national program.

*I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:*
- *Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff in all learning environments both traditional and non-traditional.*

   *Further, the program must demonstrate that it encourages students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers, and it addresses health-related issues, such as time management.*

   *Finally, the program must document, through narrative and artifacts, its efforts to ensure that all members of the learning community: faculty, staff, and students are aware of these objectives and are advised as to the expectations for ensuring they are met in all elements of the learning culture.*

- *Social Equity: The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff— irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.*

**[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.**

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which in each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

**2011 Team Assessment:** The APR provides detailed and often lengthy responses referencing policies, actions and other tangible statements and documents addressing each of these categories.

*I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives: Programs must demonstrate through narrative and artifacts, how they respond to the following perspectives on architecture education. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently within the context of its history, mission, and culture and to further identify as part of its long-range planning activities how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.*

A. **Architectural Education and the Academic Community**. That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching.[1] In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

[X] **The program has responded to this perspective.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The architecture program exists in a polytechnic institute and requires students to take general education courses offered by the university. It also offers several courses as general education for students in other disciplines. The program and the students benefit from and contribute to the other professional departments in the college. Faculty are involved in practice, writing and presenting scholarly papers at professional conferences, and mentoring their students in design competitions.

B. **Architectural Education and Students**. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to live and work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured and respected; to emerge as leaders in the academic setting and the profession; to understand the breadth of professional opportunities; to make thoughtful, deliberate, informed choices and; to develop the habit of lifelong learning.

[X] **The program has responded to this perspective.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The students at Cal Poly, having declared architecture as a major prior to entering the institution, have ample opportunities to assume leadership and emerge as professionals. The students receive encouragement and support from the faculty and staff to develop their skills necessary for life as a professional. There are an abundance of clubs and organizations that are available and several off-campus programs in a variety of cultural settings. The students are allowed to design their own studio sequence and the quarter system allows students to participate and evolve through a variety of co-op, exchange, and collaborative studios. The students are provided with studio space and outside resources to supplement their academic experience.

C. **Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment**. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located, and;

---

[1] See Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1990.

prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).

**[X] The program has responded to this perspective.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** EDES 101 Introduction to Architecture and Environmental Design presents necessary information about licensure and the registration process early in the first year of the curriculum. It incorporates a visit by the California Architectural Board, where education requirements, the Intern Development Program (IDP), and the Architectural Registration Examination (ARE) are explained. The students overwhelmingly anticipate seeking registration, and have great understanding about the process required to achieve it

D. **Architectural Education and the Profession.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to practice in a global economy; to recognize the impact of design on the environment; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to the multiple needs of a diversity of clients and diverse populations, as well as the needs of communities and; to contribute to the growth and development of the profession.

**[x] The program has responded to this perspective.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Internship and co-op experiences are offered after the third year, exposing students to a practice environment early on in their education. Placement has occurred in cooperation with a large selection of reputable firms, both domestically and abroad. The professional studio enhances this experience, allowing students to work in an office three days a week, and the remaining two days are spent solving design problems posed by practitioners in a studio-like environment.

The Arch 352/307 Architectural Design course, as well as the Arch 207 ECS course teaches students sustainable strategies, and how to implement these strategies into their design work. Both active and passive strategies clearly appear in the student work of these two courses. Additionally, the Arch 352 course pushes the students to respond to the needs of a client.

Collaborative studios in the fourth year, with both the architectural engineering program and the construction management program, help students understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice. These studios, however, are optional. Additionally, Arch 443 Practice, in which students are expected to learn how to prepare proposals, RFPs, contracts, and project teams, is run in tandem with these studios. Practice and studio courses routinely overlap in the fifth year.

The program also appears to contribute to the growth and development of the profession. Most part-time and some full-time faculty are also practitioners. Over the course of the visit, the team noted that alumni and practitioners routinely mentioned that they favored Cal Poly graduates when hiring because of the hands on knowledge that they acquire through the course of their schooling.

E. **Architectural Education and the Public Good.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to be active, engaged citizens; to be responsive to the needs of a changing world; to acquire the knowledge needed to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges through design, conservation and responsible professional practice; to understand the ethical implications of their decisions; to reconcile differences between the architect's obligation to his/her client and the public; and to nurture a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service and leadership.

**[X] The program has responded to this perspective.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The curriculum educates students in the discipline of architecture while making them aware of broader issues facing the world. Courses and programs offer students knowledge and skills necessary to be active and engaged citizens and professionals in order to become leaders in their communities and the profession.

*I.1.4 Long-Range Planning: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and, where appropriate, the five perspectives. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform its future planning and strategic decision making.*

**[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for reporting and evidence**

**2011 Team Assessment:** While a long-range plan is critical to a department's evolution, and the Cal Poly architecture program has identified a commendable plan that encompasses the integrated academic community, the practice-oriented community, and the knowledge-based community, it has been hamstrung by the lack of strategic direction from the college. In particular, enrollment projections and budgetary targets have not been made clear to the program and remain a detriment to the successful implementation of the program's long-term plan.

*I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:*
- *How the program is progressing towards its mission.*
- *Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.*
- *Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.*
- *Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:*
    - *Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.*
    - *Individual course evaluations.*
    - *Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.*
    - *Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.*
*The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.*

**[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for reporting and evidence**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The program conducts two categories of self-assessment; on-going self-assessment activities (i.e. committees, retreats, advisory bodies) and direct inquiry (i.e. surveys). The team is heartened that formal self-assessment programs have been developed, as evidenced in the work of the dean's leadership council, the department peer review process, and through the program's long-range planning initiatives. Furthermore, there is evidence that these self-assessment procedures are regular, documented measures of the program. The team, however, finds less involvement from both student and alumni groups; two groups that could provide a great deal of valuable feedback.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

**I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:**
- *Faculty & Staff:*
  - *An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions[2].*
  - *Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.*
  - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.*
  - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.*
  - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.*
  - *Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.*

**[X] Human Resources (Faculty & Staff) are appropriate (or adequate) for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The APR thoroughly addressed the issues of human resources and human resource development, and the team's investigation corroborated that information.

- *Students:*
  - *An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This documentation may include, but is not limited to application forms and instructions, admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshman, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.*
  - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.*

**[X] Human Resources (Students) are appropriate (or adequate) for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** There is evidence of human resource development as it pertains to students, both for freshmen as well as for transfer students. The program and faculty are deeply committed to student achievement. Policies and procedures are in place to support student needs and goals.

**_I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:_**
- **Administrative Structure:** An accredited degree program must demonstrate it has a measure of administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm the program's ability to conform to the conditions for accreditation. Accredited programs are required to maintain an organizational chart describing the administrative structure of the program and position descriptions describing the responsibilities of the administrative staff.

---

[2] A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.

**[X] Administrative Structure is appropriate (or adequate) for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Confirmed via the APR's detailed outline of university and architecture department organizational charts that display the administrative structure. Also included in the APR are detailed descriptions and responsibilities of the administrative staff supporting the program.

- **Governance:** The program must demonstrate that all faculty, staff, and students have equitable opportunities to participate in program and institutional governance.

**[X] Governance opportunities are appropriate (or adequate) for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Confirmed via interviews and meetings with staff as listed in APR. Interviews included both paid administrative and support staff along with student representatives.

*I.2.3 Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:*
- *Space to support and encourage studio-based learning*
- *Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.*
- *Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.*

**[X] Physical Resources are appropriate (or adequate) for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This requirement is met and validated via visual observations and review of available student studio spaces and faculty work and office facilities. Non-studio spaces also reviewed included traditional construction shops, digital fabrication facilities, galleries, and architecture specific media center. Non-architecture specific facilities made available to architecture students and staff included structural stress testing facilities, collaborative learning studios in related departments and Poly Canyon (a portion of campus dedicated to actual construction) amongst other facilities available in support of the architecture program.

*I.2.4 Financial Resources: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.*

**[X] Financial Resources are appropriate (or adequate) for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** It is a known reality that the state institutions of higher learning in California have all experienced budget cuts over the past few years. The Cal Poly architecture program has made wise decisions on how best to spend its limited resources. Even at these lower funding levels, the program has been innovative and prudent in securing financial resources to support a quality architectural education for all of its students. While further cuts are anticipated, continued reductions may not be possible without negatively impacting the quality of the educational experience or disproportionately burdening those students receiving financial aid.

*I.2.5 Information Resources: The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.*

*Further, the accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resources professionals who provide information services that teach and*

*develop research and evaluative skills, and critical thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.*

**[X] Information Resources are appropriate (or adequate) for the program**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This is met and was validated by visiting with campus main library staff dedicated to the architecture department, and the librarian specifically assigned to the architecture department's media resource center. The media resource center includes architecture specific publications, computer access to proprietary and outside digital images, along with a library of actual physical construction materials. All student studios include WiFi access to web based materials.

PART I: SECTION 3 –REPORTS
*I.3.1 Statistical Reports*[3]. *Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.*

- *Program student characteristics.*
    - o *Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).*
        - *Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.*
        - *Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.*
    - o *Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.*
        - *Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.*
    - o *Time to graduation.*
        - *Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the "normal time to completion" for each academic year since the previous visit.*
        - *Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.*

- *Program faculty characteristics*
    - o *Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.*
        - *Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.*
        - *Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.*
    - o *Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.*
        - *Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.*
    - o *Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.*
        - *Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.*
    - o *Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.*

**[X] Statistical reports were provided and provide the appropriate information**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The program provided the appropriate information in the statistical reports printed in the APR to sufficiently meet this requirement.


*I.3.2. Annual Reports: The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2009 NAAB Procedures. Beginning in 2008, these reports are submitted electronically to the NAAB. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the NAAB will provide to the visiting team all annual reports submitted since 2008. The NAAB will also provide the NAAB Responses to the annual reports.*

*The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.*

*The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the* Focused

---

[3] In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.

Evaluation Program Report *and* Focused Evaluation Team Report, *including appendices and addenda should also be included.*

**[X] Annual Reports and NAAB Responses were provided and provide the appropriate information**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Annual reports for 2005, 2006, and 2007 were provided and included appropriate information. However, the responses in each report regarding comprehensive design were weak on specific provisions for correcting the deficiency identified in the previous VTR.

*I.3.3 Faculty Credentials: The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty are adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history and context of the institution.*

*In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit[4] that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.*

**[X] Faculty credentials were provided and demonstrate the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The program benefits from a strong and committed tenured, tenure track and visiting faculty. The faculty exhibit, the courses offered, and the student work attest to the diversity in thought, pedagogical methods, and research and scholarship. Faculty teaching loads and other responsibilities are high.

---

[4] The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW
*The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.*

**[X] The policy documents in the team room were responsive to the requirements of Appendix 3**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Policy and guideline documents reviewed by the team are very comprehensive and appear to thoroughly cover a very broad range of policy issues.

## PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE -- EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE
CRITERIA

**II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria:** The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.

**Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:**
Architects must have the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This ability includes facility with the wider range of media used to think about architecture including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making. Students' learning aspirations include:

- Being broadly educated.
- Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.
- Communicating graphically in a range of media.
- Recognizing the assessment of evidence.
- Comprehending people, place, and context.
- Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.

A.1. **Communication Skills: *Ability to* read, write, speak and listen effectively.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met in a variety of courses throughout the five-year curriculum, i.e. ARCH 101 Survey of Architectural Education and Practice, ARCH 351: Architectural Design 3.1, and ARCH 492: Senior Design Thesis. The students are challenged to develop their communication skills through a variety of mediums including examples of essay writing, reading discussions and verbal presentations.

A. 2. **Design Thinking Skills: *Ability to* raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The Arch 420 course appears to provide a general overview to students of 20th century architecture and architects, and attempts to dissect multiple aspects of the contemporary aesthetics and thinking. Written assignments push the students to critically think and interpret specific aspects of modern architecture and architects. Ability is clearly demonstrated in Arch 492, which pushes this concept further by requiring well-researched position papers in which students define a theory driven problem and then argue its validity. This credit also appears to be reinforced by the thesis document written in Arch 481, although this course is not listed in the matrix.

A. 3. **Visual Communication Skills: *Ability to* use appropriate representational media, such as traditional graphic and digital technology skills, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The student work exhibited in the team room from a wide variety of classes, particularly the studio courses, demonstrated that all students had some proficiency in representing ideas and concepts visually. Work displayed included models, hand drawings, and a large number of digital renderings.

A.4.          **Technical Documentation:** *Ability* **to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is fulfilled in many courses, and in particular, ARCH 342, where it is clearly outlined in the course syllabus an present in the student work. Ironically, evidence of outline specifications preparation was found in 'low pass' work, but not in the exemplary work. ARCH 307 provided more evidence in project examples.

A.5.          **Investigative Skills:** *Ability to* **gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is addressed in ARCH 492 and ARCH 481. Complex and oftentimes conflicting information is gathered and distilled into project artifacts.

This criterion is also addressed in ARCH 420 in in-class discussion / debate position papers and expanded papers. Influential architects are researched and position papers created, evaluated, and expanded based on the content discovered and peer reviewed.

A. 6.          **Fundamental Design Skills:** *Ability to* **effectively use basic architectural and environmental principles in design.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Ample evidence for this criterion was found in ARCH 131, 132, 133.

A. 7.          **Use of Precedents:** *Ability* **to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is mainly met in the studio course ARCH 492, although it was also evident in much of the student work of other studios.

A. 8.          **Ordering Systems Skills:** *Understanding* **of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met and critically explored in ARCH 251, 252, and 253 Architectural Design 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3.

**A. 9.** **Historical Traditions and Global Culture:** *Understanding* **of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met in ARCH 217, 218, 219, 341, and 420.

**A. 10.** **Cultural Diversity***: Understanding* **of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The criterion is met in ARCH 101 Survey of Architectural Education and Practice, as well as the architectural history courses, ARCH 217, 218, 219. The course lectures, exams, and student essays are evidence that the understanding of cultural diversity is apparent.

**A.11.** **Applied Research:** *Understanding* **the role of applied research in determining function, form, and systems and their impact on human conditions and behavior.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met through ARCH 481 and ARCH 492. The ARCH 492 syllabi represent varied levels of focus in theory and detailed project research, with most being grounded more significantly in theory than quantitative research. Many of the syllabi represent comprehensive reading list, with specific content varied by professor. Representative work provided in ARCH 492 seems focused on reconciling/creating a student's design philosophy and appears to have little grounding in client based, project type needs/studies. However representative work is found in 481 addressing this criterion in the form of the project books and projects artifacts. Supplementary counseling services provided by Kennedy Library and MRC staff for all studio levels supports this criterion through their emphasis to expand information literacy and information diversity.

---

**Realm A. General Team Commentary:** Critical thinking and presentation skills are evident in the student work, and with a high degree of competency.

---

**Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge:** Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Incorporating life safety systems.
- Integrating accessibility.
- Applying principles of sustainable design.

B. 1.　　　**Pre-Design: *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.**

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** The criterion is met in ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis. The course meets the minimum requirements of this criterion and evidence is shown through research, essays, and projects.

B. 2.　　　**Accessibility: *Ability* to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical (including mobility), sensory, and cognitive disabilities.**

[X] Not Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Students seem to show some limited understanding of barrier free design, as it relates to accessible restroom facilities, however, no evidence was found in the student work that addresses accessible site design. Accessibility, which needs to be demonstrated at the ability level, requires that evidence be present in projects for which it is not the primary focus of the course. The capacity to embed accessibility into fundamental, conceptual design is missing, or not consistently demonstrated in the work.

B. 3.　　　**Sustainability: *Ability* to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction and operations on future generations through means such as carbon-neutral design, bioclimatic design, and energy efficiency.**

[X] Met

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence for this criterion was found in ARCH 207 and ARCH 307. In addition, ARCH 352 and 353 have multiple sections covering this criterion.

**B. 4.**   **Site Design:** *Ability* to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is fulfilled in ARCH 351 and 352, and is clearly outlined in course syllabi. The examples provided displayed student work that consistently addressed topographic, landscape, pedestrian and vehicular circulation.

**B. 5.**   **Life Safety:** *Ability* to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

**[X] Not Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is not met. There is inconsistent evidence that the ability to apply basic principles of life-safety is incorporated into the design process. There is substantial evidence that it is incorporated into lectures, but not shown in the student work as required by the ability level.

**B. 6.**   **Comprehensive Design:** *Ability* to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student's capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following SPC:

   **A.2. Design Thinking Skills**

   **A.4. Technical Documentation**

   **A.5. Investigative Skills**

   **A.8. Ordering Systems**

   **A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture**

   **B.2. Accessibility**

   **B.3. Sustainability**

   **B.4.Site Design**

   **B.5. Life Safety**

   **B.8. Environmental Systems**

   **B.9. Structural Systems**

**[X] Not Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence of comprehensive design is inconsistent across coursework. Realm A skills are prevalent, as well as structural systems and site design. Accessibility, sustainability, life safety, and environmental systems are more inconsistently applied.

Because of the variable scope and scale of individual studio projects, evidence is lacking that every student meets this criterion. The ARCH 481 / ARCH 492, cited as playing a major role in meeting this criterion, allows a student to select a highly theoretical or philosophical problem with no assurance that they will complete a comprehensive architecture design problem.

B. 7    Financial Considerations: *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting.

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** ARCH 443 addresses the minimum requirements of this criterion including both financial considerations of the management of an architectural practice as well as construction project costing. This is reinforced in the 4th year in the interdisciplinary studio, ARCH 453.

B. 8.    Environmental Systems: *Understanding* the principles of environmental systems' design such as embodied energy, active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar orientation, daylighting and artificial illumination, and acoustics; including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools.

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met consistently and in-depth in ARCH 207, 307 and 341. Evidence is found in lecture, exam and activity work.

B. 9.    Structural Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is fulfilled in ARCE 211, 212, 226 and 315, and is clearly outlined in course syllabi. Examples of provided material included student exams, calculations, and diagrams.

B. 10.    Building Envelope Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The Arch 342 Architectural Practice 3.2 lecture course contained very specific information on exterior building envelope systems. Slides in this course showed numerous skin conditions and details, as well as examples of failures. The Arch 341 Architectural Practice course also contained case studies, prepared by the students that showed a clear attention to detail in relation to building skin. These studies showed a clear understanding on the part of the students.

B. 11.    Building Service Systems Integration: *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Arch 307 Environmental Control Systems offers a comprehensive overview of multiple building systems and principles, including mechanical and electrical systems and acoustics. Arch 341 Architectural Practice provides an overview of structural concepts and materials, and is reinforced by the ARCE courses. Vertical transportation, security, and fire protection could use some enhancement.

**B. 12.** **Building Materials and Assemblies Integration:** *Understanding* **of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is fulfilled in ARCH 241, 242, 341, and 342, and is clearly outlined in the course syllabi. Examples are shown throughout the student work via building sections, details, and exterior elevations. Evidence also is found in outline specifications in the ARCH 342 course. Sustainable characteristics of materials shown included student acknowledgement of Forestry Stewardship Council sustainable wood, solar shading, and rainwater collection systems.

---

**Realm B. General Team Commentary:** With Life Safety and Comprehensive Design not met, Realm B is the area of instruction that needs the most attention and commitment.

---

**Realm C: Leadership and Practice:**
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

- Knowing societal and professional responsibilities
- Comprehending the business of building.
- Collaborating and negotiating with clients and consultants in the design process.
- Discerning the diverse roles of architects and those in related disciplines.
- Integrating community service into the practice of architecture.

**C. 1.** **Collaboration:** *Ability* **to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Collaboration is an ability that is strong and well met in this program, and is evidenced in the upper architectural studios. The students at Cal Poly are very fortunate to be able to participate in studios that team landscape architects, architectural engineers, construction management students and city and regional planning students in an interdisciplinary studio.

**C. 2.** **Human Behavior:** *Understanding* **of the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment and the design of the built environment.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met in ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems 1, ARCH 217 History of World Architecture: Prehistory-Middle Ages, and ARCH 307 Environmental Control Systems 2. There is clear evidence that there is an understanding of human behavior through lectures, essays, and exams within these courses.

**C. 3**    **Client Role in Architecture:** *Understanding* **of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and reconcile the needs of the client, owner, user groups, and the public and community domains.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence is found in the ARCH 443 Professional Practice course. It also shows up in several other courses and experiences that are offered as options within a requirement, for example Professional Studios (ARCH 451,452,453), Co-op Course and, the Design/Build opportunities.

**C. 4.**    **Project Management:** *Understanding* **of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Student Work in ARCH 443, Architectural Practice revealed an understanding of how to write proposals and contracts, and the lectures and exams cover both delivery methods and team building.

**C. 5.**    **Practice Management:** *Understanding* **of the basic principles of architectural practice management such as financial management and business planning, time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is fulfilled in ARCH 443, and is clearly outlined in the course syllabus. Examples included lecture notes and slide show frames indicating content delivery. Examples of student exams included topics required to fulfill criterion.

**C. 6.**    **Leadership:** *Understanding* **of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The criterion is met in EDES 101 Introduction to Architecture and Environmental Design, ARCH 341 Architectural Practice 3.1 and ARCH 443 Professional Practice. There is clear and strong evidence that the students are provided with the appropriate leadership responsibilities and opportunities of an architect through lectures, exams and practical applications.

C. 7.        **Legal Responsibilities:** *Understanding* **of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Discussions and testing of professional service contracts and professional liabilities were discussed in Arch 443 Architectural Practice. As a project, students were asked to prepare several AIA contracts.

C. 8.        **Ethics and Professional Judgment:** *Understanding* **of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues, and responsibility in architectural design and practice.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met in ARCH 443 Professional Practice.

C. 9.        **Community and Social Responsibility:** *Understanding* **of the architect's responsibility to work in the public interest, to respect historic resources, and to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors.**

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This criterion is addressed in EDES 101 and ARCH 443 in lecture and representative work. This knowledge is consistently and thoroughly carried through into many of the projects in future design studios.

---

**Realm C. General Team Commentary:** Realm C contains student performance criterion that have been mastered by Cal Poly students, who have a firm grasp of leadership and practice as it will affect them in the future.

---

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

*II.2.1 Regional Accreditation: The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).*

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The Institution is a member of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and was visited by an accreditation board for this agency in February 2010.

*II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.*

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Per the APR, the school offers a 5-year B. Arch undergraduate program. The APR further elaborates on how the curricular requirements are met.

*II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development*
*The program must describe the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications (e.g., changes or additions) are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Further, the NAAB expects that programs are evaluating curricula with a view toward the advancement of the discipline and toward ensuring that students are exposed to current issues in practice. Therefore, the program must demonstrate that licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.*

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The department curriculum committee executes the above listed responsibilities and is comprised of tenured and tenure-track faculty. A number of the tenured and tenure-track faculty are licensed architects, per the resumes included in the APR.

PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
*Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.*

*In the event a program relies on the preparatory/pre-professional educational experience to ensure that students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist. Likewise, the program must demonstrate it has determined how any gaps will be addressed during each student's progress through the accredited degree program. This assessment should be documented in a student's admission and advising files.*

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The program has a comprehensive evaluation process whereby the ability of each transfer student is properly appraised for any deficiencies in their preparatory education prior to allowing them to enter into the program.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

### II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees
*In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the* 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, *Appendix 5.*

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The above listed statement can be found at http://www.catalog.calpoly.edu/2009pubcat/caed/arch_dept/archdept.pdf on the Cal Poly website.

### II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:
> *The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*
> *The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)*

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The above listed documents can be found in PDF format at http://arch.calpoly.edu/current/naab.html on the Cal Poly website.

### II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
*In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:*
> *www.ARCHCareers.org*
> *The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects*
> *Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture*
> *The Emerging Professional's Companion*
> *www.NCARB.org*
> *www.aia.org*
> *www.aias.org*
> *www.acsa-arch.org*

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The Program offers career services, as well as access to the above listed documentation and websites.

### II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

*In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:*
> *All Annual Reports, including the narrative*
> *All NAAB responses to the Annual Report*
> *The final decision letter from the NAAB*
> *The most recent APR*
> *The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda*

*These documents must be housed together and accessible to all. Programs are encouraged to make these documents available electronically from their websites.*

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The 2010 & 2004 APRs are available in the MRC. The APRs typically include the above listed information.


## II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

*Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.*

**[X] Met**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The above listed info can be found electronically at
http://www.cab.ca.gov/pdf/reports/school_summary_report_2007.pdf

**III.    Appendices:**

**1.    Program Information**

[Taken from the Architecture Program Report, responses to Part One: Section 1 Identity and Self-Assessment]

### A.    History and Mission of the Institution

Cal Poly fosters teaching, scholarship, and service in a learn-by-doing environment, in which students, staff, and faculty are partners in discovery. As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly promotes the application of theory to practice. As a comprehensive institution, Cal Poly provides a balanced education in the arts, sciences, and technology, while encouraging cross-disciplinary and co-curricular experiences. As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility [*Approved by Cal Poly's President Baker March 22, 2010*].

*University's Learning Objectives (ULOs):*

1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1)
2. Communicate effectively (ULO 2)
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3)
4. Demonstrate expertise in the development of a project design (ULO 3)
5. Demonstrate expertise in the maintenance of an architectural practice (ULO 3)
6. Understand architecture in relation to the larger world of knowledge (ULO 3)
7. Work productively in groups (ULO 4)
8. Use their knowledge and skills to make a positive contribution to society (ULO 5)
9. Make reasonable decisions informed by shared values (ULO 6)
10. Engage in lifelong learning (ULO 7)

From its founding until today, Cal Poly has continually emphasized disciplines and teaching methods that enable graduates to succeed in the professional workplace. Particular concern for the development of the individual student is given a high priority in an environment, which encourages students to "learn by doing" through internships, cooperative education, enterprise projects and numerous co-curricular activities. An equally important manifestation of the emphasis at Cal Poly is that many of the academic and professional programs of the University are imbued with a sense of the applied and the practical, without diminishing the importance of principle and theory.

Through historical development, Cal Poly clearly holds a distinctive position in the California educational system. Founded in 1901 as a vocational high school and evolving into a modern polytechnic university, CalPoly has kept a keen sense of direction and purpose. Its distinctive mission of emphasis on undergraduate instruction is mandated by a special section of the State Education Code.

Over the 45 years from 1963 to 2009, the University grew to its current size of 19,325 full-time and part-time students. Architecture and the related Environmental Design disciplines were added as important areas of emphasis consistent with the historical mandate to stress occupational, applied and professional fields of study.

*Institutional Background History*

Today's University, with its emphasis on undergraduate education in applied fields, remains true in many respects to the original intent of its founding legislation, establishing in 1901 a polytechnic school to "at all times contribute to the industrial welfare of the State of California."

The founders' desire to establish a school that educates the hand as well as the head is still emphasized, in the University's continued commitment to a unique blend of traditional classroom instruction and applied learning outside of class ("learn-by-doing").

It is also preserved in Cal Poly's steady and enthusiastic commitment to an extraordinarily broad and varied co-curricular program – expressed in a myriad of student activities and organizations and a vibrant campus residential community.

On March 8, 1901, Governor Henry T. Gage signed a bill establishing the California Polytechnic School. The event marked the successful culmination of a campaign led by San Luis Obispo journalist Myron Angel and leading members of the area's merchant, agriculture, dairy and ranching interests.

Angel, who initially came to California with the Gold Rush of '49, had sought to bring to the Central Coast "a place...for the practical application of the arts and sciences." His vision – an institution for men and women that would "teach the hand as well as the head" – defined the new school's focus and set its course for the future. Eventually restated as "Learn by Doing," Angel's concept for the school reflected progressive views about education that emphasized addressing society's critical needs.

Leroy Anderson was appointed as the first director of the school in June 1902. On January 31, 1903, the cornerstone for the original Administration Building was laid. Construction followed on the boy's dormitory, land was designated for student farms and construction began on farm buildings.

Guided by its initial directors and supported by the local community, the California Polytechnic School enrolled its first class of twenty students in 1903. The student body tripled in size within two years, and tripled again three years later.

Eight students received diplomas in the first commencement, 1906, at California Polytechnic School. A robust calendar of sporting events and community activities enlivened the spirit and character of the School. A Farmer's Institute and Basket Picnic first held in May 1904, for example, attracted over three thousand visitors to the campus by 1910 and inaugurated an annual tradition that officially became known as Poly Royal in 1933.

In response to State Legislation, compulsory military training for men was instituted in 1915. Military discipline and uniforms were required in the dormitories as well as the classrooms. An Academic Department for college preparatory work was added to the three original departments of Agriculture, Mechanics, and Household Arts. In 1917, students began to enlist to fight in World War I. Remaining students participated in war relief projects.

Drastic budget cuts in 1923 forced a reduction in the number of classes offered. Only classes in agriculture, mechanics and printing remained. Nine female students enrolled in printing classes after their former courses of study were eliminated.

In 1927, the School added a two-year Junior College Division to the four-year secondary vocational program. Engineering/Mechanics was the principal course of study. Aeronautics was also offered. The name "Cal Poly" came into popular use.

Women students were excluded from attending Cal Poly by legislative act beginning in 1930 because of lack of on-campus housing for women.

In 1932-33, the State Board of Education directed a major reorganization of the school, abolishing the Junior College Division and the high school courses designed for university transfer. The mission of the school was changed to a two-year technical and vocational school.

With Julian McPhee (1933-1966) at the helm, Cal Poly stood poised to move to a new stage of its development and place on the landscape of California public education. The first annual Poly Royal was sponsored by the Future Farmers of America.

Urged by alumni, prospective students and employers to seek collegiate status for Cal Poly, President McPhee succeeded in obtaining approval from the State Board of Education to initiate a full baccalaureate degree program in 1940. The California Polytechnic State College subsequently awarded its first Bachelor of Science degrees to twenty-six graduates in 1942.

In the meantime, the United States' entry into World War II inaugurated an important interlude in Cal Poly's history. During the war years, the college served as state headquarters for the Food Production War Training Program, providing instruction to 120,000 California farmers. Cal Poly also implemented war preparedness training programs, for both men and women, in welding, machine shop, aircraft sheet metal and radio.

From January 1943 through November 1944, Cal Poly served as one of 17 Naval Flight Preparatory Schools in the nation, graduating more than 3,600 naval aviation cadets. In July 1944, Cal Poly was chosen as one of eight colleges to conduct a new naval aviation training program, the Naval Refresher Unit. This program continued until February 1946, serving 1,121 trainees.

Immediately after World War II, enrollment expanded to 819 students due to an influx of veterans studying under the G.I. Bill.

At the war's end, Cal Poly returned to its peacetime educational mission. In 1947, the California Polytechnic School was renamed the California State Polytechnic College.

In 1949, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation donated an 812-acre horse ranch in Pomona to the college, which was located near the Voorhis campus. By 1950, the joint operation of the two campuses was known as the Kellogg-Voorhis Unit.

The first Cal Poly float was entered in the Tournament of Roses Parade in Pasadena, California. This tradition continues today.

The prospect of higher enrollments influenced development of the College's first facilities master plan and inaugurated an ambitious building program on the campus. Enrollment rose to 2,909 students at the San Luis Obispo campus.

A graduate program leading to a Master of Arts degree in education began.

The Dexter Library, completed in 1949, offered two large reading rooms plus sixty study carrels that gave a seating capacity of 574. The stack rooms accommodated 120,000 books. By the mid-1950s, the north mountain dormitory complex had been built, signaling Cal Poly's commitment to a substantial residential program.
In 1956, female students were again readmitted to the College.

As the 1960's began, Cal Poly's enrollments and reputation continued to grow. The student body nudged toward 5,000 and would exceed 9,000 by the decade's end.

The California Master Plan for Higher Education included Cal Poly within the newly established California State College System.

Sadly, though, the new decade also witnessed the most tragic event in Cal Poly's history. On October 29, 1960, a chartered plane carrying the Cal Poly football team crashed on take-off in Toledo, Ohio, after a game against Bowling Green University. Sixteen Mustang players and six others perished in the crash.

Upon his mandatory retirement in 1966, Julian McPhee was succeeded by Robert E. Kennedy. Just as had been the case upon McPhee's assumption of the presidential mantel in 1933, Cal Poly was set for another major transition in its history.

In 1972, the State Legislature changed Cal Poly's name to the California Polytechnic State University. Following attainment of university status, over the next several decades, under two presidents, Robert E. Kennedy (1967 to 1979) and Warren J. Baker (1979 to present), Cal Poly remained faithful to its polytechnic mission and learn-by-doing educational philosophy. The annual rhythms of campus life preserved many well-established traditions. At the same time, Cal Poly developed in response to rapid change in the economy and society.

National championship academic teams and student projects like the first human-powered helicopter exemplified the enduring vitality of learn-by-doing. A significant portion of upper-division learning continued to occur outside the classroom and every graduate had to complete an independent senior project. In an era of dramatic scientific and technological breakthroughs, new curricula and research initiatives were launched. General education was revised and strengthened. Cal Poly developed a modern, robust university educational program.

Defining features of campus student life included the Week of Welcome for new students, a student residence hall community housing nearly 3,000 students, an inter-collegiate athletics program that transitioned to Division I status, and a vital student government with responsibility for running a multi-million dollar student corporation, more than 400 student clubs, the annual Poly Royal (briefly suspended, then reintroduced as Open House).

Multiple capital projects transformed the campus during the past six years. Individual, foundation and corporate gifts played a growing role in capital and program development. The CAED Construction Innovations Center, which houses classroom and faculty offices, was a groundbreaking example of a partnership between public and private monies. Among important examples across campus: the state, foundation and corporate-funded Center for Science; the privately funded Meat Processing Center and CAED Simpson Strong-Tie Materials Demonstration Lab; bonding, grants and revenue support for the Recreation Center Expansion and the Technology Park; the partnership among alumni and industry for Engineering IV; and the commitment to enhancing the living environment for student, faculty and staff with the University Union Plaza Renovation; Poly Canyon Village student housing, and Bella Montana Faculty/Staff Housing.

*Institutional Recognition*

For the 18th year in a row Cal Poly has been named the best public, largely undergraduate university in the West. Cal Poly also retained its No. 5 position overall in the magazines list of the West's best universities, including private institutions, that "provide a full range of undergraduate and master's-level programs, but few doctoral programs." (U.S. News ranks colleges, which grant doctoral degrees, such as those in the University of California system, in a separate category.)

## B.    History and Mission of the Program

The mission of the Architecture Department is to provide diverse and comprehensive educational opportunities for persons preparing to serve society as responsible, ethical and creative individuals involved in the design of the built environment and the profession of architecture. The department achieves its mission through excellence in teaching, scholarship, creative work, and service, with a strong commitment to providing a learning environment that develops the ability to make design judgments that integrate and synthesize technical, contextual and experiential issues in the creation of the built environment.

Specifically, the goals of the mission are to:

- Create a teaching/learning environment that develops an ability and passion for the lifelong pursuit of knowledge and understanding in the design of the physical environment and the practice of architecture.
- Create teaching, learning and work environments that support physical and mental health and personal and professional growth.
- Provide educational opportunities to pursue design excellence, technical knowledge and contextual understanding in the creation of the built environment.
- Provide educational opportunities to gain an understanding and appreciation for the interdisciplinary nature and integrative nature of design and the profession of architecture.
- Provide educational opportunities to gain an understanding and appreciation for the diversity manifest in the people, societies and cultures in relationship to the design and use of the built environment.

*Bachelor of Architecture Program Goals and Learning Outcomes (in relationship to the University's ULO's and NAAB SPC's)*

All students who complete the B.Arch. program at Cal Poly should be able to:

1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).

   a)  Understanding the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design (A8).
   b)  Understanding the architect's responsibility to elicit, understand, and reconcile the needs of the client, owner, user groups, and the public and community domains (C3).
   c)  Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards (A2).
   d)  Ability to effectively use basic architectural and environmental principles in design (A6).

e) Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
f) Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project (B1)
g) Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical, sensory, and cognitive disabilities (B2).
h) Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design (B4).

2. Communicate effectively (ULO 2).
a) Ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively (A1).
b) Ability to use appropriate representational media to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the design process (A3).
c) Ability to make technically clear drawings and models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design (A4).

3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
a) Understanding the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress (B5).
b) Understanding the basic principles of environmental systems' design including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools (B8).
c) Understanding the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces (B9).
d) Understanding the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems (B9).
e) Understanding the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies (B10).
f) Understanding the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems (B11).
g) Understanding the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies (B12).
h) Ability to apply the basic principles of building materials, assemblies, and systems in the development of a project design (B5 only relates to life-safety systems).

4. Demonstrate expertise in the development of a project design (ULO 3).
a) Ability to produce a complete and comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student's capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following outcomes: 1a Ordering Systems, 1c Design Thinking, 1g Accessibility, 1h Site Design, 2c Technical Documentation, 3h Building Systems Integration (NAAB emphasis on life-safety, environmental, and structural systems), 6a Historical Traditions, 9d Sustainability, 10a Investigative Skills (B6).

5. Demonstrate expertise in the maintenance of an architectural practice (ULO 3).
a) Understanding the fundamentals of building costs (B7).
b) Understanding the methods of project management (C4).
c) Understanding the basic principles of architectural practice management (C5).
d) Understanding the architect's legal responsibility to the public and the client (C7).
e) Ability to write outline specifications (A4).

6. Understand architecture in relation to the larger world of knowledge (ULO 3).
   a) Understanding parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape architecture, and urban design in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors (A9).
   b) Understanding the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment, and the design of the built environment (C2).

7. Work productively in groups (ULO 4).
   a) Understanding the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process (C6).
   b) Understanding the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities (C6).
   c) Ability to work in collaboration with others (C1).
   d) Ability to work in multidisciplinary teams (C1).

8. Use their knowledge and skills to make a positive contribution to society (ULO 5).
   a) Understanding the architect's responsibility to work in the public interest, to respect historic resources, and to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors (C9).

9. Make reasonable decisions informed by shared values (ULO 6).
   a) Understanding the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals (A10).
   b) Understanding the implications of diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects (A10).
   c) Understanding the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment (C8).
   d) Ability to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction and operations (B3).

10. Engage in lifelong learning (ULO 7).
    a) Ability to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes (A5).
    b) Understanding the role of applied research in determining building form, function, and systems as well as their impacts on human conditions and behavior (A11).

*Program Overview*

The BS Architectural Engineering program and department became effective with the 1947-48 Catalog. Prior to that time, the department was called Architectural Drafting with a technical certificate. The Trustees granted approval for the 5-year Bachelor of Architecture Degree to be offered, effective Fall 1963. With the 1964-65 Catalog, the Architectural Engineering Department changed to Architecture and Architectural Engineering Department, and the five-year B. Arch curriculum appeared for the first time in a catalog. There were six first graduates from the B. Arch program in 1964-65. The first two years of B. Arch and BS are the same. In 1976, B. Arch was changed into a four-year B.S. and two-year M.Arch. Due to low numbers of students going into the two-year accredited program the M.Arch program was changed in 1979 back to the B.Arch.

Since the last accreditation visit, the Department of Architecture has a permanent Department Head Henri T. de Hahn (2006-present) who is assisted by Associated Department Head Prof. Bruno Giberti (2007-2009), and Associate Department Head Prof. Thomas Fowler (2006-present). As of Fall 2010, Prof. Jim Doerfler will replace Prof. Bruno Giberti who accepted the on-campus position of Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning.

*Program Recognition*

The Architecture Department has been ranked, by *DesignIntelligence* (published by the Design Futures Council, a Washington, D.C.-based think tank that deals with architecture, engineering and building technology) in the top six best undergraduate architecture programs (2006, 4th; 2007, 6th; 2008, 4th; 2009, 3rd; and 2010, 3rd). In the 2010 ranking Cal Poly was the top state sponsored undergraduate program. The program was ranked *Best in the West* in the Regional Ranking for 2006-08 (ranking discontinued as of 2009). Cal Poly's Architecture program has made the nation's Top 20 list since 2003 with a ranking of sixth or better. In 2010, for the third year in a row, Cal Poly's architecture program earned the nation's top honor in the Construction Methods and Materials category. This ranking is based on a range of skills such as design, analysis and planning, and research and theory. Responses cited Cal Poly's "integrated curriculum, preparation of graduates ready for work, and sustainability." "This rating comes from the surveys of the partners, principals and personnel directors at more than 1,000 architectural firms throughout the United States.

Cal Poly aspires toward a polytechnic identity that stimulates the personal, professional, and intellectual growth of their students; all to prepare responsible citizens ready for the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century. This comprehensive approach is reflected in the Architecture Department's intention to educate the next leaders by providing them with a state of the art interdisciplinary curriculum experience; one that finds its balance between art and science.

The Architecture Program is one of five departments in the College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED). The CAED's mission, citizenship and professional awareness objectives and the history of the "Poly Canyon, the location of experimental structures, provide the context for understanding the program.

The Mission of the CAED is to deliver a 21st century polytechnic education that provides graduates with the creative, technical and leadership abilities to plan, design, construct and steward the built and natural environment. The College aspires to play a significant leadership role in graduating students equipped with the professional skills to create sustainable communities, utilize innovative technology, and embrace global engagement through interdisciplinary collaborations, which includes:

- The built environment at all scales, from rooms and interiors to single structures and complexes to site planning to urban and regional systems;
- The visual and spatial relationships among elements of the physical environment, including open space as well as built features;
- The natural environment to which the built environment must respond and within which it must function.

To provide that education, the CAED will offer degree programs in each of its five departments - Architectural Engineering, Architecture, City and Regional Planning, Construction Management and Landscape Architecture - that realize to the greatest extent possible the synergistic affinity between them by creating a teaching/learning

environment based on collaboration, and by conducting research and related creative activity that enhances interdisciplinary modes of practice.

*CAED Citizenship and Professional Awareness Objectives*

Socio-economic Awareness – CAED graduates have a general awareness of the individual and societal needs and desires, and the economic forces, that shape the planning, design, and construction of the built environment.

Environmental Awareness – CAED graduates have a general awareness of the relationship between the development and use of the built environment, and the impact of such development on natural resources, the natural environment, and human health and well being.

Cultural Awareness – CAED graduates understand and respond to the presence of different and even conflicting cultural attitudes and aesthetic opinions related to the process and the products of planning, design, and construction.

Development Process Awareness – CAED graduates comprehend the general process by which buildings, landscapes, infrastructure, and human settlements are developed by either private or public agencies, and within that context understand the role of their future profession within the larger development context.

Professional Responsibilities Awareness – CAED graduates understand the general responsibilities of their profession related to accommodating current human and societal needs, providing resources for future needs, and creating work of lasting value.

Civic Responsibility Awareness – CAED graduates will value the contributions they and their professions can make to the improvements of their communities and regions, and will be exposed to and cognizant of the responsibilities of professionals in their fields toward public, community, and professional service activities.

Personal Responsibilities Awareness – CAED Graduates will value and embody high standards of conduct and ethics as both professionals and citizens.

*CAED Professional Skills and Knowledge Objectives*

Graphic Skills – CAED graduates are able to employ appropriate representational media for their discipline, including freehand sketching and drafting, to convey concepts and essential formal elements at each stage of the programming, planning, design, or construction process.

Computer Skills – CAED graduates are able to employ appropriate computer based representational media and software programs to convey written, graphic, financial, or other information expected of their profession.

Oral Communication Skills – CAED graduates are able to speak clearly, confidently, and effectively to communicate the intentions of their classwork, projects, and research.

Written Communication Skills – CAED graduates are able to write effectively on subject matter and in situations expected of their profession.

Problem Solving Skills – CAED graduates are able to employ basic methods of problem identification, data collection, analysis, and articulation of conclusions and recommendations as required by their profession.

Critical Thinking Skills – CAED graduates are able to make a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of an existing or proposed urban plan, building, landscape, or other physical improvement and convey a supported judgment or opinion about the physical, environmental, financial, social, or aesthetic qualities and impacts, as appropriate to their profession.

Leadership Skills – CAED graduates are able to assume project organizational and management responsibilities when participating as a member of a study or

project team (e.g. coordinating communications among parties, planning and coordinating participants, time, and resources, and administering agreements).

Collaborative Skills – CAED graduates are able to interact effectively with others when working as members of a team.

Systems Coordination – CAED graduates are able to coordinate and integrate architectural systems with structural systems and mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems, at the design, construction document, and construction phases of a project, as expected of their profession.

Design Knowledge – CAED graduates are able to understand and apply basic organizational, spatial, structural, and constructional principles related to building and landscape elements, as expected of their profession.

Detail Knowledge – CAED graduates are able to provide and interpret details and specifications related to the planning, design, or construction of buildings, landscapes, or infrastructure, as expected of their profession, and are familiar with appropriate building and landscape materials, systems, and construction techniques.

Public and Stakeholder Representation – CAED graduates have the capacity to make client, stakeholder group, and public presentations.

Professional Foundation – CAED graduates are knowledgeable of the general principles, history, achievements, and responsibilities of their profession, and are familiar with significant projects and role models that are part of the common knowledge base of their field.

Industry Readiness – CAED graduates are able to make a positive contribution to the workplace as a result of their knowledge of standards of professionalism in practice and the general codes, contracts, and regulatory framework in which their profession is expected to perform.

Productivity and Supervision – CAED graduates can plan and execute projects and complete the materials required to communicate their work with minimal supervision.

*A Brief History of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design's Poly Canyon*

The late Dean George Hasslein strongly encouraged students to build structures on campus to experiment and develop through the campus's motto, "learn by doing". The then campus President, Robert Kennedy, still preferred to have the structures removed shortly after having been built. Dean Hasslein asked repeatedly for land on campus where he could leave some structures up on a more permanent basis so students could learn from their example. Approval for land came slowly for Dean Hasslein, so he lobbied off-campus with Alex Madonna (of Madonna Inn fame) for a piece of property alongside the main freeway in town, Highway 101. Shortly after Madonna approved a parcel for architecture students to build attention grabbing experiments in front of his attention-grabbing Inn, the University decided to dedicate the piece of land known as "Poly Canyon" to the CAED. In 1963, Cal Poly through a cooperative agreement between the College of Agriculture and the School of Architecture and Environmental Design, assigned nine acres of Peterson Ranchland in a nearby canyon to the College to use as an ongoing construction site. Professor Hans Mager described how certain aspects of the site worked together: "The Canyon now is a small village with many kinds of experimental buildings where cows walk around. One sculpture specifically made by George Hasslein's fifth year students was in the shape of a big, stylized banana tree. We found the cows liked to use it to scratch their necks."

In the last forty years, many structures have been designed and built on the parcel. As part of the Introduction to Environmental Design (EDES 101) course offered to incoming freshman every Fall, students often work on a project in the "Canyon" in need of repair. A

list of highlighted projects completed in the last four decades can be found in the team room. An overview of the canyon can be found at http://www.caed.calpoly.edu/facilities/poly-canyon.html (accessed August 10, 2010).

## C. Long-Range Planning

*I.1.4a A description of the process by which the program identifies its objectives for continuous improvement.*

The Department's long-range plan has eight total goals that are divided into three broad categories: Integrated Academic Community, Practice-Oriented Community, and Knowledge-Based Learning Community.

This plan is comprised of strategic components which are meant to complement the College's vision, and seek to further develop the Architecture Department's identity, curricular goals, faculty and staff development, students' community life and learning objectives, new programs, and alumni relations, as well as to secure longer term financial health.

This plan reflects the evolution of this long-range plan since the last accreditation visit and has been shared with the Dean and the Faculty to guide the actions of the Department.

*I.1.4b A description of the data and information sources used to inform the development of these objectives.*

The department has a number of mechanisms for informing the development of these objectives. A selected sampling of these items includes: surveys, town hall meetings, feedback on publications, and Department's Facebook page.

*I.1.4c A description of the role of long-range planning in other programmatic and institutional planning initiatives.*

Long range planning is critical to the constant evolution of the Department. Long range planning is not a proscribed timeline but the constant coordination, assessment and revision of the programmatic and institutional goals. The plan is impacted by outside forces (institutional change, budget), but relies most on the discussions amongst department leadership, faculty and students.

The Department's academic planning is focused inward on its role in educating professional architects, by gradually revising the program and fine-tuning where necessary, while initiating focused pilot programs that respond to a variety of needs; expanding the theoretical component through research agendas among students and faculty; and offering work experiences through the expansion of the Professional Studios, Coop, Internships, and new Metro Programs. Emphasis has been placed on the importance of pursuing these goals within the interdisciplinary context of the CAED. Other important points in long range planning include enhancing recruitment efforts, calibrating enrollment, and increasing the visibility of the program through a robust advancement strategy. Altogether these efforts will strengthen the Department's position both on campus and nationally, as it partakes in CAED and University efforts to define the "Polytechnic identity in the 21st Century."
(see http://www.wasc.calpoly.edu/pdfs/cpr/cpr_essays_web.pdf, co-authored by Prof. Bruno Giberti)

Parallel to these activities, the Department will actively seek to transform the existing M.S in Architecture to an M.Arch and develop a new role for the graduate program that embraces the CAED's strength as the only College having these five interrelated disciplines. A new M.Arch program poses wonderful opportunities for the Architecture Department to contribute to design education, sustainability, and intense collaboration.

*I.1.4d A description of the role the five perspectives play in long range planning.*

The long range plan is framed by the following general principles for the department (which references the five perspectives in parentheses): Curriculum Innovation (Architectural Education and the Academic Community + Architectural Education and Students); Integration of Professional Perspective within the Academic Environment (Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment + Architectural Education and the Profession); and a Comprehensive Scholarship agenda (Architectural Education and the Public Good).

***The Long Range Plan* Measures of Success, Time Line for Implementation**
The long-range plan below shows the objectives for each goal with the following information:
- Priority (*high, medium or low*)
- Time Line
- Date – Completed or Proposed for Completion
- Outcome Assessment Levels – *"Well Met", "Met", "Not Met", or "In Progress"*
- Measures – For carrying out objectives of goals

**\*Note:  See APR for remainder of plan.**

D.     **Self-Assessment**

The Architecture program has two broad categories for the self-assessment process. The first includes ongoing components of self-assessment activities: committees, faculty retreats, advisory bodies of alumni/ae, support facility and area coordinators, quarter end critiques, annual department events, student evaluations of faculty teaching, and the faculty review process. The second is a set of periodic surveys that have been carried out by the department to assess the quality of the program, including: Early Graduating Student survey; Senior Project Survey; 3rd Year Practice Survey: BIM and Revit; Rubric for Fourth Year Design; 3rd Year Priority; Co-op: Third Year; Co-op: Fourth Year; and AIAS Student Survey. (See team room documentation for survey data.)

In addition, the NAAB accreditation process itself, of which the APR is a significant component, involves the following stages:
- Regular meetings with faculty and lecturers outlining the NAAB criteria for gathering material
- Asking appropriate committees to discuss, assemble and evaluate the APR matrix on several occasions in meetings and informal discussions
- Seeking comments (especially focused on the program in light of the NAAB perspectives) from students and alumni, in particular through a questionnaire that was circulated and as of 2010 conducted electronically through SurveyMonkey
- Working with several faculty and staff members in specialized parts of the APR (i.e. Library,
- Finances, Statistics, Co-Op, etc.)

- Reviewing the prepared draft submission in part and with individual colleagues and staff.

*Ongoing Components of Self-Assessment*

The College has ten standing committees on which the Department has one or two representatives. These committees are for the purpose of monitoring College-wide program development activities. The Dean, Associate Dean, and Department Heads, meet weekly to discuss and set College policy. The CAED Department Heads Committee, comprised of the Department Heads, also meets regularly to further discuss the implementation of College policy. Over the past six years, both committees have been instrumental in revamping the College Strategic Plan and in developing a facility plan, a plan for common course integration, and a revised budget projection and allocation model.

Each September, the department faculty holds a one or two-day on-campus retreat to discuss program direction, curriculum agenda setting, management of the Department, teaching strategies, and other items of current importance to the Department. The Department has 5 standing committees: Post-Tenure Review; Peer Review; Professional Development and Leaves; Student Advising; and Scholarships. Department faculty serve as liaisons and task force representatives on numerous College and University Committees. The five-person faculty Department Curriculum Committee meets on as-needed basis, reports back to the faculty of the whole, and has 13 subcommittees comprised of instructional area faculty and their coordinators, who deliberate on intra-department and intra-college curriculum matters. The tenured faculty meet regularly to review personnel matters and to further advise the Department Head on Department policy.

An end-of-quarter "crit" process has been established where the location and time of each review is posted throughout the architecture building and on the Web for all to see. This allows faculty and students to participate in design reviews during the ninth week of the quarter. In addition to the Best of Show (new Third Year Review described in our response to 1.1.3.D), an Open House celebration in early May, and a Fifth Year Reception in early June are held each year, to which faculty, parents, students, administration from the College and University, and alumni are invited to review exhibits of student work.

The faculty peer review process is mandated and controlled by the California Faculty Association (CFA), the collective bargaining unit for the faculty within the CSU system. This requires the selection of a Peer Review Committee from the tenured faculty of the Department, which serves as the first level of review. The Department Head is the second level, the Dean is the third, and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost are the fourth level of review. In addition, there is a mandatory post-tenure review required of all tenured faculty every fifth year. Within the last five years, the Department ARPT criteria have been amended to include an additional level of assessment of faculty performance for all Part-Time Entitled three-year

Lecturers. Additionally, to cultivate a participatory role for all tenure-track faculty during the yearly review process, in 2008 the PRC established an informal discussion between the Committee and the faculty under review prior to review by the Department Head. The intention was to create the sense of assessment as part of a larger picture and to indicate mutual commitment and respect between the department and the candidate.

Student evaluations of faculty teaching part-time and full-time are required by the CFA/CSU MOU (Article 15.15) to be conducted on a minimum of two classes annually,

and evaluations of part-time faculty are required at least once per year. The results of these evaluations are placed in the faculty member's Personnel Action File and distributed to the respective faculty members themselves. The student evaluations constitute one of many components used by the Periodic Review Committee (PRC) and the Department Head's evaluation process.

The faculty may qualify for a Wes Ward Faculty Teaching Award, which is administered by an alumni endowment group called the College of Architecture and Environmental Design Foundation (CAEDF) and for the Paul and Verla Scholarship.

Formed in 1988, the College's Dean's Leadership Council is comprised of 24 professionals in fields related to the college. Council membership represents a diverse range of firm size and geographical location (although all are headquartered in California). In the past, almost half were graduates of the Architecture Department. However, the board is now transitioning to reflect a greater balance and diversity of professionals and to introduce more non-Cal Poly Alumni. This Council meets on campus annually with the Dean and Department Heads to provide advice, advocacy, access and resources for the college and its Dean. Regional meetings are also held in various locations across the State. The Dean's Leadership Council has recently provided direction to the College on the formulation of its Strategic Plan (see www.caed.calpoly.edu/alumni/leadership-council.html).

Cal Poly Career Services conducts an annual survey of the prior year's graduates to determine the number of graduates hired in their respective professions. In addition to the description in our response to 1.1.3.C, they provide the department with the names and locations of hiring firms, average starting salaries, and rank or title. They also provide information on the number of students who continue to seek employment and the number who are in graduate school. Consistently most alumni are employed in California, reinforcing our need to provide a well-trained workforce for the state. These statistics are published in a book (available in the Team Room). Alumni have an opportunity to provide feedback on this survey. Their comments and suggestions are forwarded to the Department for review and consideration. No other formal survey of alumni is conducted at this time. This information is regularly used by the Department for purposes of establishing co-op and internship opportunities for the students, and to inform its five-year enrollment plan.

Department faculty and staff serve as ADA, learning disability, sexual harassment, affirmative action and student club advisors and facilitators.

*Additional Programs*

There are five special lab or support facilities available to students and faculty: the award winning Collaborative Interactive-Integrative Digital-Design Studio (CIDS); the Digital Fabrication Laboratory (d[Fab]Lab); Hay Media Resource Center and Materials Library (MRC); the Photo Presentation Facility; and the Support Shop.

The CAED has seven minor coordinators: Sustainable Environments, City and Regional Planning, Integrated Project Delivery, Construction Management, Real Property Development, Environmental Design and Architectural Engineering).

In addition, the Department has thirteen special program coordinators: Architectural Management Track; Professional Studios/Co-ops/Internships (coordinated by Associate Department Head Jim Doerfler); Florence IP; WAAC; Fontainebleau; Denmark International Studies; Japan/Thailand IP; Bauhaus (Dessau) in Germany; CEPT in Ahmadabad, India/Cal Poly Exchange Program (newly established in 2010); Puebla

University Visiting Student Program; University of Canberra/Cal Poly; Ecole d'Architecture de Paris-Val-de-Seine/Cal Poly Exchange Program; and S.F. Urban Design Internship Program.

The Department conducts surveys of students, faculty and alumni to obtain input. A selected list of surveys includes (for complete surveys see the Team Room documents):

1. [Students] NAAB Student's Survey (Summer 2010), June 24, 2010, 338 responses
2. [Faculty] NAAB Alumni Survey (Summer 2010), June 24, 308, 330 responses
3. [Students] 3rd year Practice Survey: BIM and Revit, June 2, 2010, 37 responses
4. [Faculty] Rubric for Fourth Year Design, October 27, 2009, 25 responses
5. [Students] 3rd Year Priority, January 11, 2010, 80 responses
6. [Faculty] Self-Assessment Using the WASC Rubric, October 15, 2009, 46 responses
7. [Students] Co-op: Fourth Year, October 29, 2009, 33 responses
8. [Students] Co-op: Third Year, October 29, 2009, 75 responses
9. [Students] AIAS Student Survey, June 11, 2009, 65 responses

Surveys #1 and 2 (conducted Summer 2010) of alumni and students are summarized below:

*Student Survey Summary*

Introduction

The Department and faculty conduct surveys regularly and take action on curricular adjustments when appropriate. Past survey audiences and topics have included: Graduating Students, Seminar Evaluation, AIAS, Co-Op Fourth Year and Third Year, Third Year Priority Registration, Rubric for Fourth Year Design, Third Year Practice Survey: BIM and Revit, Senior Survey and Alumni Survey.

The selected comments located below are from the 2005 APR and are included as a basis of tracking those comments and current improvements. (C = Comment; I = Improvement)  C: "The curriculum should be more rigorous in design studios and incorporate ECS and practice courses into design more coherently." I: A 3rd year two quarter pilot program focused on the integration of the design studio, and the practice and ECS activity courses. C: "There is a definite lack or disdain for practical knowledge." I: With the hiring of two faculty members to revamp the entire practice sequence of 2nd and 3rd year, a culture of practical knowledge has substantially improved the students' interest and appreciation for how buildings are put together. An increase in case study exercises has emphasized this integration. C: "Also, I've never been introduced to detailing." I: Second through 4th year student projects have incorporated appropriate levels of comprehensive design issues with an emphasis on detailing (i.e. Prof. Robert Arens' 2nd year Winter quarter; Prof. Mark Cabrinha's 3rd year design build AIAS F-Stop renovation; and Prof. Jonathan Reich's 4th year on-campus interventions). C: "Reformat Arch 106 curriculum, i.e., in the first quarter, freshmen should take an introductory course while the current in-depth Arch 106 material should be converted into a year-long series of courses in 2nd year." I: As of Fall 2009, a new 1st year has integrated several past courses within a single sequence ARCH 131 and ARCH 101. The current ARCH 106 course is offered to Architecture Engineering and Construction Management students and cannot be extended into 2nd year.

During summer 2010, the Architecture Department conducted a department-wide Student Survey through *SurveyMonkey* (see Team Room for full survey) asking students enrolled in 2nd through 5th year to respond to 18 assessment questions with three additional open-ended questions. Out of 793 students, a total of 317 surveys were completed

(40%). The following data reflect the rating average for each topic based on a scoring scale where 1 is Weakest and 5 is Strongest: Sketching Skills (3.14); Practical business and practice knowledge (3.26); Knowledge of architectural detailing (3.68); Oral and written communication skills (3.52); Building /structural knowledge (4.02); Project management (3.06); Relationship between design and technology (4.01); Work ethic, self-motivation (4.14); Analytical thinking/problem solving (4.14); Teamwork skills and collaboration discipline (3.78); Design skills (4.33); Interdisciplinary skills (3.49); Computer skills, including AutoCAD (3.27); Knowledge of interior design/space planning (3.42); Design theory, history and criticism (3.74); and Research skills (3.53).

Student Comments from the three open ended questions:

1. Please list specific skills, knowledge, experience and personal qualities you have gained during your tenure at Cal Poly. "I learned many methods of design..." "An abundance of technical construction knowledge, knowledge on traditional materials such as wood, concrete, and metal, final drawing skills, analytical thinking as well as synthesis for projects." "I've learned a lot about design, design theory, and displaying and transitioning an idea into a final product." "Time management (that's a really big one), expression of creativity, the ability to work with people whether you like them or not." "I have gained greater knowledge of design and drawing, specifically related to architecture. I have also learned the basics of architectural and construction practices. Additionally, I have learned a great deal about architectural history and feel I have improved in my presentation and communication skills." "I have learned to dive into the library and mrc [Media Research Center] for research. I also learned that the architecture department takes the learn by doing philosophy very seriously, which I like very much." "Practical/realistic construction techniques, drawing/sketching techniques, formatting, printing, hand drawing, water coloring, model building techniques." "I have learned to work with Auto cad, indesign, Photoshop, Autodesk, Revit, Sketchup, Rhino, digitizer, and drawing/painting skills." "Leadership skills from club participation. Work experience from Co-Op experience (offer more opportunities please)." "I have gained the continuous curiosity about how things are put together and been opened to a new way of thinking." "Teamwork, real-world knowledge of working with outside contractors and businesses, time-management, communication how to represent ideas so that others can understand them, history of architecture, structural considerations, essentials of design, hand drafting, computer aided design, building components and tectonics, perseverance, the benefits of collaboration, how to take critique, and inspiration to continue in design." "Designing as part of a team has been a very valuable self-improvement tool I appreciated how it mimics professional practice." "After completing three years at Cal Poly Architecture, I have nothing but amazing things to reflect on.

Not only do I feel that I have gained valuable knowledge form close relationships with my design professors, I also feel that I am ahead in the practical sense of architecture as well. This summer, I was fortunate enough to get hired for an internship at a small firm. During my first few weeks there, I have felt very prepared in the work setting by being able to answer various question and being able to complete many office tasks that have to deal with Revit, AutoCAD, and the Adobe Creative Suite."

2. Do you have any suggestions on how Cal Poly and/or the Architecture Department might improve your education and/or program? "Teach us how to use computer aided design programs better." "More specifics on deliverables." "More feedback! It would be very helpful to receive some feedback pertaining to any project." "More interdisciplinary working environments and projects. There have been several speakers at the college now that have spoken about interdisciplinary designing, but I feel there hasn't been much of an attempt at integrating any interdisciplinary projects from a good amount of professors. We're missing that perspective on design, while there seems to be a majority

of the general contractor perspective." "Add more business aspect to program, more collaboration with other departments within CAED." "It would be nice to learn more about project management, and practical business knowledge for our field of study." "The administration and communication from the architecture department could be much improved. I often received more pertinent and personalized advising about my education from Al Hauck (the CM department head) than I did from the architecture advising faculty... However, I also believe that the architecture requires a stronger organizational framework and cohesive vision if there is to be any Improvement." "Encourage more interaction between the students across the years." "More criticism in every studio, force it..." "Integrate summer internships into the curriculum." "Keep working on an improved registration system..." "There is a disconnect from second year to third year, there is not an emphasis on computer based design in the second year, and there is not an emphasis on hand skills in the third year, a balance of both in both years would be nice." "I think that teachers should give better reviews after a project not just sending us immediately to a new one without letting us know how were doing until the very end of the quarter when we receive our grades and don't' know why we got what they thought was fair." "Use the first hour of studio hours for actual lectures for Space Planning, Interior design, technology, collaboration, project management, written communication, sketching detailing, etc."

3. Please provide any additional comments about the program here. "This is such an incredible program filled with an extremely enthusiastic faculty/administration." "I believe that Cal Poly pushes students to the limit so that they may hold themselves accountable whether it may be a group project or independently. I believe the integration of technology as well manual projects is what makes this curriculum successful." "The "Best of Third Year" organized by Tom Fowler was by far the most meaningful evaluation event for me. The guest critics, and presentation format was excellent." "I am very grateful for Cal Poly, the hard working professors and staff, and our facilities, but as a student here, I am not seeing proof that this school is one of the top in the nation." "I really enjoyed my two quarter studio but again I know it's not fair because there are a limited amount of "good" professors. I think we need more good professors hired so that everyone can have a good education at Cal Poly, not just a select amount who have lucky registration ranks." "Some really good studios. Some not so good studios. The latter should be reevaluated." "I personally have not taken a two-quarter long studio, but I can see the results of the past third-year students. My feedback is positive." "When touring other programs it shocked me to see how little integration there is between the physical and digital media. At Cal Poly we are trained equally well in both." " Pleased with the overall program and its pretty well rounded approach. Most of the professors are very good, a few could use review. The idea of encouraging a portion of 4th year to be off-campus is brilliant. Keep it."

Overall Department Comments

Overall the students seem happy with their education. The department is poised to evolve rather rapidly over the next years with the upcoming wave of faculty retirements and the need to hire new tenure-track faculty. Contemporary modes of thinking will bring a new balance as the department seeks to reinforce the strength of its teaching with new research aspirations. Ongoing curricular revisions are addressing many of the students' concerns. The hiring of nine tenure-track faculty since 2004 has already increased the overall sensitivity towards a more integrative learning approach that emphasizes team work, research skills, construction techniques, digital technology, and work experience.

The responses under question 1 that reflect what students feel they have learned are in strong relationship to what alumni (in their separate survey) look for in hiring (teamwork, etc). Responses to question 2 (suggestions for improvement) also bear a strong

relationship to what alumni emphasize as aspirations for the program – particularly, greater incorporation of business and construction administration courses.

Students appear to appreciate the breadth of courses offered, with favorable comments ranging from design studio to construction methods to history and theory. The integration of internships (and other professional off campus programs) is important to the students and has been the impetus for change already underway.

The department has formalized very strong interdisciplinary courses with Construction Management and Architectural Engineering and is currently working with the department heads in Landscape Architecture and City and Regional Planning to increase offerings in those realms. One limiting factor is the discrepancy in the size between architecture and other departments.

The Department takes very seriously the desire of students to become proficient in a variety of digital media and appreciate that they are still eager to learn analog techniques. Overall students appear satisfied with the course offerings in this realm. The Department has added optional workshops for the spectrum of representation (from free hand drawing to water color to Revit and portfolio creation) to bolster specific individual needs.

A significant theme of the responses was more criticism in design studio. In the past three years the Department has added "cross section" reviews to 3rd year to both elevate the level of discourse and provide both faculty and students the opportunity to critique the breadth of work in the department. We continue to refine the methods of self-evaluation and peer evaluation.

Other comments serve as reminder that while substantial improvements have been made since the last accreditation, efforts need to be better coordinated within design years and have a "buy in" by faculty teaching specific years, and across the entire program and not limited to pilot programs. These efforts will need to overcome the size of the department and reconcile that opportunities might not be available for all students at the same time. There is clearly a need to continue to improve the Cal Poly registration process and give greater personal student attention when advising. Constructive review feedback, increased and targeted discussions on topics pertinent to the students' projects are areas that can easily be adjusted.

*Alumni Survey Summary*

Introduction

The survey was distributed in July 2010 to all alumni of the department for whom we have email addresses. The survey was generated as a pairing of two surveys: a draft survey developed by the Dean's office to solicit attitudes about graduates from employers and a survey distributed to the current students in the classes of 2005-2010. These occasionally overlapped in areas queried, but it was felt the questions were nuanced enough to continue both sets of questions. Additionally, short answer questions provided a means to elaborate on several areas. The survey was completed by 308 alumni and placed in an anonymous matrix (for complete survey see Team Room documents).

Reflection

The recent alumni were almost exclusively engaged in architecture, and were almost universal in their pride in having attended Cal Poly. Many included written comments that their firms particularly solicited from CalPoly, sometimes exclusively, for employees.

The survey indicates several strengths, including the overall quality of the degree experience, especially the ability of graduates to be immediately successful in an

architectural office relative to peers from other institutions. Responders found Cal Poly graduates to be extremely strong in computer skills and industry readiness.

When asked the skills most valued when hiring new employees, respondents most frequently mentioned 1) Communication skills, 2) technical ability/construction knowledge, 3) computer skills, and 4) team collaboration. Selected survey responses include:

1) Communication Skills: Respondents rated recent alumni strongly in this area with 55.9% Agreeing recent alumni are able to speak and write effectively and 28.3% Strongly Agreeing.

2) Technical Ability and Construction Knowledge: These topics were covered in several areas. The overall industry readiness rating was very high with 49.2% Strongly Agreeing and 39% Agreeing. Knowledge of Detailing was not as strong with 47.2% agreeing and 17.5% Strongly Agreeing.

   Implementation and coordination of MEP systems and integration of documents ratings were weaker with 33.2% Neutral, 41.7% Agree and 15.2% Strongly Agreeing. The department is engaged in strengthening these skills in three ways: first - the creation of an Integrated Interdisciplinary Studio, which brings design, construction documents, estimating and scheduling together; second - the strengthening of the Practice classes led by faculty members Robert Arens and Jim Doerfler, and third - the Fall 2010 completion of the Simpson Strong-Tie Materials Demonstration Lab. This facility will allow faculty to adjust their course curricula to include more hands-on access to materials.

3) Computer Skills: Respondents ranked these as among the strengths of the recent alumni with
   37.3% Agreeing and 49.3% Strongly Agreeing that recent alumni were able to employ appropriate representational media. In the open comments area of the survey some alumni indicated the need to accompany this with the continued reinforcement of freehand sketching techniques. The Department concurs and in academic year 2009, the 1st year curriculum was revamped to join what were two tracks of studio: digital and analog (ARCH 121/ARCH 131). In conjunction, the department is focused on hiring faculty with expertise in these skills (i.e. Jim Bagnall, traditional sketching; Brian Ridley, digital modeling). Many workshops have been offered in both media.

4) Collaborative Skills also received high ratings with 47.6% Agreeing and 39.9% Strongly Agreeing that recent graduates are able to identify and assume divergent roles that maximize individual talents while working with other professionals as a member of a team. Collaboration, particularly across disciplines, has received special emphasis in recent years, for example in the curricula associated with the Integrated Interdisciplinary studio.

Several responders hoped that the program would include more interaction with Business (in business practice coursework and with business students for a personal connection). Currently faculty member Dan Panetta offers a course that integrates College of

Business students. This course culminates with the Bank of America Low Income Housing Competition. The 2010 team was composed of 13 students from six departments including Business. The team finished 1st in 2009 and 2nd in 2010. In addition, the College is currently considering joining with the Orfalea College of Business to create a major in Real Estate.

The survey indicated continued interest in strengthening internships and any other pre-graduation professional experiences. Some responders expressed conviction that this was important to their education and others expressed the hope that these programs will continue to expand or even become mandatory. The expansion of the pre-graduation professional experience is a high priority with the department. In addition to continuing the San Francisco internship program, the Department now offers six professional studios (this has unfolded since 2005). The existing co-op program is being expanded. In addition to placing more students we hope to offer studio credits along with work experience. Students participating in overseas exchange programs have also extended their stay through an international co-op experience. The department's ambition is to incorporate the academic with the work experience during an internship or co-op and not treat them as two separate paths. This is a continuation of the learn-by-doing philosophy central to Cal Poly.

The University has expressed an expectation that, in every academic program, the entire curriculum be assessed during one cycle of program review. The Architecture Department has begun a process of assessing one design year during each academic year, with the idea that this would provide time to assess the entire ARCH curriculum during the six-year cycle of accreditation and program review. The occasion is the annual faculty retreat, which takes place at the beginning of each academic year. The retreat has been repurposed as an assessment exercise, with groups of faculty representing all years and curriculum areas focusing on random samples of student work. This effort finds support in the department's longstanding syllabus policy, which requires the inclusion of learning outcomes, and in a more recent commitment by the faculty to move toward an e-portfolio by requiring students to summarize their work in the form of a PDF representing the final project in each studio.

This process has had some success, beginning in September 2008 with an assessment of Fourth Year work. This area of the curriculum has long been a concern of the faculty; the variety of experiences available to students, both on- and off-campus, has been a valuable source of programmatic richness, but the overall rigor of these experiences has not been assured. In response, the faculty asked all Fourth Year students to submit a portfolio representing work completed in design studios and in those courses substituting for ARCH 420 Seminar in Architectural History, Theory, and Criticism. The assessment of the studio work reached the conclusion that, although the overall quality was very good, there was little evidence that the off-campus studios were addressing the Student Performance Criteria associated with systems integration. There was an accompanying recognition that we had not done enough to communicate programmatic expectations to our off-campus partners or to those of our students participating in off-campus programs; this led to a yearlong effort to develop a Fourth Year rubric based on NAAB criteria, which could be given to both our partners and our students. The rubric, which was developed by the Curriculum Committee as part of its assessment responsibilities, is finding a broad application in the upper division of the on-campus design curriculum.

ARCH 420 is a writing-intensive course; a separate assessment of the students' written work led to the conclusion that none of the off-campus courses substituting for ARCH 420 were addressing writing skills at the appropriate level. As a result, the department ended the practice of granting automatic course substitutions and now requires students to present their work for review. In addition, the off-campus advisors were asked to

communicate the department's expectations to our off-campus partners, who have responded positively. It remains to be seen whether the student work will improve.

The assessment of Fifth Year, which took place in September 2009, was less successful, owing to some disagreement about the nature of the assessable artifact, but also to the

enormous distraction of the continuing financial crisis. The pressures of competing business made what had been an all-day affair into less than a full afternoon, with predictably inconclusive results. The lesson should be clear: if the Department intends to concentrate its assessment efforts on the faculty retreat then it truly needs to be a one-day exercise.

The Department does remain committed to assessment and continuous improvement, as evidenced by the process of revising the ARCH course outlines, which took place during the balance of 2009-2010. The process was a deliberate one, beginning with a preliminary revision based on existing documents like the course catalog and previously approved curriculum map. A guided discussion involving the Associate Department Head, curriculum area, area coordinator, and the entire Curriculum Committee resulted in the revision of both the map and the outlines as well as the alignment of course outcomes, program goals, and University Learning Objectives (ULOs). The result is that the Department now has a common set of course outcomes based on the Student Performance Criteria. In conformance with University expectations, these outcomes are organized under a set of easily communicated program goals, which are keyed to the ULOs. The result should be a greater degree of clarity and transparency in discussing learning with both students and faculty members.

Several topics from the most recent student and alumni surveys will be discussed at the Department Fall Retreat 2010. Among these are, at the bachelor level, even more integration with the curriculum between design studios and supporting courses and at the Master's level the future direction of the program.

The results from these self-assessment activities provide the department with an opportunity to reflect on long-range planning, curriculum development, and learning culture of the program and make changes as necessary to keep it relevant to the changes of our global society.

## 2.    Conditions Met with Distinction

B.8.    Environmental Systems
C.1.    Collaboration

Architecture Department

# Memorandum

CAL POLY

One Grand Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0282

805.756.1316
email: architecture@calpoly.edu
web: www.arch.calpoly.edu

| PAGE # | ADDENDUM ITEMS (CORRECTIONS IN "RED") | ADDENDUM COMMENTS |
|---|---|---|
| | **Summary of Team Findings** **1. Team Comments & Visit Summary** | |
| 1 | B. Students Students are actively engaged and involved in their education, and are eager to be involved in curricular development, if when allowed. | There are many examples via surveys and the direct input of students regarding curricular development and therefore "when" is more accurate. |
| 1 | C. Facilities<br><br>Classroom and studio facilities appear to do provide adequate instructional and pin up space, and feature plenty of natural daylight.<br><br>The recent renovation of the media resource center (since the last accreditation visit) gives students quick access to recent periodicals and selected publications, as well as hands on ability to understand building systems materials via the new database and collection of building materials.<br><br>There is concern that reductions in budget may compromise availability to facility resources, with reduced investment in maintenance, equipment replacement, and hours of availability. | We appreciate this insight regarding our studio and classroom spaces, but think the modifiers make it seem that all studio spaces are abundant regarding pinup space and daylight. We think this is misleading due to the increased size of our design studios since the last visit – which is reinforced by the team's comments later in the report regarding the increasing of studio enrollment with shrinking budget. |
| 1 | D. Faculty<br><br>The superb faculty (tenured, tenure track, and full and part-time lecturers) visiting faculty constitutes a diverse and gifted group of educators. In recent years, the hiring of strong new tenure track faculty members have alleviated the retirement concerns expressed in the previous VTR. adequately addressed the last visiting team's cause of concern regarding the (VTR '05) *hiring and retention of faculty created by the number of recent retirements.*<br><br>The commitment by the faculty to the individual inspiration and academic success of all students is evident. This commitment to success and quality resonates with students, and is made consistently clear through, staff, faculty, and the department head's words and deeds. Continuing this student learning centric culture will be critical to the program's long-term success. Of particular note are the department's efforts to support those programs where faculty has intertwined their areas of expertise, research interests, and teaching. the faculty with increased publications (23 since the last visit) of faculty as well as one time stipends in recognition of newly acquired professional credentials (i.e., architectural registration or completion of doctoral program).<br><br>Given the reduced number of available tenured and tenure-track faculty lines, due to budgetary constraints, faculty are | While Cal Poly has a visiting professor line, the Department currently has no visiting professors on staff. We believe that it is important to state the different ranks as the Department has been very inclusive of all faculty ranks.<br><br><br>This last sentence too vague and therefore not sure what programs these are that support the intertwining of expertise, research interests, and teaching. We have provided a list of these things that the department has done, |

Architecture Department

CAL POLY
One Grand Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0282

805.756.1316
email: architecture@calpoly.edu
web: www.arch.calpoly.edu

# Memorandum

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | spread thin with increasing student faculty ratios in ~~major and elective courses~~ design studios (increased to 1:20/21 from 1:17/18 during the last visit), reduced opportunities for elective opportunities, additional committee assignments, and other departmental commitments. The team is encouraged that the department is currently in the process of completing the search for two or three new tenure tract faculty to start fall 2011. | which has supported the faculty's research efforts. |
| | **3. Causes of Concern** | |
| 3 | Financial Resources<br>A. Budget<br><br>Budget cuts are a reality facing the college and the department. The provost is requiring a balanced budget, and it is understood by the department, that past funding levels will most likely not reappear from state sources. **[This sentence was moved from the end of the last paragraph]**<br><br>The team found that the department faculty and staff have been trying to address the budget cuts, but their efforts are not productive because the specifics of the new budget have not been available to them, or what has been available, has been to subject to constant change due to the state's continuing economic downturn.<br><br>The team believes that this critical situation will require leadership from the administrators and faculty in order to make the necessary cuts. It will also require ~~transparency and~~ inclusionary processes. The dean, associate dean, department head, faculty, staff, and students have to work together and in a timely manner to ~~develop~~ work through and reach some agreement on the identified long and short-term strategies developed in the APR for delivering the program within the new budget, ~~realities~~ while protecting its quality to the highest degree possible.<br><br>Related to the budget and contributing to anxiety, and the need for the program department head, faculty, and staff to plan for change, is the issue of the future decreased enrollment size of the department. ~~new enrollment cap by the University, that significantly reduces the enrollment of the program.~~<br><br>Because of a ~~very~~ projected bleak funding trajectory, alternative funding methods are more important now than ever.<br><br>**[This sense of concern, in the below sentence, is covered above – not sure it needs to be further stated].**<br>~~This lack of transparency in decision-making regarding enrollment numbers is creating confusion for staff, faculty, and students.~~<br><br>**[Moved to first paragraph to flow better?]**<br>~~Past funding levels will most likely not reappear from state sources.~~ | Our goal here is to portray as accurately a picture as possible regarding the budget.<br><br>The items under the "Causes of Concern" that have subtitles of Budget, College-Based Fees (CBF), Fiscal Planning, Off Campus Programs Funding all fall under the "Financial Resources" Condition. We suggest to help clarify this, by placing all of these under the category of Financial Resources.<br><br>It's very important to note and emphasize here, that the department has done extensive strategic planning (which the team acknowledges in this VTR), which includes the budget planning/projections outlined in the 27 pages of the Financial Resources section of the APR.<br><br>We also would like to strike all of the uses of the world "transparency" since overused and not quite sure what it means in this context. |

# Architecture Department

# Memorandum

CAL POLY

One Grand Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0282

805.756.1316
email: architecture@calpoly.edu
web: www.arch.calpoly.edu

| 3 | Financial Resources<br>B. College-Based Fees (CBF)<br><br>*The CBF is a mandatory Cal Poly fee, supported by a vote of the students, which is one portion of the overall registration costs each student pays to enroll at Cal Poly.* The distribution and management of the college-based fees (CBF) have become confusing to students. The CBF program started before the last accreditation visit in 2001/02, with overwhelming support by the students.<br><br>The students They have seen tangible benefits in the equipment that a portion of those funds have purchased. that a An elected group of representative students have been involved in making recommendations to the Department Head in the past over the six-year period since the last visit.<br><br>Even though a few students did express frustration regarding how the CBF funds were being used for the 2010/2011 academic year, the Department Head did make the CBF student committee aware that, for this year only, the Dean had mandated that 100% of CBF would be allocated to faculty salaries. Since the last accreditation visit, a CBF web page is maintained monthly and features CBF meeting minutes and the equipment purchases over the years.<br>Students expressed distress that the entire fee is being this year to offset the department's used without their input. They would like a voice in the disposition of some of the funds. This has impacted their trust of administrative decisions and their commitment to supporting future student enterprises.<br><br>As stated in the previous NAAB team's VTR (2005), the CBF funding mechanism is considered problematic and non-sustainable. The college should consider putting in place and/or publishing guidelines regarding the allowable allocation of these funds. Greater budget and planning transparency should be made available to those participating in the process.<br><br>In response to the previous NAAB team's VTR (2005), the Department has developed a CBF Student Committee that has bylaws and elected student representatives for each year and have been involved directly in making recommendations on how money was spent over the six years since the last visit. The department has also shown in the financial section of the APR, budget projections two years out that show a balanced budget without the CBF. The department has ramped up collection of private donations that are twice what they were during the last visit. The continuation of the CBF for future years is currently in discussion at the CSU system level. | The first sentence inserted is quoted from the CAED CBF Web Site (http://www.caed.calpoly.edu/college-based-fees/).<br>We don't feel that this accurately captures the CBF situation over a six-year period. We need your assistance in being mindful that this is a very sensitive area, since currently in discussion at the Chancellor Office level regarding this program will continue in the future. It would have been helpful to verify these student comments from what we understand to be from a few students, since the CBF is documented in the APR with extensive details referenced on Department's Web Site. Every single year, where an apportioned amount of CBF funds were available to students (the decision of apportioning a certain percentage of money is decided by the Dean), students have always had a voice in how those funds would be dispersed. Extensive minutes showcase the discussions, initiatives, votes, purchases and annual detailed reports. It is only as of the AY 2010-11 that no funds were attributed and students were made aware of this. You can see the minutes September 30, 2010 where the Department Head (Henri de Hahn) is quoted (http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/college-based-fees/index.html.) that as per the Dean 100% of CBF is going towards instruction). |

Architecture Department

# Memorandum

CAL POLY
One Grand Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0282

805.756.1316
email: architecture@calpoly.edu
web: www.arch.calpoly.edu

| 3 | Financial Resources<br>C. ~~Lack of~~ Fiscal Planning<br>Faculty ~~regularly~~ expressed concern over the fluctuating ~~inconsistent~~ annual budgets provided to the Department. This appears to be causing concerns for faculty and staff, who find it difficult to plan for courses, off-campus opportunities, and maintenance of current equipment.<br><br>Over the past several years, the amount of available funds assigned to the college has continued to decline ~~drop at irregular and irrational intervals,~~ making it difficult for the ~~staff~~ Department to plan ~~both~~ annual budgets, as well as long term spending strategies. ~~At the time of the visit, the team could find no documentation of a strategic budget plan that extended beyond the current academic year.~~ The Department has done an excellent job outlining the history of the program's budget over the last six years and is doing the best that they can with the fluctuating information provided to them.<br>~~This appears to be causing concern for faculty and staff, who find it difficult to plan for courses, off-campus opportunities, and maintenance of current equipment.~~ [Moved to first paragraph] | The department has done extensive fiscal planning as indicated in the 27-page Financial Resources section of ~~report in~~ the APR, which included the required 2 years out of budget projections. Also, additional information was provided by the Department Head at the time of the visit, regarding additional budget details and this included budgeting information related to student cohorts and staffing.<br><br>In addition, the team was presented during the first morning's breakfast meeting a five-year student enrollment plan that was tied into three separate curricular initiatives that are a direct response to a clear and demonstrable budget strategy; one that envisions multi-year scenarios that are in preparation to possible additional budget cuts that could be required to be implemented on short notice by the continuing adjustments from the CAED's budget. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | ~~D. Continuing Education~~<br>Financial Resources<br>D. Off Campus Programs Funding<br>Before implementing perceived methods for budget savings, such as the moving of courses in both summer and off-campus programs to the CAED's continuing education model of funding, the full impact to the department, college, university, and students must be explored and accounted for. The school may utilize campus services and resources as needed to estimate the costs of all initiatives. What may appear to be beneficial in the short term could ultimately decrease the department and/or college's capacity to justify state financial investment in the department in terms of space, faculty, and other operational support in the short and long terms. In addition, the financial impacts to the students should be fully studied.<br>Additionally the lack of predictability and planning around these areas is creating undue uncertainty and impacts on those wishing to participate. The team noted that there was a lack of a discernable long-term financial plan or forecast. | Listing this funding under Continuing Education is very confusing. Continuing education is just a funding model, so best (and not so confusing) to place this under "Off Campus Programs Funding", which more directly identifies what it is. |

Architecture Department

# Memorandum

CAL POLY

One Grand Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0282

805.756.1316
email: architecture@calpoly.edu
web: www.arch.calpoly.edu

| 4 | E. Student Registration | It needs to be made clear that we use the University's system for registration. |
|---|---|---|
| | Student mistrust regarding the fairness in the University's registration system is pervasive. The student perception is that the priority system of registration is inconsistently deployed between the university registration protocols and the timing of department level faculty teaching assignments. The Department is currently working on fixing what students consider to be a misalignment between university registration and architecture department class and/or faculty assignments, ~~leads to students feeling there is no logical strategy available to them to~~ so program students are able to reap the benefits of a 'priority' system established by the university. ~~yet undermined by late department assignments.~~ | What is not mentioned in this narrative, which is included in the APR, is that the department has conducted a range of surveys and has piloted two registration system adjustments during the last 1 ½ years in the third year to explore improvement to this system for all students.<br><br>An additional point is that "late department assignments" are not an accurate way of describing this. Due to the University Faculty Bargaining Agreement (Unit 3), the word staff must be used when no faculty contract has been extended. This has been the case since there is more often a hold of lecturer contracts as in the past and this is also a direct response to the current budget climate. |
| | **4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (Year)** | |
| | [NOTE: These need to be cross-referenced in the VTR.]<br>**Causes of Concern (From '04 VTR)**<br><br>• The previous reductions in state funding have resulted in a financial strain on the Architecture Department. There is a concern that the Architecture Department college-based fees are not a viable long-term solution for covering state funding shortfalls.<br>**[This is one of the Causes for Concern Item that is cross-referenced in the VTR under B. College-Based Fees (CBF), page 3]**<br><br>• There is a concern about the hiring and retention of faculty created by the number of recent retirements, cost of housing, and the university's financial constraints. This is most evident in the inability to obtain a permanent department head.<br>**[This is second one of the Causes for Concern Item that is cross-referenced in the VTR under D. Faculty, page 1]**<br><br>• While advising services are available, they are inadequate in supporting the | Where are these '04 VTR causes of concern followed up within the VTR?<br><br>Typically (it is the collective understanding of the program) there should be a referencing of these causes of concern in this front-end narrative to close out these concerns from the prior VTR. In come cases these causes of concern have been referred, but the others have not. |

Architecture Department

CAL POLY

One Grand Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0282

805.756.1316
email: architecture@calpoly.edu
web: www.arch.calpoly.edu

# Memorandum

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | needs of the majority of the students.<br><br>• There is an ongoing concern about the limited range of opportunities for on-campus studios and instructors for the fourth year. While progress has been made in this area since the last visit, more can be done to improve the situation for students who do not participate in off-campus programs. | |
| | **II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation Part One (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT Part One (I): Section 1. Identity and Self-Assessment** | |
| 6 | **B. Architectural Education and Students.**<br>**[X] The program has responded to this perspective.**<br>**2011 Team Assessment:** The students at Cal Poly, having declared architecture as a major prior to entering the institution, have ample opportunities to assume leadership roles and emerge as professionals. The students receive encouragement and support from the faculty and staff to develop their skills necessary for life as a professional. There are an abundance of clubs and organizations that are available and several off-campus programs in a variety of cultural settings.<br><br>*The students are allowed in the fourth year of the program a number of options: to design their own studio sequence and the quarter system allows students to participate in a variety of foreign programs, co-op/internships, on campus interdisciplinary studios or professional studios in a range of firms in the state. The students are provided with studio space and outside resources to supplement their academic experience* | **Not sure where the information for student's having the ability to design their own studio sequences come from. Fourth year is the place in the curriculum where students do have many options.** |
| 6 | **C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment.**<br>**[X] The program has responded to this perspective.**<br>**2011 Team Assessment:** EDES 101 Introduction to Architecture and Environmental Design, ARCH 443, and the suite of fourth-year (interdisciplinary courses with ARCH, ARCE, CRP, LA, CM) presents necessary information about licensure and the registration process early in the first year of the curriculum. It incorporates a visit by the California Architectural Board, where education requirements, the Intern Development Program (IDP), and the Architectural Registration Examination (ARE) are explained. The students overwhelmingly anticipate seeking registration, and have great understanding about the process required to achieve it. | |
| 7 | **D. Architectural Education and the Profession.**<br>**[x] The program has responded to this perspective.**<br>**2011 Team Assessment:** Internships, co-op experiences and the unique professional studios that were created since the last accreditation visit are offered after the third year, exposing students to a | |

Architecture Department

CAL POLY

One Grand Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0282

805.756.1316
email: architecture@calpoly.edu
web: www.arch.calpoly.edu

# Memorandum

| | | practice environment early on in their education. Placement has occurred in cooperation with a large selection of reputable firms, both domestically and abroad. The professional studio enhances this experience, allowing students to work in an office three days a week, and the remaining two days are spent solving design problems posed by practitioners in a studio-like environment. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | | **Architectural Education and the Profession.** **[x] The program has responded to this perspective.** **2011 Team Assessment:** Internship, co-op and professional studios experiences are offered formally after the third year, exposing students to a practice environment early on in their education. Placement has occurred in cooperation with a large selection of reputable firms, both domestically and abroad. The professional studio enhances this experience, allowing students to work in an office three days a week, and the remaining two days are spent solving design problems posed by practitioners in a studio-like environment. The Arch 352/307 Architectural Design course, as well as the Arch 253/207 ECS course teaches students sustainable strategies, and how to implement these strategies into their design work. Both active and passive strategies clearly appear in the student work of these two courses. Additionally, the Arch 352 course pushes the students to respond to the needs of a client. Collaborative Interdisciplinary studios in the fourth year, with both the architectural engineering, construction management and landscape architecture programs (with CRP it happens off-campus during the Oakland Metro Studio), helps students understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice. These studios, however, are among the choices that students have in fourth year. Additionally, Arch 443 Practice, in which students are expected to learn how to prepare proposals, RFPs, contracts, and project teams, is run in tandem with these studios. Students that are participating in off-campus programs during the fourth year, take this fifth year Practice Course in the fifth year. The program also appears to contribute to the growth and development of the profession. While 98% of the faculty are registered architects, most part-time and full-time Lecturers are also practitioners, along with a few of the tenure and tenured track faculty. Over the course of the visit, the team noted that alumni and practitioners routinely mentioned that they favored Cal Poly graduates when hiring. | **To be consistent in the sustainability strategies for students' design work, Arch 253 design course should be linked to 207 (like 352 w/ 307.)** |

Architecture Department

CAL POLY

One Grand Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0282

805.756.1316
email: architecture@calpoly.edu
web: www.arch.calpoly.edu

# Memorandum

| 10 | I.2.3 Physical Resources:<br>[X] Physical Resources are appropriate (or adequate) for the program<br>2011 Team Assessment: This requirement is met and validated via visual observations and review of available student studio spaces and faculty work and office facilities. Non-studio spaces also reviewed included the CAED's support shop traditional construction shops, digital fabrication facility, computer lab, gallery spaces, and architecture specific CAED's Media Resource Center. Non-architecture specific facilities made available to architecture students and staff included structural materials stress testing facilities, collaborative interdisciplinary design studios in related departments and Poly Canyon (CAED's experimental building area on campus) a portion of campus dedicated to actual construction amongst other facilities available in support of the architecture program. | Unclear as to what "faculty work" is. Best to delete "work" and tie to office facilities. |
|---|---|---|
| | **PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS** | |
| 12 | I.3.1 Statistical Reports.<br>[X] Statistical reports were provided and provide the appropriate information<br>2011 Team Assessment: The program provided the appropriate information in the statistical reports printed in the APR to sufficiently meet this requirement. | It's disappointing that, given the new requirements of the 2009 Conditions for more comprehensive reporting of program statistics, and the requirement to contrast current stats with prior visit numbers, and the resulting length of this section of the report, that more visiting team narrative has not been provided regarding highlighting the gains that the program has made in these outlined areas, and of course any causes of concern that the team might have.<br><br>For instance, no acknowledgements regarding the changes in the student to instructor ratios in the design studios since 2004. |
| 12 | I.3.2. Annual Reports:<br>[X] Annual Reports and NAAB Responses were provided and provide the appropriate information<br>2011 Team Assessment: Annual reports for 2005, 2006, and 2007 were provided (and 2008, 2009, 2010 provided by NAAB) and included appropriate information. However, the responses in each report regarding comprehensive design were weak on specific provisions for correcting the deficiency identified in the previous VTR. | There is no mention of the 2008, 2009, 2010 Annual Reports that were supplied to the team by NAAB. Where these reports reviewed too?<br><br>It would help to have more insight on the weak specific provisions for correcting Comprehensive Design. |

Architecture Department

CAL POLY

One Grand Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0282

805.756.1316
email: architecture@calpoly.edu
web: www.arch.calpoly.edu

# Memorandum

| 12 | *I.3.3 Faculty Credentials:*<br>[X] Faculty credentials were provided and demonstrate the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement.<br>2011 Team Assessment: The program benefits from a strong and committed tenured, tenure track, ~~visiting faculty~~ part and full time ~~lecturesr~~ faculty. The faculty exhibit, the courses offered, and the student work attest to the diversity in thought, pedagogical methods, and research and scholarship.<br><br>The visiting team does have a concern that faculty teaching loads and other responsibilities are high. | |
|---|---|---|
| | **PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM**<br>**PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE – EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA** | |
| 15 | **A. 2. Design Thinking Skills:**<br>[X] Met<br>2011 Team Assessment: The Arch 420 course appears to provide a general overview to students of 20th century architecture and architects, and attempts to dissect multiple aspects of the contemporary aesthetics and thinking. Written assignments push the students to critically think and interpret specific aspects of modern architecture and architects. Ability is clearly demonstrated in Arch 492, which pushes this concept further by requiring well-researched position papers in which students define a theory driven problem and then argue its validity. This credit also appears to be reinforced by the thesis document written in Arch 481. ~~, although this course is not listed in the matrix.~~ | Just re checked the APR and the SPC Matrix shows ARCH 481 listed right next to ARCH 492 course under the category of "5$^{th}$ Yr. D+S" category. |
| 16 | **A.4. Technical Documentation:**<br>[X] Met<br>2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is fulfilled in many courses, and in particular, ARCH 342, where it is clearly outlined in the course syllabus and present in the student work. | |
| 16 | **A.5. Investigative Skills:**<br>[X] Met<br>2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is addressed in ARCH 492 and ARCH 481. *Complex and oftentimes conflicting information is gathered and distilled into project artifacts.* | We understand that this SPC is met, but it would be helpful just to have 1 or 2 sentences that describe what was the *"complex and often conflicting evidence"* found? |
| 19 | **B. 6. Comprehensive Design:**<br>[X] Not Met<br>2011 Team Assessment: Evidence of comprehensive design is inconsistent across ~~coursework~~ ARCH 481 and ARCH 353 and are cited as playing a major role in meeting this criterion. Realm A skills are prevalent, as well as structural systems and site design. Accessibility, sustainability, life safety, and (?)environmental systems are more inconsistently applied. | We are confused by the addition of ARCH 492 (seminar research/theory course) by the visiting team to Comprehensive Design SPC.<br><br>The ONLY TWO COURSES linked in matrix are ARCH 353 (third year building design course) and ARCH 481 (fifth year thesis building design course). We recommend removing this sentence listed below, since not |

Architecture Department

CAL POLY

One Grand Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407-0282

805.756.1316
email: architecture@calpoly.edu
web: www.arch.calpoly.edu

# Memorandum

| | |
|---|---|
| **[NOTE: We recommend removal of this sentence, but if not, more narrative is needed to explain what is meant by this statement for both ARCH 481 & 353 Building Design Courses.]**<br>*(?)Because of the variable scope and scale of individual studio projects, evidence is lacking that every student meets this criterion.*<br><br>~~The ARCH 481 and ARCH 353 ARCH 492~~<br>**[Moved sentence up since it flowed better]**<br>are ~~cited~~ as playing a major role in meeting this criterion. ~~allows a student to select a highly theoretical or philosophical problem with no assurance that they will complete a comprehensive architecture design problem.~~ | *relevant to these building design courses, allows a student to select a highly theoretical or philosophical problem with no assurance that they will complete a comprehensive architecture design problem.*<br><br>**Also it appears that this narrative does not reflect the comprehensive design work of 353 (since left out of narrative).**<br><br>**We are also not sure if environmental systems were evaluated at an understanding level since listed along with ability level SPCs (accessibility, sustainability, & life safety) in narrative. We don't agree that this criteria has not been met an understanding level. It is ironic that environmental systems criterion is not met here, since this criterion has been indicated as well met in the curriculum.**<br><br>**Does this statement still hold true if ARCH 353 is included and ARCH 492 removed?**<br>*Because of the variable scope and scale of individual studio projects, evidence is lacking that every student meets this criterion.* |
| ***II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development***<br><br>**[X] Met**<br>**2011 Team Assessment:** The department curriculum committee executes the above listed responsibilities and is comprised of tenured and tenure-track faculty. A number of the faculty (tenured, tenure-track, and part and full time lecturers) are licensed architects, per the resumes included in the APR. | |