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Preface

The Architecture Program Report (APR) is a submission to the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). It is the first stage in an application by the Architecture Department, College of Architecture and Environmental Design, at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo for continuing accreditation of its professional Bachelor of Architecture program.

This APR document has been prepared in accordance with the NAAB 2009 Conditions for Accreditation and represents the collective input from the faculty, students, staff, and administrators of the Architecture Department, with input from the College and the University. At the center of this report is the Department’s trust in the process, thus our aspiration for transparency in setting up this important document.

Without a doubt, this process was rewarding on many levels. It allowed a robust and in-depth assessment of the Department’s strengths, as well as areas needing further adjustments. It showcased a six-year journey that balanced the Department’s identity with the relevancy of the NAAB conditions. And perhaps most importantly, it offered the opportunity for the Department’s faculty, students, staff, and administrators to reaffirm our common goals and vision, and celebrate our numerous accomplishments.

The education of an architect has been hit hard, due to the ongoing budget crisis, and trying to educate a new generation of leaders within the State of California seems at times a Herculean challenge. And yet, there is no impact big enough that can deflect our commitment to maintaining the excellence in education that our students, faculty, and alumni have come to expect. The Department has collectively and collaboratively envisioned curricula adjustments, forged a network of alliances, and unfolded advancement strategies that align our desire to balance academic integrity, professional accountability, and fiduciary responsibility.

Sincerely,

Henri de Hahn, EPFL/SIA
Professor, Department Head

James Doerfler
Professor, Associate Department Head

Thomas Fowler IV, AIA
Professor, Assistant Department Head

Kathi Good
Administrative Support Coordinator

Alissa Magorian,
Accounting Assistant
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1.1.1 History and Mission

1.1.1 a A Brief History of the Institution

1.1.1 a1 Institutional Mission Statement

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)

1.1.1 a2 Institutional Founding Principles

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, Cal Poly 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.)

1.1.1b A Brief History of the Program

1.1.1b1a Mission (Architecture Department)

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 BArch 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 Arce 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.

1.1.1a3 Description of how mission and founding principles are expressed in the context of 21st century higher education

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;
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.

1.1.1b1b Mission (College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED))

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 coursework, 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).
1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity

1.1.2a Policies related to learning culture (including the Studio Culture Policy).

1.1.2b Evidence that faculty, students, and staff have access to these policies and understand the purposes for which they were established

1.1.2c Evidence of plans for implementation of learning culture policies with measurable assessment of their effectiveness.

1.1.2d Evidence that faculty, staff, and students have been able to participate in the development of these policies and their ongoing evolution.

1.1.2e Evidence that the institution has established policies and procedures for grievances related to harassment and discrimination.

1.1.2f Evidence that the institution has established policies for academic integrity (e.g., cheating, plagiarism).

1.1.2g Evidence that the program has a plan to maintain or increase the diversity of faculty, staff, and students when compared with the diversity of the institution. If appropriate the program should also provide evidence that this plan has been developed with input from faculty and students or that it is otherwise addressed in its long-range planning efforts.
1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity

1.1.2a Policies related to learning culture (including the Studio Culture Policy)

The following selected sampling of learning culture policies are accessible on the department’s web page under “Resources” (copies of these policies will be available in the team room). The URLs (accessed August 10, 2010) are:

Administration
http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/administration/index.html

Current Students
http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/current/index.html

Advising
http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/current/advising.html

A list of these learning culture policies include:

Department Policies:
- Studio Use Policy (Approved 05/15/09)
  - The Architecture Faculty has approved these guidelines to help ensure the safety, security, and integrity of our facilities. They are intended to foster a culture of respect for our rooms and buildings, which is especially important now that our labs have been refurbished.
- Computer Policy (Approved 07/23/04)
  - This policy describes the department’s responsibilities to provide computers, software, peripherals, and technical support through a variety of funding sources, as well as the students’ responsibilities towards this equipment.
- Grading Policy (Approved 11/12/04)
  - This policy describes the grading policy that the University, the CAED, and the Department have set in place that every student receives a grade for every course every quarter.
- Studio Enrollment Policy (Revised 08/18/06)
  - This policy pertains to the student to faculty ratio in the design studios and the overall operational strategies to secure the greatest student experiences.
- 4th Year Portfolio Requirements (Approved 05/18/09)
  - This policy describes the department’s portfolio policy that requires all students to collect work representing their progress toward the B. Arch.
- 4th Year Off-Campus Application Process (Updated yearly)
  - This process describes the steps students need to take if they wish to attend an off-campus Independent Study for 4th Year Design Policy (Approved 06/12/08)
  - This policy describes the eligibility and application requirements to enroll in an independent 4th year design studio.
- Advising Policy (Approved 10/01/05)
  - This policy describes the outreach program to inform and advise students
- Minor Policy (Updated 07/30/09)
  - This policy describes the process for architecture students to enroll in the Construction Management Minor
- Time Conflict Request Policy (Updated 02/25/09)
  - This policy highlights the University policy on time-conflicts requests
- Student Resources and Policies web page (Updated regularly)
  - This web page highlights the major University, CAED, Department, Student Organizations, and Professional Organizations and miscellaneous web pages

University Policies:
- Diversity Learning Objectives
  - All students who complete an undergraduate or graduate program at Cal Poly should be able to make reasoned decisions based on a respect and appreciation for diversity as defined in the Cal Poly Statement on Diversity (see http://diversity.calpoly.edu/policies/dloes.html).

1.1.2b Evidence that faculty, students, and staff have access to these policies and understand the purposes for which they were established
The College has held quarterly long range planning workshops encouraging active College participation of alumni, faculty, staff and students. The Department Heads are invited to participate on the Dean’s Leadership Council, which meets bi-annually. Department Heads form policy and develop procedures at bi-weekly Department Head meetings. The Department has held faculty retreats at the beginning and at the end of the school year; disseminated policy information through a variety of venues that include email attachments and hardcopies in mailboxes. The tenured faculty body, faculty curriculum committee and instructional area faculty meet bi-weekly. Staff attends the general faculty meetings and curriculum committee meetings as resource persons. The Staff meet regularly with the Department Head and Associate Heads.

In 2009, the Faculty established an ad-hoc committee on governance with the goal to offer more clarity and transparency in how the department engages in shared governance, and to review policies and working rules and to develop a constitution. The process has been delayed due to this past year’s mandated furloughs and the need to focus on budget concerns. This document will secure the rules and procedures of the department and define the various levels of inclusion of students, faculty, staff, and the administration (Shared Governance document available in the team room).

Draft department policies are routed through the department’s Administrative Support Coordinator for review and input relative to campus policy and staff perspective.

See Section 1.1.2a for links to access department polices on the Architecture web site.

1.1.2c Evidence of plans for implementation of learning culture policies with measurable assessment of their effectiveness.

Lecturer Kent Macdonald and Prof. Robert Arens worked with the AIAS students during the 2009-2010 to develop a final draft of Learning Culture Policy. This policy has not been distributed to the general student body yet or reviewed by the faculty by the end of 2010 school year. Fall 2010 this policy will be reviewed by the faculty and sent around to all students for approval (copy of draft of policy is in Team Room documentation).

1.1.2d Evidence that faculty, staff, and students have been able to participate in the development of these policies and their ongoing evolution.

Initiative proposals are developed within the appropriate committee structures where the chair of the committee leads the charge to develop and/or modify existing policies with all committee members. Faculty input is requested when the initiative has been formalized.

There are several mechanisms for student input. The first is The College Based Fees Committee (CBF), which plays a major role in providing student input in voting to decide how to allocate funding for programs. All year levels are represented on the CBF through annual elections. The second is that Architecture students as club presidents also play an active role on the CAED Student Council. The Head and Associate Head have periodically scheduled Open Student Forums and year level student meetings.

Due to the state’s reduction of funding for higher education, the academic year 2009-10 was an important milestone in discussing the relationship between budgetary implications and the need to adjust aspects of the curriculum. Faculty met frequently to participate in intensive discussions regarding initiatives in response to this situation. As early as Fall 2008, the Department Head held several emergency meetings to discuss how one could respond proactively to the current budget cuts with an eye on implementing curricular initiatives over the next years. A five-year enrollment plan to find a balance between incoming freshmen, transfer students, and change of major was presented to faculty. (Memoranda: 10/07/08; 06/19/09; and 11/16/09 are available in the Team Room). One result was an increase in the quarterly offerings for professional studios, co-ops, and off-campus experiences.

1.1.2e Evidence that the institution has established policies and procedures for grievances related to harassment and discrimination.

In 2005, Executive Order 927 replaced Executive Order 345, by broadening the scope of what was once the CSU’s sexual harassment policy to one that prohibits unlawful harassment based on any statutory category protected by the Fair Employment and Housing Act. In addition, to comply with California law (AB 1825), the California State University registers all members of the academic community who hold supervisory roles to complete on a yearly basis an on-line course on sexual harassment. Cal Poly Department of Academic
Personnel web page features all information related to Sexual Harassment Prevention and Non-Discrimination Policies, Procedures and Action Guidelines:  
http://www.employequity.calpoly.edu/sexual_harassment_prevention.html and  

Cal Poly has records of providing sexual harassment prevention training to campus advisors as far back as 1986. AB1825 created a December 31, 2005 Sexual Harassment Prevention (SHP) Training deadline for all supervisors in the CSU. December 31, 2005 was the first year that Cal Poly offered online Sexual Harassment Prevention (SHP) through WorkPlace Answers. The statute requires that employees take the training every two years. Major trainings occurred in December 2007 and December 2009. The FEHA definition of supervisor is broadly applied at Cal Poly. In addition to those individuals who have stated supervisory duties in their job descriptions, we consider anyone who "assigns" work to be a supervisor. Therefore, staff and faculty that utilize student graders, lab assistants or student assistants fall under the definition of "supervisor" at Cal Poly. Over 1,500 of the 2,500 employees at Cal Poly take the Sexual Harassment Prevention Training.

1.1.2f Evidence that the institution has established policies for academic integrity (e.g., cheating, plagiarism)

The Institution has a “no-tolerance” academic cheating or plagiarism policy. All faculty and students are encouraged to review the formal policy on cheating and plagiarism (including definitions, sanctions, and appeal procedures) found in the Campus Administrative Manual, Section 684. This policy is also detailed in the Cal Poly catalog and can be found on Cal Poly’s web at http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/academicpolicies/Cheating.htm (accessed August 10, 2010)).

1.1.2g Evidence that the program has a plan to maintain or increase the diversity of faculty, staff, and students when compared with the diversity of the institution. If appropriate the program should also provide evidence that this plan has been developed with input from faculty and students or that it is otherwise addressed in its long-range planning efforts.

See Part 1, Section 1.1.4 Long Range Planning for additional information. The following provides an outline of the program's activities to address the diversity of faculty, staff and students in the department.

Diversity of faculty: With the increase in the number of retiring faculty, it is the department's objective to creatively resolve the imbalance in faculty diversity and to improve the opportunities for equity in the workplace. This responsibility is part of the CAED’s leadership role in having a College representative of the diversity of California’s population. The department is committed to seek all available opportunities to engage the architecture profession with a diverse and equitable workforce. (For additional information, see Part 1, Section 1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resources Development)

As a result, yearly part-time faculty recruitments attract a diverse group of qualified faculty members. During 2005-10 five new faculty members increased the department's diversity. Increased outreach efforts are regularly conducted, and during the last completed tenure-track search (2007-08), the department received 74 applications including approximately 28 candidates of diverse background. Three offers, out of five available positions, were extended to women candidates. Unfortunately, none of the three chose to accept the offer. Major stumbling blocks to recruitment include remoteness from urban centers, limited opportunities for trailing spouses, and a fixed CFA pay scale. The Architecture Department’s student body is roughly 50/50 male/female and we are committed to attracting candidates to make our faculty diversity more reflective of this.

Since the last accreditation, three female faculty members were elevated to the status of part-time 12.12 entitlement (faculty who have been employed during the prior academic year and possessing six or more years of prior consecutive service on campus). As well, one female faculty member and one African-American faculty member of were promoted to the rank of Full-Professor. Every effort in the next tenure-track search will seek to appoint faculty of diverse backgrounds with the intent to find a necessary balance in our faculty.

The department continues to strive for diversity parity in appointing part-time/full-time lecturers, external examiners, guest speakers and guest critics. Between 2005-10, five out of eleven part-time/full-time lecturers were women.
Diversity of Staff: Staff hiring follows the University hiring policies, ensuring equity in hiring. All hiring committees include an Employment Equity Facilitator, who ensures that the committee adheres that equal employment opportunity (EEO) practices are followed.

Diversity of students: Cal Poly students’ success placed the university among the Top 10 of the "Top 100 Degree Producers 2009" rankings compiled by the magazine Diverse Issues in Higher Education. In the organization’s 2009 national rankings, the Architecture Department was: No. 5 in architecture degrees to students of all minority groups; No. 5 in architecture degrees to Asian American students; and No. 5 in architecture degrees to Hispanic students. Student recruitment takes place at the University level. However, the department, in concert with the CAED and Cal Poly’s Admissions and Recruitment’s office, continues to strategize to implement outreach efforts to include a more diverse student body, improve the pool of applicants and cultivate out-of-state applicants. Freshmen selection criteria are available at the University’s Admissions site (http://www.ess.calpoly.edu/admiss/, accessed 8/10/10) The department developed a content-rich web page for Prospective Students (http://arch.calpoly.edu/prospective/index.html, accessed 8/10/10) and has included on its Student Resources and Policies web page a link to the AIA Diversity and Inclusion Program and Initiatives, as well as the AIAS Studio Culture Initiative-Resources (http://arch.calpoly.edu/current/student-resources-and-policies.html, accessed 8/10/10). The Department is committed to diversity enhancement of underrepresented students in our profession. To this effect, Fall 2010, the Department is committing to support the University’s recruitment efforts of two out-of-state minority students through enhancing Cal Poly’s commitment to them (Fall 2010: 2 students/$2,000 per year for 5 years).

Students of diverse backgrounds hold leadership roles in Architecture Department Students Clubs. During the 2009-10 academic year three women held the role of President, Vice President, and Secretary in Alpha Rho Chi; one woman held the presidency of AIAS (this year two women, one of Hispanic background, will hold the positions of vice president and secretary); the entire board of directors of The Construction Specifications Institute Student Club (CSI) –a professional organization comprised of a cross-section of architects, contractors, engineers, material specifiers and suppliers, etc and are architecture women students (one of Hispanic origin and the four others of Asian background). This group of students demonstrates the awareness of the importance of diversity in the profession, and confirms their abilities in countering societal impediments to diversity equity in the profession, from registration and licensing, to practice and holding leadership roles.

An intensive 4-week in-residence Summer High School workshop, designed for high school students considering architecture as a career, attracts annually a diverse student body. A scholarship program was established in 2008 that focuses on minority students. The recipients are selected through the Dean’s Leadership Council (2008: 4 were given; 2009: 6 were given; and 2010: 5 were given, of which one was sponsored by the Department based on financial need).

University Diversity Programs

In order to achieve equality and diversity the Department, College, and University have established a range of strategic and specific plans and programs.

Cal Poly Cultural Pluralism Curriculum Requirement:
In December 1992, a university-wide curriculum requirement was adopted concerning Cultural Pluralism, starting with the 1994-96 catalog cycle. Courses must meet the following criteria:

- Emphasis on one or more of these four U.S. Cultures: Asian American, African American, Hispanic American, American Indian;
- Attention to general issues of gender, diversity, equity, ethnocentricity, and ethnicity; and the relationships to problems facing contemporary society, especially those resulting from racism, discrimination and cultural conflict;
- Application of rigorous pedagogical, scholarly methods and standards as evidenced in substantive exams, reports, papers, and projects;
- Attention to critical thinking skills which will allow students to address cultural, racial, and gender issues in a sensitive and responsible manner and to evaluate their own attitudes and those of different attitudes.

Cal Poly Ethnic Studies Program:
Ethnic Studies at Cal Poly uses inter- and multidisciplinary approaches to study the lives of Indigenous, African, Latino/a, and Asian peoples in the United States within a global and post colonial context, and encourages critical dialogue about race, ethnicity, postcoloniality, and transnationalism across the entire
university curriculum, with special focus on concepts that integrate the arts, humanities, social sciences, as well as the sciences and technology.

Between 2005-10, Architecture Professor Michael Lucas offered a number of courses: ARCH X370 which was later changed to ARCH 326, titled “Native American Architecture and Place”, is cross listed under Ethnic Studies Department and was taught in the Winter quarters of 2004-2009; ARCH 316 California Architecture and the California Dream; and ARCH 401 Toward a Barrier-Free Environment; Professors Chris Yip and Don Choi each year teach ARCH 320, Topics In Architectural History, and ARCH 420, Seminar in Architectural History, Theory and Criticism. Both focus on Asian Architectural and Urban History.

Student Organizations:
Latinos for Academic Design Advancement is an student organization designed to guide Latino students through their academic careers within the College of Architecture and Environmental design community. Architecture faculty member, Barry Williams, is the advisor for this organization.

Cal Poly Student Academic Services:
Through Student Academic Services, eligible students can utilize a network of academic services, advisors and activities, as well as referrals to additional campus resources. The goal of this department is to ensure academic success and graduation for students from backgrounds that have traditionally been underrepresented within the California State University. Student Academic Services incorporates the offices of the Educational Opportunity Program (low income), Disabled Student Services, Student Support Services (low income, first generation grads), Summer Institute; as well as many others.

Student Academic Services is a comprehensive program of transition and retention services that are all designed to support academic excellence at Cal Poly. Once accepted to the university, eligible students may attend new student academic orientations for assistance with registration and academic advisement, as well as seminars with academic deans, financial aid, housing and other university offices. Architecture faculty participate in these activities each Fall.

The Summer Institute provides a transitional college environment for a group of selected students to preview or review key academic coursework prior to the first quarter of enrollment. Nine Architecture students will be participating during the Summer 2010 Summer Institute.

Students with permanent or temporary disabilities are eligible to receive support services through the Disability Resource Center following an intake interview and necessary verification.

The Learning Center assists students in learning how to develop and maintain the basic skills necessary for effective study toward academic success.

Additionally, Student Academic Services is useful as a referral center for students’ academic, financial, and personal questions and concerns. As of 2009, Sarah Clark, Student Academic Services (SAS) advisor for Educational Opportunity Program students from the College of Architecture and Environmental Design, provides daily office hours at the Academic Skills Center. Previously, Trish Stewart was the SAS advisor for CAED and provided office hours in the Architecture advising office. Students are counseled in the achievement of academic excellence, provided assistance with class scheduling, academic, learning and study skills, graduation planning, career clarification and related personal advising. Study Skills Seminars, supplemental instruction workshops that focus upon first-year science and math courses, as well as small group study assistance, are also available through Student Academic Services.

All of the above services are offered in addition to those of the Architecture Faculty Advising Center.

Additional university information can be found at Cal Poly’s quarterly Registration Monitor (http://www.ipa.calpoly.edu/publications_reports/reg_mon/, accessed 8/10/10) as well as the most recent Poly View (http://www.ipa.calpoly.edu/publications_reports/polyview/, accessed 8/10/10, Admissions Info Brief (http://www.ipa.calpoly.edu/publications_reports/infobrief/ib09adfl.pdf) and Enrollment Info Brief for Fall 2009 (http://www.ess.calpoly.edu/_admiss/Pdf/Profile10_51910.pdf, accessed 8/10/10)
1.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives

1.1.3a A narrative description of the program’s response to each of the five perspectives.

1.1.3b A narrative description of the opportunities for student learning and development within the accredited degree program that are responsive to the five perspectives.

1.1.3c A cross-reference to the five perspectives and the role they play in long-term planning (see Part One, Section 1.1.4 Long-Range Planning) and self-assessment (see Part one, Section 1.1.5 Self Assessment Procedures).
1.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives:

1.1.3a A narrative description of the program’s response to each of the five perspectives.

1.1.3b A narrative description of the opportunities for student learning and development within the accredited degree program that are responsive to the five perspectives.

Program Responses to the NAAB Perspectives

The Architecture Department at Cal Poly addresses the needs of its five key constituencies - educators, students, alumni, registration boards, practicing professionals and the public - by way of a selected sampling of activities which include: interdisciplinary faculty and student collaborations, student club and committee initiatives, alumni outreach and internships, practitioner shadowships (called “Blind Dates”, where students during spring break assist offices in accomplishing a range of tasks over a one week period of time) and hands-on community projects.

A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community (Institutional Context)

Department Activities

The intellectual activities of the department are ours to share. Increased faculty scholarship in the four areas defined by the 1990 Boyer Report continues to have a direct impact on students, faculty colleagues, and professionals. To showcase these efforts and to increase the national and international prominence of these activities, in 2007 the department initiated the publication of a number of booklets around faculty scholarship and student work. Subsequent interest justified establishing a Publication Committee (faculty members and students) to coordinate, design, and publish books representing student and faculty work. In 2008, the Architectural and Environmental Design Press (AeDPress) was established. Under AeDPress, twenty-three publications on the work of students, design studios, shows, Hearst Lecture series symposium, commemorative milestones (i.e., five years of the Vellum design furniture competition), and faculty scholarship have been published since its inception. Faculty leadership has created a momentum and the Department anticipates additional new and interesting publications to come out of AeDPress. Other publications outside this parameter include the Department Alumni Newsletter and the thesis pamphlet.

Academic and Professional Standards

The Cal Poly Architecture program receives the benefits and accepts the responsibilities of a setting within a college rooted in a polytechnic tradition, a large university community, and being part of a larger state system of institutions. Cal Poly is part of a 23-campus California State University (CSU) system with the state identified goal of providing predominantly undergraduate education. This differs from the University of California system of educational institutions, which the state has identified as predominantly doctoral/research-based settings, and which are funded at a higher level per pupil than the CSU schools. Cal Poly is under authority of the State of California and Trustees of the CSU, which impose certain academic and professional standards, general education content and organizational and accounting structures. Cal Poly is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and responsible to their standards and criteria. The University is home to a large number of professional programs such as engineering disciplines, which also undergo rigorous professional accreditation.

Academic standards for faculty are largely contained within documents generated by the department with reference to overarching state, CSU, faculty union, and college criteria and are included in the team room documentation. Professional standards are maintained through retention, promotion and tenure processes, as determined by the department with similar overarching connectional documents. Faculty that are members of the AIA and have professional licenses are under AIA continuing education requirements, in addition to the requirements for their state or other jurisdiction of licensure.
Academic standards for students are set by the University, Architecture Department and faculty through coherent course learning objectives, progress to degree monitoring and advising, major, and college minimums, and the sequence of courses in the curriculum.

Interaction between the program and other programs in the institution

The program is centered within the Cal Poly San Luis Obispo campus, gaining advantages of broad General Education opportunities from the assets of a wide variety of other academic departments based in a 19,325 student enrollment campus, and particularly from within the College of Liberal Arts and College of Science and Mathematics. Cal Poly’s Academic Senate has interpreted mandated State of California content into a 72 unit General Education template that exposes the student to critical areas outside of the architectural studies core topics.

The Making Excellence Inclusive initiative is designed to help colleges and universities fully integrate their diversity and educational quality efforts and embed them into the core of academic mission and institutional functioning.

While the academic setting is largely geographically confined to San Luis Obispo, opportunities for study in alternative contexts are offered an extensive series of off campus programs in year four of the curriculum, with full lab sections of students studying in highly structured programs in Florence and Rome Italy; Copenhagen, Denmark (DIS); Alexandria, Virginia; and San Francisco. Smaller group studies in Paris, Germany, India, and Australia are also available. There are also options for students to participate in Professional Studios and have a choice of 6 firms in the mainly the Southern California area of the state along with options for participating in interdisciplinary design studios on campus. These opportunities are supplemented by individual labs with focus in regional areas, which have included urban San Francisco, Los Angeles, New York City, Phoenix, Seattle, San Diego, Las Vegas, etc, as well as several of California’s unique smaller towns in rural or agricultural settings. Several architectural labs offer a community based service focus, which focuses on immediate area needs.

In Poly Canyon, almost sixteen acres were set-aside for the CAED in 1963 for the purpose of allowing students to design and build experimental structures, often through collaboration between students from several departments. The land and structures are managed and maintained by the Dean’s office. Although, there has not been permanent building activity in the canyon since the last accreditation visit, due to changing fiscal context at the school, several Architectural Engineering students have successfully executed small thesis, non-habitable structural projects there. The canyon remains the location for the annual Design Village event (http://designvillage.calpoly.edu/, accessed 8/10/10), an open invitation design-build competition run by a CAED student club during during the Cal Poly’s Open House. This event currently attracts about forty teams and over 200 participants for the three day transport-erect-inhabit-take down cycle. In 2010, Cal Poly Beginning Design student teams (interdisciplinary Architecture and Architectural Engineering) participated. Interest in participating in Design Village has grown dramatically around the southwest region, despite the overall economy.

Additionally, community-based projects permeate the program, and often student designed or student inspired projects are constructed on campus within the department and college, in addition to the immediate San Luis Obispo City and County area. A number of upcoming senior projects will use Poly Canyon as a laboratory for their thesis.

Beyond the required core curriculum, faculty/student relationships offer flexible opportunities through experimental and independent study classes. The diversity of career opportunities are openly discussed and nurtured, though the primary career choice of our graduates is the traditional architecture licensure/professional track.

The Architecture Department at Cal Poly is one of five departments in the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. The other departments are Architectural Engineering, Construction Management, Landscape Architecture, and City and Regional Planning. All of these programs are currently accredited. The inter-relationship of these departments as well as the College’s close working relationship with the other six- academic colleges of the University is a critical element of the program’s success.
The inter-disciplinary relationships parallel the profession, and provides the framework for a life-long respect for and relationship with our allied professions, emphasizing and demonstrating the needs of partnering, and understanding the expanded horizons available to professionals working together. Inter-collegiate opportunities cater to the holistic overview needed and desired by students of architecture, and include the opportunity for minoring in some areas.

Cal Poly's "hands on" approach to study is clearly demonstrated in the Architecture program. The rigorous path to a degree in architecture couples the normal marathon design effort with the added emphasis of practice courses in four of the five years, traditional and computer graphic skills in design and other contract document services, and two years of intensive structural design courses. The Environmental Control System series, along with the practice courses combine both lecture and activity components, effectively integrating the building sciences into the architectural design laboratory projects.

The following are some examples where our program effectively interacted over the past several years with other programs within the College and University:

(i) Faculty “affinity groups” that cross over departmental lines include:

- Architecture Department faculty within the Sustainable Environments Emphasis Group (SEEG) – Over the past several years, Professors Panetta, Arens, Macdonald, Peters, McDonald, and Stannard have successfully enlisted faculty in the Landscape Architecture, Bio-Resource and Ag Engineering, Civil and Environmental Engineering and Natural Resource Management Departments to participate in this group. Several of these efforts received grants from the University Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and the newly established Planning, Design and Construction Institute (PDCI).

(ii) The following are examples of cross-disciplinary “consultancies”:

- Activities in Sustainability Studies (Collaborations within the College of Architecture and Environmental Design). The EDES 406 (Sustainable Environment), EDES 408 (Implementing Sustainable Principles and EDES 410 (Advanced Implementation of Sustainable Principles) courses listed below are team taught with faculty from Landscape Architecture and City Regional Planning.

- EDES 406 (Professor Reich co-teaching with other faculty from within and outside of the College): This course introduces, illustrates and analyzes concepts and principles of sustainability for use in environmental design and policy at various scales. New approaches to the integration of knowledge of human and natural ecosystems with environmental, social and economic concerns are presented. This course provides a global-to-local perspective of the interrelatedness of sustainability issues, based upon the interaction of the natural and built environments. Enrollments in this course are typically comprised of Architecture, City and Regional Planning, Landscape Architecture, Environmental Engineering, Environmental Horticultural Science and Liberal Arts majors.

- EDES 408 (Professor Reich co-teaching with other faculty from within and outside of the College): This course is primarily project-based and is intended to aid students who wish to collaborate with the purpose of implementing sustainability principles by developing tools, process or designs for community-based projects and proposals (at various scales of planning, architecture and design of the human environment to address social, environmental and economic issues). Enrollments in this course are typically comprised of Architecture, City and Regional Planning, Landscape Architecture, Environmental Engineering, Environmental Horticultural Science and Liberal Arts Majors.

- EDES 410 (Professor Reich co-teaching with other faculty from within and outside of the College): This course is an advanced continuation of community-based projects defined and initiated in EDES 408. Ongoing projects, individual and group, address variable scales of planning, architecture, and environmental design, with required completion at the end of the course.

Activities with the Ethnic Studies Department (College of Liberal Arts):
See Part One, Section 1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity - Ethic Studies Program
Two new interdisciplinary design studios were launched over the past years. See Part One, Section 1.1.4 Long Range Planning – Goal A: Advance Opportunities for Interdisciplinary Activity

Contributions of the students, faculty and administrators to the governance as well as the intellectual and social life of the institution.

The Architecture Department comprises approximately half of the College’s student enrollment. The Head of the Architecture Department sits on the Dean's Department Heads Committee, Instructional Faculty Department Head Committee and the College's Advisory Council. The Dean's Department Heads Committee develops College policy and promotes interdepartmental coordination on budgetary, curriculum and personnel matters.

Over the past five years the Architecture Department has participated on a number of University and College-wide committees. At the University level the Architecture Department was represented on the Faculty Senate, Substance Abuse Advisory Committee, Global Affairs Council, Budget Committee, Research Committee, Branding Committee, Intellectual Property Committee, Coordinating Committee on AIDS/HIV (CCAH), Curriculum Committee, International Education Programs Committee, Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing, Graduate Programs Committee, Campus Planning Committee, Commencement Committee, Library Committee, Long Range Planning Committee, Affirmative Action Faculty Development Grants Committee, Registration and Scheduling Committee, Status of Women Committee, Calendar-Curriculum Committee, Commencement Speaker Screening Committee, Provost Search and Screen Committee, Dean of Liberal Arts Search and Screen Committee, Arts Program Board, College of Business Graduate Committee, General Education Governance Committee and Area A and C Subcommittee, Cultural Pluralism Requirement Subcommittee, Performance Salary Step Increase (PSSI) Committee, and the Foundation Board of Directors.

At the College level, the Architecture Department has been represented on the CAED Curriculum Committee, Professional Development and Leaves Committee, Peer Review Committee, Instructional Technology Committee, Graduate Programs Committee, Scholarship and Awards Committee, Multimedia Committee, Presentation and Exhibition Committee, Facilities and Equipment Committee, Off-Campus Programs Committee, Common Foundation Course Task Force and Employment Equity/Affirmative Action Facilitators Committee.

The following faculty have participated as advisors or have represented the department to ACSA:
- Brian Kelly, Robert Arens, Advisor for AIAS
- Robert Arens, Doug Jackson, ACSA Faculty councilor
- Tom di Santo, Advisor for Alpha Rho Chi

B. Architectural Education and Students (Student Leadership/Initiative/Diversity)

The program provides support and encouragement for students to assume leadership throughout life in many ways. Individual responsibility starts with an incoming student declaring architecture as their major, a Cal Poly requirement for entrance, and with guidance, allowing students to create their own schedules for the duration of the time in the program. The professional and other elective options gives students either finely honed, or multi faceted areas of study and discovery. Inter-departmental, courses and collective projects offer further opportunities for teamwork and leadership roles. EDES 101, a requirement for all CAED students, is an introduction to the professional fields of architecture, landscape architecture, structural engineering, construction, and city planning, a preface to the college's programs as they relate to individual aptitudes. Students are encouraged to participate in a multitude of activities. Student clubs include the American Institute of Architect Students (AIAS), Alpha Rho Chi, CAED Student Council, the Renewable Energy Club, Construction Specification Institute (CSI), and roughly four hundred university-wide clubs with emphases in as many areas. The Architecture Department student body has been recognized as having the highest number of Hispanic students of any NAAB Accredited program.

Off-campus programs offer students direct experience in varied professional and cultural settings. Students may apply to domestic programs, such as the one-quarter San Francisco Urban Studies Internship, or a full academic year at the Washington/Alexandria Consortium, a program with Virginia Tech that this year is celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Architecture Department’s involvement. Study abroad programs include the CSU International Programs with one academic year study in Denmark or Florence. Summer
and one quarter programs are also available in London and at the Fontainebleau. Exchange programs are increasing, and students now have opportunities in France, and Australia, and Germany.

In 2010 two new exchange programs were established: the Bauhaus in Dessau, Germany; and the Centre for Environmental Planning and Technology (CEPT) in Ahmadabad, India. Additional exchange programs are under consideration with the following institutions: Accademia di Architettura in Mendrisio (Switzerland); HIT, University of Applied Sciences in Stuttgart (Germany); Nanjing University of Technology (China); Universidad de Buenos Aires (Argentina); and Universität für Angewandte Kunst in Vienna (Austria); Additional exchange programs have been established through Cal Poly’s International Exchange Program (IEP). For example, in 2010 two students from Stuttgart will join our campus for two quarters, and the National Student Exchange (NSE) will bring two students from Iowa State University for one quarter.

As part of the larger effort to create robust opportunities for students who elect to not leave the region or state, in 2005 the department launched the Professional Studios Program (fourth year design studio plus a paid co-op experience). This has expanded to include six regional offices per year. In addition, the San Francisco Urban Design Internship Program (lead by faculty member Prof. Sandy Miller) continues to offer students an opportunity to live, study and work in a major urban environment. In an effort for students to gather critical information that will help shape their careers, the department promotes a range of co-operative programs and internship opportunities where students travel nationally and internationally for their work terms, which exposes them to cultural diversity (i.e., Arene Quinze, Kortrijk, Belgium; Coop Himmel(L)AU, Vienna; Luxigon, Paris; and HOK, Hong Kong (SAR)). Often these opportunities lead to an extended offer after graduation.

While the department does not require students to study in a cooperative setting, recent curricular discussions are moving towards the integration of such professional experiences within the department’s offerings. Students continue to consult the information resources provided by the University Career Services, which organizes quarterly on-campus job fairs. Each quarter, Cal Poly’s Career Services Department sponsors a job fair that allows firms to interview perspective students for summer employment or for permanent positions. The popularity of job fair has grown over the years, and therefore more architecture firms desire to participate in this event than there is room to accommodate them.(the 2009 CAED Job Fair was temporary suspended due to low firm attendance). The department has a web page that informs students about the content of the Professional Studio Experience and Co-Operative experiences, how to apply, course submittals, and the manner of the work being carried out during the work term, and is developing an information system regarding leading and emerging design practices. Students often recommend employers, or others they have met during their co-op experience, as guest critics, lecturers or invited instructors to the department. All of this promotes student leadership roles. Faculty and University support remain focused on appropriate behavior in finding and maintaining employment throughout their tenure at Cal Poly.

The exchange program offers the added opportunity of enriching the lives of our students who cannot travel, through the academic and social relationship with foreign students on our campus. Additionally, our students have, in the last few years studied in Austria, Mexico, Japan, Switzerland, and Thailand.

Students’ diversity of thought and the creative process is nurtured, in one way, by the large number of choices offered in the design lab sequence. Advantages of the three quarter system allow students from first through fourth year three faculty choices among many in any given year, offering an extensive array of design experiences. In addition, the urgency of needing to accomplish tasks in short periods of time, emulates the frenetic nature of practice in the studio setting. However, in an effort to enable faculty to direct their research within the design studio context, a number of two-quarter long pilot programs were initiated this past year, enabling more robust content and integration of research agendas to conclude with stronger learning outcomes (i.e., the integration of the design studio with the practice and ECS courses in third year, taught by two design faculty members). In addition, and for the purpose of a more seamless integration of the history/theory/criticism lecture courses within the design context, history faculty continue to be asked to teach design studio. With the recent hires, the studio offerings have better integrated design studios with support and elective classes. In the fifth year, students are given choices of professor/topic for the extended 3-quarter effort required of the seminal design adventure. For students to make an informed choice about potential faculty instructors, the department publishes on the Web the respective course content for each class, an overview of the faculty members who will be teaching during the coming academic year, and their teaching philosophy and course activities.

Cal Poly requires from each undergraduate student a capstone experience in the form of a senior project, which integrates theory and application from across the student’s undergraduate educational experiences.
Over three consecutive quarters, students define every major aspect of their work, seek outside accomplished advisors in their field of research, within the framework established by the thesis faculty and the University (2009-2011 Cal Poly Catalog, pp.48-49). Over the years, students have demonstrated, through their projects, a high level of maturity and currency in the topics and the questions being asked. Noteworthy are the diversity of projects that tackle social and community topics (refer to the four thesis books, available in the Media Resource Center). In 2008, a pilot program introduced a 1+2 quarter-long thesis where the Fall quarter was dedicated to a more comprehensive project (Profs. Chuck Crotser, Barry Williams, and Kent Macdonald (see Team Room documentation for AeDPress publications list)).

While maintaining quality of content and instruction, the department aims to be responsive to student wishes regarding learning and adjustments in the implementation of the curriculum. During the academic year 2009-10, third year faculty held several town hall meetings to engage students on important issues such as improving registration and offering a pilot two-quarter design studio where ECS and the practice activity courses were integrated with the design studio projects (typically the content of the activity courses constitute separate exercises). The results of this two-quarter studio were successful, and a number of faculty will again offer the experience this year, fine tuning the learning objectives and students outcomes.

Students were directly involved in the preparation for this NAAB visit; from assisting in the development of the student work database, to the collection of information, to assisting with how this information needs to be displayed in the team room.

Students continue to be called upon to produce innovative solutions that enable them collaboratively to address the challenges and needs for a more sustainable environment. In a globalized working environment, the department encourages informed, considered, self-directed thought and action in all aspects of our students' lives. Through course work, workshops, lectures, guest critics, and faculty research, students are prepared to resolve problems locally (i.e., Prof. Margarida Yin's community activism projects), and globally with an emphasis on emerging countries (i.e., recent thesis projects in Africa).

In recent years the department has been successful in increasing its scholarships adding 18 new ones: George Agron Memorial; Emily N. Alstot Memorial; Darden Architects; Mackey Deasy Memorial; Henri and Tracee de Hahn Second and Third year Award; R. L. Graves Jr. Larry Loh Architecture Design Excellence; Thomas Maple; Mazzetti Architects; Morris Poinidexter Memorial; Michael Shannon; Vern Swansen Memorial; Don Tanklage; Vellum Design Competition; and J.R. Whisenant). Additional funds from the Anonymous Donor are dispersed per faculty and department recommendations.

C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment

Demonstration that students have a sound preparation for transition to internship and licensure is supported by several items:

The first is the department's consistent high ranking by Design Intelligence (published by the Design Futures Council, a Washington, D.C.-based think tank dealing with architecture, engineering and building technology). (See Program Recognition in Part One, Section 1.1.1 History and Mission.)

The second item is that graduates matched the US Architectural Registration Examination pass rates in many of the categories (see Part Two, Section 2.4.4 ARE Pass Rates). The Department's commitment to high standards for all courses, the recognition that architecture is the marriage of art and technology, and the position of the Department within the College are all keys for the success of our graduates. It should also be noted that the overwhelming majority of students will have had two summer internships and/or part time work experience while in school prior to graduation.

% alumni licensed

There are no accurate records kept to determine how many of our graduates are licensed. In comparing 2009 pass rates of Cal Poly graduates to 2004 pass rates (out of the nine sections that can be compared to '04), four areas had higher percentage rates for passing, and one area remained the same.

% alumni placement (employers and graduate programs)

According to the most recent Cal Poly Graduate Status Report (http://www.careerservices.calpoly.edu/students/career_planning/gsr.htm, accessed 8/10/10) of April 2009 (for 2007-2008 graduates), 65 graduates report holding a full-time employment (37%), 3 holding a part-time employment (1.7%), 7 that they were attending graduate school (3.9%), one
who was seeking employment (0.56%), and one who was not seeking employment (0.56%). Out of 176 surveys sent out, 99 (56%) graduates did not respond. A recent sampling of students having attended graduate school over the past five years shows that they attended Carnegie Mellon University, Columbia University (GSAAP), Cornell, Harvard University (GSD), Princeton, Virginia Tech, University of British Columbia, University of Idaho, University of Pennsylvania, University of Texas at Austin, The Architectural Association and The Bartlett School of Architecture in London, and Woodbury University.

This same report indicates that students who are employed tend to migrate towards the following cities: CA (Bakersfield, Camarillo, Culver City, Fresno, Irvine, Glendale, Los Angeles, Moorpark, Orange County, Palo Alto, San Diego, San Leandro, San Luis Obispo, Sacramento, San Jose, San Pedro, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, Santa Maria, Santa Cruz, Sausalito, Walnut Creek; CT (Windsor); DC (Washington); MA (Boston); NY (New York City); OR (Portland); TX (Dallas); WA (Seattle). Internationally students work in Hong Kong (SAR), and Seoul (South Korea). Once again, this report shows the impact our graduates have on the state of California. The following firms, to name a few, continue to value the polytechnic education our graduates receive: AEDAS HK; Boulder Associates; HMC Architects; HOK; IBI Group; KTGY Group; Lewis Tsurumaki Lewis, Architects; NBBJ; Perkins + Will; SOM; LPA; NTR; and WATG.

Selected Activities:

Annual Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) Meetings, organized by the Student Affiliate Chapter – Construction Documents Technology (CDT) certification for students and practitioners

Once a year there is a CSI Conference on the Cal Poly Campus. This conference will feature a product show and a variety of professional and intern development seminars. Some of the revenues generated by this conference will be earmarked as seed monies for Cal Poly's Affiliate CSI Student Chapter. A panel discussion featuring representatives from CSI, AIA, SEAOC, NSPE and SMPS discuss the opportunities available in various programs developed by professional associations for intern development, continuing education and professional certifications.

Student participation in the May 2009 AIA Convention in San Francisco, CA

In conjunction with the convention the Department celebrated its 45th anniversary and hosted an Alumni Social that drew over 270 alumni, friends, and students. All student club officers were invited and they presented an update of the activities accomplished during the past year. Second year faculty typically organize a field trip to allow all second year students to attend the convention. Additionally, many third, fourth and fifth year students also attended. Many AIAS students every year attend this annual convention (see Summer Architecture Department Newsletter – center fold).

D. Architectural Education and the Profession (Engagement in the Professional Community)

The Architecture Department at Cal Poly has multiple links to the professional community. The Department is working with the profession on a regional basis to develop mutually beneficial collaborative learning opportunities for students and practicing architects. Selected examples of this include:

• The award winning “Design Collaboratory” (NCARB Prize 2010), an interdisciplinary studio (architecture and architectural engineering) ARCH 452/452 with Prof. Jim Doerfler, Tom Fowler, Mark Cabrinha, and Ken Dong-ARCE).

• The Department also explores various forms of practice through working with communities in the design studio sequence. Some selected examples include: 2009: Salinas Chinatown Renewal Urban Design Plan; Auto Row and Lake Merritt Neighborhood Planning; Country Transition Home, Atascadero, CA; Asian Cultural Museum and Center, Salinas, CA; 2008: Chumash Museum and Healing / Educational Center, or The Medicine Turtle, Tiksmu’ P’teu’k-eu; MBI competition design of a Community Center; 2007: Dale City, School District Elementary School Study, Octavia Boulevard Zoning Analysis; 2006: New Neighborhood Planning Alternatives). Bank of America, College of Business, and CAED Community Development Initiative Grants: 2010 Broadway Village-Oakland CA (2nd Place); 2009 Rosemary Santa-Santa Maria (1st Place); 2008 Project: Vivo Towers – San Diego CA (4th Place); 2007 The Crossing at Miller & Boone; 2006 Grover Beach-Ventana del Mar, CA (Honorable Mention); and 2005 Project: River Oaks Redevelopment: Paso Robles Housing Authority (1st Place).
• Most of the part-time lecturer faculty are local practitioners who split their time between professional practice and academia. Several members of the full-time faculty including lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors and full professors also practice professionally. Guest critics from the architecture community including architects, landscape architects, and planners are frequently invited to the studio shows and formal critiques.

• Appreciation of diverse and collaborative roles for architects is made apparent in the Professional Lecture and Activity classes (ARCH 443) where internship, registration, and IDP requirements are specifically introduced and discussed during lecture and activity sessions offered in 4th and 5th year. During these classes, all aspects of professional practice are covered in detail, with emphasis on ethical questions related to the integrity of the profession. How to reconcile various conflicts becomes an essential part of this class and the overarching part of our teaching.

• Internationally-acclaimed practitioners are brought in to lecture on the nature of their practice. In 2008, the Darden Architects Professional Workshops program was established to contribute to the profession of architecture through experience sharing. Fifteen hour-long sessions covered topics such as: Construction Documents; Specifications Writing; Information Management; Project Delivery Methods and LEED AP Exam. In conjunction with these workshops, in 2009 and 2010 a full day seminar/workshop was offered with Rachel Kros (NCARB) and Haley Gipe (AIACC, IDP State Coordinator, North) presenting the new Intern Development Program (IDP) requirements.

• As of 2010, Prof. Kent Macdonald is the IDP Architecture Department Coordinator, following Profs. Curt Illingworth and Allan Cooper. Pertinent information about the IDP Program can be found on the department’s web page under IDP (see http://arch.calpoly.edu/current/documents/idp-kentmacdonald-letter.html, accessed 8/10/10). Prof. Macdonald and Department Head Henri T. de Hahn attended the 2010 Summer IDP Coordinators Conference in Chicago (08.6 - 7.10).

• Continuing education is mandatory for architects in California and in other parts the United States. It is important to the department that our students, through working alongside practicing professionals in various academic settings in the department, embrace the concept of lifelong learning.

• During the AY 2008-09, College Based Fees (CBF) (see part1, 2.4 Financial Resources for more information) funds reimbursed the LEED Practice Test fee of $400 to twenty students who had successfully completed the examination, thus giving students additional professional credentials when seeking an internship. The department prides itself that with the exception of four faculty who are eligible for registration, all other faculty are registered nationally and/or internationally.

• The Architecture Department actively seeks ways to introduce work experience to students either regionally or around the world, exposing them to an office experience with a special emphasis on leading offices in the discipline or in associated disciplines and professions. To this purpose, the Architecture Department offers a selection of diverse opportunities for students to engage in the professional community, and ensures that students move smoothly between school-based and practice-based studies in architecture. Students return after these experiences with an increased appreciation of the profession and are able to engage their peers in balancing the architect’s responsibilities to various constituencies (clients, regulatory, agencies, constructors, public, etc.) and the demands of the creative enterprise of our discipline. Most of our students who participate in internships/co-op experience have finished their 3rd year and are engaged in one of the minors offered in the CAED: Architecture Engineering (15.6%), City and Regional Planning (no data), Construction Management (18.3%), Integrated Project Delivery Minor (0%), Real Estate Development Minor (4.6%), and Sustainable Environment Minor (64.2%), thus being able to engage in more complex and integrative issues during their professional work experiences (percentages taken from the 2010 Student Survey).

• The department has identified that after 3rd year, curricular opportunities should be offered to all students interested in establishing professional credentials through internship and co-op experiences. A selected list of these programs include:

  • Founded by Prof. Sandy Miller in 1988, the AIA Award Winning San Francisco Urban Design Internship Program is an immersion program, an opportunity to live, study and work in a rich cultural and professional environment. The Program is a one-quarter innovative program offered in the Fall and Spring where students learn about urban design and community design issues. For example, in 2007 students collaborated and researched with the Western SoMa Task Force Liaison Group including a Planning Department Senior, and the developer. The students master planned a 3.3 acre
In addition to the off-campus opportunities, design and practice studios plan extensive office visit/field trips to locations in California such as San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento, Santa Barbara and the Napa Valley. Some of the notable and frequently published offices visited include, but are not limited to: Morphosis, Eric Owen Moss, Roto Architects, Shimoda Design Group, Bernard Tschumi Architects, George Ranalli Architect, Resolution: 4 Architecture, Bernard Tschumi Architects, Coates Design, Inc, LMN, Anne Fougeron Architecture, and Brian Healy Architects.

In addition to the off-campus opportunities, design and practice studios plan extensive office visit/field trips to locations in California such as San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento, Santa Barbara and the Napa Valley. Some of the notable and frequently published offices visited include, but are not limited to: Morphosis, Eric Owen Moss, Roto Architects, Shimoda Design Group, Rebecca Binder FAIA, Rob Wellington Quigley, Public, Estudio Teddy Cruz, Smith + Others, HOK, South Park Fabricators, Mark Horton, Jim Jennings, Sands Studio, Pfau Architects, SOM, and Anne Fougeron, RNT Architects. Fifth year thesis design studios travel to offices even further afield, visiting offices in cities such as Tokyo, Mexico City,
Seventh year running concurrently each quarter, the intention of hosting a third year Winter super review “Best of Two other major reviews/exhibitions were initiated during the past five years. With typically 8-10 sections (1st pamphlet of the first five years was published under AeDPress.

Wujcik, Jeff Sand, Hugo Matinez, Tricia Hamachai, and faculty and local practitioners. A retrospective becoming a place for faculty and student exchanges. Regular combined final reviews now take place in this large open space and given the central position of the (roughly 800 students) the display and critique of the work is important for the internal student culture. Gallery space, and social functions for the CAED. Given the amount of student work produced over a quarter (Fishbowl) was funded by an Irvine architectural firm, to provide a dedicated place for reviews, exhibition and social events. The Berg Gallery constitutes the central gallery of the CAED and remains heavily used by all five departments. In 2007, a combined studio (Fishbowl) was funded by an Irvine architectural firm, to provide a dedicated place for reviews, exhibition gallery space, and social functions for the CAED. Given the amount of student work produced over a quarter (roughly 800 students) the display and critique of the work is important for the internal student culture. Regular combined final reviews now take place in this large open space and given the central position of the gallery, students from other disciplines can drop by and view the projects of the CAED students, thus becoming a place for faculty and student exchanges.

Hosted by Cal Poly's College of Architecture and Environmental Design, in the Berg Gallery and/or Business Rotunda, the Hearst Lecture Series - made possible through a grant from the Hearst Foundation, is a place to bring internationally respected designers, practitioners and educators to San Luis Obispo to speak with the students and faculty. Over the past five years the following topics were addressed: 2005-06: “40 Below”; Young Design Professionals; 2006-07: “Pan Pacifica”; 2007-08: “Media and Technology”; 2008-09: “Research and practice”; and, in 2009-10: “Integrated Design Practices.” A symposium was held in Spring 2009 dedicated to the study of architecture research and its relationship to design practice. Internationally acclaimed architects, urban designers, historians and theorists met on the Cal Poly campus to discuss history and theory alongside the methodological approaches of architecture design research relevant to innovation in contemporary building design, urban theory, and technology practices. Proceedings of this event were published under AeDPress. In addition, guest speakers are invited to host a workshop the day following their lecture, extending the sharing of knowledge to a more targeted audience.

At the end of the academic year fifth year put on a fifth year show of the entire thesis projects in the Chumash Auditorium on campus. This event attracts future employers, returning alumni and the local community to view the range of projects and speak to the students about their work. The Cal Poly 5th Year Architecture Show remains the department's strongest venue for a public audience to see what students produce. Each year, a committee of thesis students along with an advisor, present their yearlong thesis in the University Chumash Auditorium. Students, parents, faculty, alumni, and the public at large gather over three days to view the work. This event complements the quarterly University Job Fairs, and it is not uncommon to see “interviews” conducted with students or business cards left on students’ models. Since 2007 a thesis pamphlet has accompanied the show (2007: Small Servings; 2008 Unleashed; 2009 Rise and Run; and in 2010 Abridged). Through the financial support of the CBF, in 2010 students were asked to submit their required end of the year thesis book to the MRC (both in hard copy and digitally), thus building up a permanent collection of thesis books showcasing the student’s learning outcome.

Overall, the department lacks sufficient exhibition and review spaces. The Berg Gallery constitutes the central gallery of the CAED and remains heavily used by all five departments. In 2007, a combined studio (Fishbowl) was funded by an Irvine architectural firm, to provide a dedicated place for reviews, exhibition gallery space, and social functions for the CAED. Given the amount of student work produced over a quarter (roughly 800 students) the display and critique of the work is important for the internal student culture. Regular combined final reviews now take place in this large open space and given the central position of the gallery, students from other disciplines can drop by and view the projects of the CAED students, thus becoming a place for faculty and student exchanges.

Launched in 2004, the yearly Fall Vellum Design Build Competition/Exhibition (sponsored by Vellum Design Build and the CAED) hosts an all school competition to design and construct furniture, lightings, and accessories. By participating in a juried design competition, students' projects consider functionality, innovation, materials, manufacturing, beauty, ergonomics and environmental impacts. Over the past two years, the top entries are featured in the Santa Barbara Design Within Reach Showroom. Past jurors have included: Ron Radziner, Larissa Sand, Hilary Nagler, Joanna Grawunder, Eric Pfeiffer, Joey Shimoda, Len Wujcik, Jeff Sand, Hugo Matinez, Tricia Hamachai, and faculty and local practitioners. A retrospective pamphlet of the first five years was published under AeDPress.

Two other major reviews/exhibitions were initiated during the past five years. With typically 8-10 sections (1st -4th year) running concurrently each quarter, the intention of hosting a third year Winter super review “Best of Show” was for faculty and guest critics a way to assess a particular design year by comparing and contrasting program topics and the learning outcomes of the students’ projects. This review system is partial because it is not comprehensive, and for faculty to select student projects is an opportunity to highlight the students’ accomplishments within a specific section and teaching philosophy. For students, it is a way to obtain a holistic view about the work across the entire third year and come to appreciate the diversity of design approaches and philosophical research agendas of the third year faculty. The outcome has been beyond our expectations, as student's projects have demonstrated increased completeness and comprehensiveness, as well as a more sophisticated ways to orally and visually present their ideas, and develop leadership qualities when teamwork is part of the design exercises. Guest critics include: Alfred Jacoby (Director of the Dessau Bauhaus), Wendy Ornelas (President of NAAB), Robert Condia, Raveevarn Choksombatthai Thom Faulders, Kim Groves (Morphosis), Judy Krasnick, John Trautmann, Andrew Saunders, George Tolosa, Susan Ubbelohde, Tsz Yan Ng, and Paul Adamson. Particularly noteworthy are
the discussions at the end of the day, where faculty, students, and guests have an opportunity to highlight the coherence/inconsistencies of third year learning objectives and student outcomes, thus enabling third year faculty to make the necessary adjustments for the next quarter.

Second year has interpreted the Best of Show by providing, since 2008, a comprehensive show of all second year student projects. Because of the scale of the event, it takes place in Spring in the Berg Gallery bleeding into the two adjacent outside spaces. Typically a BBQ accompanies this event and draws students from other design years.

Cal Poly Alumns have created a Web Site called sloArch.com (started May of 2009), which has the purpose of providing news and entertainment site dedicated to strengthening the Cal Poly San Luis Obispo Architecture community. The goal is to bring assistance, education, and entertainment to the Cal Poly Architecture community though news coverage, podcasts, scholarships, and community outreach.

And finally student’s understand the responsibility for professional conduct is engendered and reinforced through the delivery of every key course in the program, including student clubs, and field trips. The Department continues to recruit both tenure-track and lecturers that are registered architects.

E. Architectural Education and the Public Good.

The polytechnic education is a balance between art and science and the department is committed to nurturing this dual identity. Courses throughout the program encourage students to gain an informed understanding of architecture as a cultural and social endeavor, hence the need for a solid foundation in the areas of principles of design, technology, humanities, representation, Professional Practice, ecology, and history/theory/criticism. Faculty’s teaching and research enable students to understand how a range of topics, within and outside our discipline, inform each other. The tradition of the department emphasizes the case-study method that seeks to understand precedence based on community issues, social and environmental problems, and urban issues (neighborhoods, villages, regional landscapes and cities). Furthermore, over the course of their studies, students are exposed to the strength, opportunities, and value of teamwork that are critical to architecture as a social art. Underlying all of the students’ activities is to understand design within an intellectual, historic, cultural, and environmental context. The thesis year represents a transition to their professional career and many projects engage in topics that set a path of future research in community activism and social engagement. The richness of the senior project is intended to showcase the students ability to incorporate values espoused during their studies, and understand design and the quality of space as socially relevant with real people, real issues, and real stakeholders.

As mentioned in the section D. Architectural Education and the Profession (Engagement in the Professional Community), many design studio topics promote a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service that include meetings and public presentations with community groups and other stakeholders. In addition, the AIAS will be in 2010 the first among California Architecture Programs to participate in the AIAS Freedom By Design (FBD) program.

The Department has implemented a recycling practice that emphasizes an awareness of selecting what is trash and what can and deserves to be recycled. Permanent bins are provided appropriately near design studios for students to use during the quarter. Discussions among faculty are in the early stages of implementing a Green Culture in Architectural Education that emphasizes the need to practice a sustainable culture in all matters related to the student's design projects.

1.1.3c A cross-reference to the five perspectives and the role they play in long-term planning (see Part One, Section 1.1.4 Long-Range Planning) and self-assessment (see Part One, Section 1.1.5).

The long range plan provides the framework for setting the priorities for the many activities, and the role they play in long-term planning, as listed in the five perspectives. The self-assessment plan provides the feedback loop for determining the success of these activities.
1.1.4 Long Range Planning

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

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

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

I.1.4d A description of the role the five perspectives play in long range planning.
I.1.4 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, Co-op, 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

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL A: ADVANCE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td>To provide educational and professional opportunities for students and faculty to engage in interdisciplinary collaborations</td>
<td>Objective A.1</td>
<td>Develop and support opportunities for interdisciplinary design studio and other course collaborations</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective A.2</td>
<td>Support cross-disciplinary field trips and activities</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective A.3</td>
<td>Develop post professional degree graduate program to strengthen undergraduate program (improve teaching integration, interdisciplinary research projects, etc)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL B: SUPPORT OFF-CAMPUS EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES</strong></td>
<td>To provide educational and professional opportunities for students and faculty to engage in off-campus domestic and international educational programs</td>
<td>Objective B.1</td>
<td>Evaluate and coordinate program requirements, approval process and performance expectations for off-campus programs</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective B.2</td>
<td>Increase and expand the number of fourth year opportunities for students who are not able to participate in out-of-the country programs and increase the number of exchanges</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL C: ENCOURAGE UNIVERSITY, COMMUNITY AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE</strong></td>
<td>To participate as a major partner in evaluating, contributing to and directing the future physical planning and development of the University, and the surrounding region and community.</td>
<td>Objective C.1</td>
<td>Increase community involvement activities that support instructional goals</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL D: IMPROVE FACULTY COLLEGIALITY</strong></td>
<td>The Architecture Department will strengthen its commitment to be an academic community dedicated to the success of all its members and to the achievement of its collective purposes.</td>
<td>Objective D.1</td>
<td>Enrich the overall scholastic and social experience for all students and promote a learning climate that remains dynamic.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective D.2</td>
<td>Recognize that the Department is moving towards a community of scholar-teachers, each with unique needs for teaching, scholarship and professional development.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective D.3</td>
<td>Improve the interaction with Department, College, University and members of the Community</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective D.4</td>
<td>Improve the mutual respect and openness of the department with the faculty and students</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective D.5</td>
<td>Advance the department’s stature by continuing to recruit distinguished faculty</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2007 Met</td>
<td>B.2—Additional Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective D.6</td>
<td>Develop self-governance procedures for the department with the assistance of the faculty</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2010 In progress</td>
<td>B.2—Develop and Approve Procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOAL E: IMPROVE STUDENT COLLEGIALLY
The Architecture Department will strengthen its commitment to be an academic community dedicated to the success of all its members and to the achievement of its collective purposes.

| Objective E.1 | Enrich the overall scholastic and social experience for all students and promote a learning climate that remains dynamic. | M | 2010 In progress | B.2—Develop and Approve Procedures |

GOAL F: CONTINUOUS ASSESSMENT / IMPROVEMENT
The Architecture Department is committed to the continuous assessment and improvement of the program through a range of activities.

| Objective F.1 | Improve the continuous assessment process of program | M | 2010 In progress | B.2—Develop and Approve Procedures |

CATEGORY # 2 PRACTICE ORIENTED COMMUNITY:

GOAL G: ENRICH PROFESSIONALY-BASED CURRICA
To encourage strong professionally-based curricula that include interdisciplinary opportunities.

| Objective G.1 | Increase the opportunities for practitioners to participate in educational programs | M | 2009 Met | G.1 Professional Studios/ Bay Area Summer Program |
| Objective G.2 | Establish and support inter-college, inter-departmental degree programs, minors, concentrations and courses | M | 2010 Met | G.2 Inter-college/ inter-department degree programs, Minors, etc |
| Objective G.3 | Expand and enhance lecture series | M | 2008 Well Met | D.4 Hearst Lecture series |
| Objective G.4 | Expand the number of advanced technology workshops for students | M | 2008 Well Met | D.5 Workshops |
| Objective G.5 | Increase the number of outside professional reviewers that interact with faculty and students in the program | M | 2009 Met | D.6 List of selected critics |

GOAL E: ENHANCE CONTENT INTEGRATION
To provide a framework that provides integration opportunities for integrating content across a range of courses.

| Objective E.1 | Develop and implement a plan to integrate course content. | H | 2009 Met | E.1 Faculty meetings regarding course objectives confirmation |
| Objective E.2 | Improve the integration of building technology systems across the curriculum | M | 2010 Met | E.1 Integration of Activity Courses to Design Studios in 2nd and 3rd years. |
| Objective E.3 | Develop and implement a plan to integrate course history, theory across the curriculum | M | 2011 In progress | E.1 Hybrid History Course |

CATEGORY # 3 KNOWLEDGE-BASED LEARNING COMMUNITY:

GOAL F: DEVELOP SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR SCHOLARLY WORK:
To create an academic environment which promotes faculty, staff and student development by encouraging and supporting the pursuit of teaching excellence, scholarly work, and challenging professional development and responsible service.

| Objective F.1&2 | Define criteria and support faculty in developing their scholarship of teaching, discovery, integration, and application. | M | 2009 Met | Selected Activities: F.1 Planning Design and Construction Institute (PDCI) F.2 University’s Center for Teaching and Learning F.3 College of Architecture and Environmental Design Foundation (CAEDF) Teaching Award |
| Objective F.3 | Define criteria and support faculty in developing departmental, college, university, community | H | 2010 Met | F.3 Community |
### Objective F.4
Formulate a plan that will develop and maintain diversity (e.g., pluralism of cultures, values, philosophies) among students, faculty, and staff in order to build a strong and effective learning environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Development Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2013 Not Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL G: IMPROVE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT:**
To acquire and develop facilities and equipment for educational needs, technological change and future program growth.

### Objective G.1
Develop a long range plan for maintaining and enhancing physical facilities and furnishings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Development Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2012 Not Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective G.2**
Articulate comprehensive technology applications and implementation plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Development Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2013 Not Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL H: ENHANCE DEPARTMENT ADVANCEMENT:**
To plan, coordinate and implement fundraising and outreach programs to secure supplemental public support and increased private support to meet priority needs of the College.

### Objective H.1
Develop a plan for improving communication strategies for highlighting the successes of the department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Development Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2009 Well Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective H.2**
Identify short-term and long-term needs, prioritize needs and update program for support of important initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Development Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>2009 Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective H.3**
Establish a financially healthy department, so students can graduate on time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Development Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2010 Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Long Range Plan’s List of Key Indicator Measures:**

#### Category #1: INTEGRATED ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

The Architecture Department will strengthen its responsibilities toward a comprehensive academic excellence and maintain and enhance its stated vision and values in educating students to become leaders in contemporary architecture practice.

**Goal A. Advance Opportunities for interdisciplinary activity.** To provide educational and professional opportunities for students and faculty to engage in interdisciplinary collaborations

**A.1 Develop and support opportunities for interdisciplinary design studio and other course collaborations — 2008 [Met]**

EDES 101 Course - Overview of CAED disciplines for freshmen students. Range of activities that expose student to the disciplines of architecture, city and regional planning, construction management, landscape architecture and architectural engineering (e.g., structural engineering). There are a range of collaborative projects assigned in this course that require the different disciplines to work together as a way of building collaborative skills for students’ future courses and their professional careers.

The ARCH 106 Course is tailored for non-architecture CAED majors, specifically construction management and architectural engineering students working alongside architecture students.

Until 2008, architectural engineering students took the entire ARCH 121, 122, 123 “Beginning Design and Drawing” sequence, as well as ARCH 221 “Architectural Design Fundamentals.” As of 2009, a new first year curriculum was implemented that continues to include the architectural engineering students taking the entire ARCH 131, 132, 133 “Design and Visual Communication” sequence. The new ARCH 101 Theory Course, starting Fall 2009, is in response to the more integrative first year design model. This course includes a cohesive exploration of design issues that respond to local and global environmental issues.
Since 2007, an Integrative Building Envelopes elective (ARCH X410 + ARCE X410 + CM X410) for 3rd and 4th year students was co-taught between faculty members of the Architecture and Architectural Engineering Departments to explore an integrated project team approach to the design and construction of sophisticated external building envelopes. Students from Architecture, Architectural Engineering, and Construction Management enroll in this course. Many of these students decide to enroll in an interdisciplinary design studio during their fourth year, because of the great learning experience that they have in this initial Building Envelopes Course.

As of 2008, an experimental interdisciplinary Building Design Course was developed into a permanent design course offering as part of the fourth year curriculum. The following disciplines participate in this course: Construction Management (ARCH 431), Architecture (ARCH 451, 452, 453), Architectural Engineering (ARCE 415), and Landscape Architecture (LA 405).

During the winter quarter of 2009 Prof. Troy Peters (ARCH) and Prof. Christy O’Hara (Landscape ARCH) co-taught an interdisciplinary studio (ARCH 452, LA 405).

In 2009, as part of an effort to provide additional funding support for studios (“Named Studios”), the department reached out to the CAED Foundation to sponsor the renovation of the “Bridge Gallery” between the existing Engineering West building and the new Construction Management building. Profs. Thomas Fowler (ARCH), Nick Watry (CM), and Elbert Speidel (CM) are in charge of this interdisciplinary studio with work on the Gallery to be completed Winter 2011.

During Winter and Spring 2010 an interdisciplinary design studio composed of Architecture, Architectural Engineering, Construction Management, and Landscape Architecture students was invited by Michael Miller, Dean of Cal Poly’s Kennedy Library, to renovate the 1982 central courtyard of the library, by providing electrical upgrades, code compliance, and improved landscape features. Prof. Nicholas Watry (CM) was the instructor of record.

Profs. Thomas Fowler (ARCH) and Elbert Speidel (CM) have run (since 2007) an independent study course called Interdisciplinary Projects Group (IPG), which focuses on the design and construction of community design + build projects.

During the summers of 2009 and 2010, students and faculty of the Architecture, Landscape Architecture and City Regional Planning Departments participated in an interdisciplinary design studio in San Francisco as part of the pilot CAED off-campus Metro Program.

The Environmental Design Minor provides students from all major programs with the knowledge and ability to integrate such broad concerns as design, construction, history, urbanization, sustainable development and historic preservation with their major field of study. This minor involves six architecture prefix courses.

A.2 Support cross-disciplinary field trips and activities — Year 2009 [Met]

Field trips:
- The Construction Management and Architecture Departments organized College field trips for faculty
- Prof Dan Panetta’s Bank of America (BofA) interdisciplinary design studio has visited the client (usually a non-profit developer), to survey the site, meet with volunteer consultants (financial and architectural consultants), and on occasion attend political functions related to the projects in a range of different California Cities
- Construction Minor Students participate on annual Construction Management Teams to annual national construction management student competitions in Reno, Nevada

Activities:
- Faculty invite colleagues from different departments for lectures and reviews
- As part of the Hearst Lecture series professionals from a range of disciplines are invited to speak (see http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/news-events/hearst-lectures.html, accessed 8/22/10)
A.3 Develop post professional degree graduate program to strengthen undergraduate program (improve integration, interdisciplinary research projects, etc.) year 2011 [Not Met, In Progress]

A.3 Associate Department Head will develop a plan for post professional degree graduate program that includes an initiative to establish a consortium for Master Students in Los Angeles.

GOAL B: Support off-campus education opportunities: To provide educational and professional opportunities for students and faculty to engage in off-campus domestic and international educational programs

B.1 Evaluate and coordinate program requirements, approval process and performance expectations for off-campus programs. Year 2008 [Well Met]

Over half of the Architecture Department students, before they graduate, participate in one or more off-campus programs. Permanent programs include: Florence and Copenhagen (CSU), Washington Alexandria Architectural Consortium (WAAC), Paris exchange program and the San Francisco Urban Studies Internship Program. Other programs that are organized and lead by faculty members are offered and are dependant on faculty and student interest. These programs have included, for example, Thailand, Mexico, Japan and Switzerland.

Based on discussion emerging from a Faculty Retreat in Fall 2008 the department has developed the following items to improve the fourth year off-campus programs (see http://arch.calpoly.edu/current/fourth-year-off.html, accessed 8/10/10):

1. Developed evaluation rubric to assess student’s work from all off-campus programs
2. Inaugurated 4th year portfolio requirements to be submitted by all students prior to acceptance to off campus programs (Approved 5-18-09)
3. Established an Independent Study for 4th Year Design Policy (Approved 6-12-08)
4. 4th Year Off-Campus Application Process Updated
5. Developed a robust 4th year Off-Campus Web Site to assist students in making informed choices on the variety of options available for off-campus opportunities. This information includes an overview of the program, itinerary, course work, program costs and miscellaneous information pertaining to the individual programs (Web page developed Winter 2009).

During the Fall quarter, each program displays a representative sample of the previous year’s student work as a part of the annual off-campus program cycle. The committee’s intention (lead by the 4th year design studio coordinator) is to educate prospective off-campus students prior to the orientation meetings/presentations in the Winter. The exhibits help students see the range of the programs and what they could expect.

B.2 Increase and expand the number of fourth year opportunities for students who are not able to participate in out-of-the country programs. Year 2007 [Met]

Since 2007 a shift in expertise of Faculty Early Retirement Plan (FERP) participants to other areas of the curriculum has enabled other permanent faculty members and guest lecturers to teach in 4th year, thus bringing new ideas and design opportunities to 4th year students.

For students remaining on campus, exchange programs are an invaluable opportunity to experience different cultures and expand their knowledge of the world while remaining in San Luis Obispo. Ongoing efforts are underway to expand these exchange opportunities with other institutions, and to increase the number of students enrolled in these experiences.

For example, the Paris exchange program increased the number of French students enrolled on campus in San Luis Obispo. Per the Dean’s request all future exchange program (2010 and beyond) are to be conducted under the umbrella of the CAED. The Canberra, Australia program established in 2001 became a CAED program in 2009, and, as mentioned previously, in 2010 two new exchange programs were established: the Bauhaus in Dessau, Germany, and the Centre for Environmental Planning and Technology (CEPT) in Ahmadabad, India. Additional exchange programs are under consideration with the following institutions: Accademia di Architettura in Mendrisio (Switzerland); HFT, University of Applied Sciences in Stuttgart (Germany); Nanjing University of Technology (China), Universidad de Buenos Aires (Argentina); and Universität für angewandte Kunst in Vienna (Austria).
As previously noted, additional exchange programs have been established through Cal Poly’s IEP (for example, in 2010 two students from Stuttgart will join our campus for two quarters), and the National Student Exchange (NSE) which will bring two students from Iowa State University for one quarter.

As part of the larger effort to create robust opportunities for students who elect to not leave the region or state, in 2005 the department launched the Professional Studios program (fourth year design studio, taught by practitioner firm, plus a paid co-op experience). This has expanded to include six regional offices per year. In addition, the San Francisco Urban Program continues to offer students an opportunity to live, study and work in a major urban environment. The department continues to promote a range of internship opportunities that often lead to an extended offer, and has even led to the firm bringing the student to their overseas office.

**GOAL C: Encourage University, Community and Professional Service:** To Participate as a major partner in evaluation, contributing to and directing the future physical planning and development of the University, and the surrounding region and community.

**C.1 Increase community involvement activities that support instructional goals. Year 2008 [Well Met]**

In 2008, the CAED under the leadership of Prof. Margot McDonald hosted the 7th Annual UC/CSU/CCC Sustainability Conference that promoted “a green workforce and work place for the state of California and the nation.”

As of 2008, faculty members of the Architecture Department have participated as jurors in the AIA Central Coast Chapter annual awards selection.

Practicing faculty members who hold partnerships in local firms contribute to improving the local community through their work. Many of them garnish awards at the yearly AIACCCC Awards gala.

From 2007 to present, Prof Dan Panetta has conducted the Bank of America competition in an interdisciplinary design studio context with emphasis on community activism, including four of the five CAED departments along with MBA and undergraduate business students. Occasionally students from liberal arts, industrial technology, and civil engineering joined the group (for more information see Part One, Section 1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development).

Third year Prof. Margarida Yin conducts projects based on community activism through local and regional engagement in order to improve the quality of life in the region (for more information see Part One, Section 1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development).

Many of our students develop thesis topics that focus on community issues and civic engagement. These topics present students with real people, real issues, and real stakeholders. Projects are interdisciplinary by nature. A selected example of these projects includes: Matthew Ridenour and David Aine’s 2007 thesis: Hope Clinic for the Maasai culture in Kenya (construction completed), and a project that is currently proposed to be built is Carisa Nakano’s 2010 thesis: a Cocoa Education and Research Center in Ebekawopa, Ghana, Africa. Professor Robert Arens and Professor Neuhaus (Cal Poly Food Science and Nutrition Department) are conducting parallel research on a feasibility study for this project.

Prof. Robert Arens and Prof. Ed Saliklis (Architectural Engineering Department) are working on a Rapidly Assembled Emergency Shelter as part of a global engagement effort (awarded a PDCI Cal Poly grant in 2010).

Prof. Thomas Fowler, Director of the award winning Collaborative Integrative-Interactive Digital-Design Studio (CIDS) has been involved with a number of interdisciplinary community projects, which include working with Professor David Gillette, Director of the Liberal Arts of Engineering Studies (LAES) Department along with Construction Management Lecturers Elbert Speidel and Nick Watry. A selected example project includes: Housing Authority of San Luis Obispo’s project called "Housing Opportunities through Modular Construction (HO:ME)", which also was recognized with a University Service Award May 2010.
A Material Library, established through a Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) grant has the goal of enhancing the active hands on learning that will also serve the university community and engage practitioners to use this resource.

**GOAL D: Improve faculty collegiality:** The Architecture Department will strengthen its commitment to be an academic community dedicated to the success of all its members and to the achievement of its collective purposes.

*D1 Enrich the overall scholastic and social experience for all students and promote a learning climate that remains dynamic of the individual and collective endeavors of our students. Year 2009 [Well Met]*

Faculty prospecti are posted on the Web, enabling students to choose faculty according to teaching philosophy, building program descriptions, and research interests of each of the faculty. In addition, the hiring of a number of tenure-track faculty holding Ph.D’s has increased to 7, with 3 All But Dissertation (ABD) (4 in 2004, and 1 ABD). As a result, the number of students interested in conducting research and participating in faculty research has increased over the years, thus we expect student work to reflect a new level of excellence over the coming years. Faculty have embraced the integration of teaching, scholarship, and research; and, by implementing their findings directly within their courses, have offered students a richer and more meaningful experience.

Curricular improvements have enabled students to experience a number of pilot programs: interdisciplinary studios; two-quarter long studios which integrate the practice course; design build projects (one example is “F-Stop” – Offices of the AIAS); and enhanced final reviews (3rd and 2nd year, in addition to the Chumash 5th year thesis show). All of these programs are designed to elevate student expectations and have enabled the department to implement stronger public assessment through the inclusion of national and international guest reviewers. In addition, the Hearst Lecture Series remains a place for the presentation of contemporary ideas within the public realm (See appendix: Hearst Lecture Series).

The department continues to promote opportunities that include individual work, group projects, team learning, community related projects, formal review sessions, internships, professional studios, membership on departmental committees and student associations (AIAS, Alpha Rho Chi, CBF), IDP, exhibitions, workshops and lecture series, and Instructional Student Assistant positions.

With increased discretionary funds available for students, the department has supported a wealth of opportunities that enable individual students, groups, and the entire student body to benefit from the generosity of the alumni and friends of the department. Direct improvements to the computer labs (almost 40 workstations and software have been upgraded twice in six years) and to all the design studios with plasma screens and mini Macs, reflects the commitment to promote the integration of computing into all areas of the architecture program. The creation of the (df)lab in conjunction with the purchase of new technology has increased in a meaningful way the overall digital learning experience of our students. The integration of the lab into the curriculum can be seen through the numerous installations, the effect on the quality of the work for the annual vellum furniture show, throughout the studio work as well as in the F-Stop renovation. The F-Stop (owned and run by the AIAS) renovation was developed by a third-year design-build studio as a demonstration project of these newly acquired tools into the culture of the school. Student assistants have been hired in almost every area. Improvements to the MRC have contributed as well to the scholastic experience of our students.

Select booklets published under the Architecture Department’s AeD Press celebrate the students’ learning outcomes. In addition the department posts student accomplishments to bring attention to the diverse successes, all as a means of encouraging excellence (See complete list of publications in the team room). Also, the AIAS, CBF, CSI, and Alpha Rho Chi have been key leaders in promoting opportunities for a dynamic learning environment.

In concert with the CAED, the Architecture Department continues to create unified facilities that include state of the art spaces for teaching, research, assembly, temporary and permanent exhibition spaces, and archive rooms for student and faculty work. With a robust influx of JC2 (“Joint Cooperative-Agreement 2” with the College of Engineering) Group II funds, provided by the University in 2008-09 (almost $600,000), major improvements have been completed. New desks
and chairs, as well as equipment and technology upgrades for all of the design studios have enhanced both a contemporary didactic and interactive learning environment.

With the implementation of the improved first year curriculum during the 2009-10 year, the department, over the next few years, will take a closer look at promoting recruitment policies for transfer and change of major students.

**D.2 Recognize that the Department is moving towards a community of scholar-teachers, each with unique needs for teaching, scholarship and professional development. Year 2009 [Met]**

With the adopted criteria developed as part of the Annual Review for Promotion and Tenure (ARPT) Document (Approved 09/24/04–revised 6/4/09), faculty have increased in quality and quantity the scholarship activities of teaching; discovery; integration; and/or application. While there were concerns voiced by the department in the last accreditation report about “dwindling department budgets for professional development and field trip expenditures,” robust advancement efforts since 2006 have secured funds to enable faculty to conduct diverse scholarship activities (see I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development). Concerns remain that the chronic budget crisis in California might reverse past fundraising successes and impact the future of faculty scholarship and community service.

With yearly formal evaluations of the Faculty Development Plans (per University schedule), and through informal mentoring meetings to assist faculty in their scholarship activities, the department continues to align faculty research with teaching responsibilities. Since 2008, the department has enabled faculty teaching large lecture courses in addition to design studios, to concentrate their required teaching loads over two quarters, thus liberating the third quarter for scholarly activities. Currently Prof. Robert Arens and Assistant Professors Marc Neveu and Troy Peters have benefited from this opportunity to advance their scholarship. Release time and assigned time is granted when appropriate funds are available.

The following polices to assist faculty in achieving the highest level of scholarship have been developed:

- Faculty Development Funds Policy (Adopted 12/7/05, revised 2/10/10)
- Peer Review Committee Membership and Procedures (PRC) Document (Adopted 2/26/09)
- Periodic Evaluation Assistance (Adopted 01/12/06)

During the last tenure-track recruitment (2007-08), the department hired two new faculty with PhD’s, thus adding new research agendas to the department and CAED. Currently the number of faculty members holding doctoral level degrees is seven with two ABD; almost a quarter of the department’s full-time faculty now hold PhDs, a testimony of the department’s interest in bringing robust research agendas into the environment while maintaining its commitment to excellence in teaching.

**D.3 Improve the Interaction with Department, College, University and members of the Community. Year 2009 [Met]**

Increased integration between departments of the CAED has offered faculty the opportunity to present interdisciplinary scholarship, and receive a number of grants from the University’s teaching and Learning Center, as well as through the newly established Planning, Design and Construction Institute (PDCI), [http://www.caed.calpoly.edu/pdci/](http://www.caed.calpoly.edu/pdci/) (accessed 8/10/10). (2 architecture faculty recipients in 2010).

Weekly Faculty and Student Digests were established in 2007 to assist in communicating to a large faculty and student body important information about our collective achievements and activities. An archive of these digests have been set in place on the web (Faculty-[http://arch.calpoly.edu/administration/digests/digests-0910/archive-0910.html](http://arch.calpoly.edu/administration/digests/digests-0910/archive-0910.html), accessed 8/10/10) Students - [http://arch.calpoly.edu/current/digests/digests-0910/archive-0910.html](http://arch.calpoly.edu/current/digests/digests-0910/archive-0910.html), accessed 8/10/10).
Committee structure enables faculty to interact with each other within the Department and the CAED.

Faculty continue to be involved in projects and activism within their communities (see Faculty Resumes).

D.4 Improve the mutual respect and openness of the department with the faculty and students. Year 2008 [Well Met]

As mentioned previously, the transparency of communication is assisted with the weekly student and faculty email digests, in addition to the Department’s Facebook page. The Department works closely with the respective faculty committees and student organizations to seek input and provides four staff members to assist faculty’s requests. The Department has an open door policy for students and promotes awareness of faculty and students academic and other professional achievements.

D.5 Advance the Department’s national standing by maintaining and recruiting distinguished and diverse faculty. Year 2007 [Met]

The Department continues to evaluate and update as necessary the Peer Review Committee Membership and Procedures (PRC) and Annual Review for Promotion and Tenure (ARPT) policies to ensure faculty can achieve the highest level of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

The 2007-08 tenure track recruitment efforts enabled the department to appoint four new faculty to the department in the areas of design and digital media; design and history/theory/criticism; design and sustainability; and design and technology. Between 2005-2010, six faculty were promoted to full-professor, and three faculty to the rank of associate professor. During this same time period, two faculty members resigned to move to other institutions and/or to practice architecture, one full-professor retired, three faculty withdrew from the Faculty Early Retirement Plan (FERP); six faculty completed the FERP; two entitled lecturers retired; five faculty joined the FERP program; and six lecturers had their part-time/full-time appointment converted to a three-year 12.12 entitlement (per University policy).

Continued efforts to secure national and international faculty as successful promotions are granted and senior members within the department retire is part of the department’s strategic plan (Refer to appendix: Faculty hiring strategy). A scheduled tenure-track search was initiated for the AY 2009-10 but due to the budgetary concerns and state furloughs, the search was cancelled. A new tenure-track recruitment effort is underway and it is anticipated that a minimum of two new faculty members—possibly three, will join the department fall 2011. In addition, the department is seeking during its next tenure-track search (2010-11), candidates who have interest and expertise in teaching in a cross-disciplinary manner.

In a constant effort to resolve the imbalance in faculty diversity (due to the retirement of several diverse faculty), and to improve the opportunity for equity in the workplace, every effort is made to retain, attract, and nurture diversity and gender balance within the faculty body. During the last tenure-track recruitment, three offers were extended to faculty with diverse backgrounds. Unfortunately those offers were declined.

Objective D.6 Develop self-governance procedures for the department with the assistance of the faculty — Year 2010 [In Progress]

A self-governance policy draft was presented by the Department Head to faculty for their input and consideration (see team room policies). Further development and approval is pending. A central point of this policy is greater inclusiveness across the various faculty ranks and the inclusion of student input.

GOAL E: IMPROVE STUDENT COLLEGIALLY
The Architecture Department will strengthen its commitment to be an academic community dedicated to the success of all its members and to the achievement of its collective purposes.
Objective E.1 Enrich the overall scholastic and social experience for all students and promote a learning climate that remains dynamic — Year 2010 [In Progress]

The department promotes leadership opportunities that include individual work, group projects, team learning, community related projects, formal review sessions, internships, professional studios, membership on departmental committees and student associations (AIAS, Alpha Rho Chi, CBF), IDP, exhibitions, workshops, socials including film series, and the Hearst Lecture Series, and multiple instructional Student Assistant positions.

With Student Digest (since 2008) and Facebook communication, the Department is reaching out to all students to highlight weekly events and opportunities (see under Resources/Student Digests http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/current/index.html, accessed 6/1/10.)

The 2008 establishment of the df[fab]lab (digital fabrication lab) created the opportunity to increase student awareness of design with contemporary media.

Adjustments to the recruitment policies for freshmen and transfer students continue to create a more diverse and mature group of students.

A number of learning culture policies (see Part One, Section 1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity) have been set in place, such as the 4th Year Independent Study Policy, 4th Year Off-Campus Policy, 4th Year Portfolio Policy, Studio Enrollment Policy, and Studio Culture/Use Policy.

GOAL F: CONTINUOUS ASSESSMENT / IMPROVEMENT. The Architecture Department is committed to the continuous assessment and improvement of program through a range of activities

Objective F.1 Improve the continuous assessment process of program — Year 2010 [In Progress]

A number of pilot programs were set in place in response to faculty initiatives and curricular adjustments (i.e., two quarter long design studios, improved integration of studio with practice and Environmental Control Systems (ECS) activities, 3rd year super reviews, 4th year and 5th year portfolio requirements, interdisciplinary design-build studios). Further qualitative student learning assessment efforts need to take place prior to their implementation on a larger scale. This is critical, as the department has opted to promote within its curriculum a number of interpretations. However these are often isolated successes that need to be shared with all students and faculty members in detail.

A number of policies have resulted from discussions on the following topics: incorporation of writing skills across the board, with a strong emphasis in the History/Theory/Criticism sequence; critical thinking; oral and final presentations; portfolio requirements; and 4th year rubric (on campus and off-campus programs).

Faculty coordinators set in place annual assessment strategies and integrate faculty input through internal adjustments.

Improvements in advising and counseling are not yet achieved, and various models are under discussion to improve how to assist over 800 students in a consistent and informed manner.

CATEGORY # 2 PRACTICE ORIENTED COMMUNITY:

GOAL G: ENRICH PROFESSIONALLY BASED CURRICULA. To encourage strong professionally based curricula that include interdisciplinary opportunities

Objective G.1 Increase the opportunities for practitioners to participate in educational programs. — Year 2009 [Met]

A number of practitioners have been invited to teach design studios (Bruce Tomb of San Francisco, Ralph Roesling of San Diego, Marcus des Plantes and Michio Vallian of San Luis Obispo), offer workshops (Darden Architects, Hearst Lecture Series speakers), serve as guest critics (in particular for the super review), advise on student competitions (Ralph Roesling, Buro Happold, of Los Angeles). In addition, student clubs bring professionals to campus.

Objective G.2 Establish and support inter-college, inter-departmental degree programs, minors, concentrations and courses. — Year 2009 [Met]
In the most recent student survey, students enrolled in one or more minors are distributed as follows: Architectural Engineering (15.6%), Construction Management (18.3%), Integrated Project Delivery (0.0%), Real Estate Property Development (4.0%) and Sustainable Environment (64.2%).

Objective G.3 Expand and enhance lecture series — Year 2008 [Well Met]

The Hearst Lecture Series has become the jewel of the CAED’s public face and remains a venue par excellence to bring internationally respected designers, practitioners and educators to San Luis Obispo to speak with the students and faculty (see http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/news-events/hearst-lectures.html, accessed 6/1/10). Additional guest speakers are brought to campus to present their work and assist specific project assignments and lecture/activity classes.

Objective G.4 Expand the number of advanced technology workshops for students — Year 2008 [Well Met]

Over the past years the following technology workshops were offered (taught by current students, recent graduates or in some cases directly from software company): Grasshopper (Rhino Plugin), Rhino Scripting, Rhinocam Training, Introduction to Revit and BIM, 3DS Max Rendering, Bentley Microstation, Mastercam Faro Scanning software, and Maya.

Objective G.5 Increase the number of outside professional reviewers that interact with faculty and students in the program — Year 2009 [Not Met]

While increased efforts have enabled additional reviewers pooled from academia and/or firms to participate in final reviews, the Department recognizes the need to continue to expand these opportunities to all areas despite the size of the program. The department seeks to evenly distribute the limited resources for various types of support (professional Development fund, travel opportunities, student leadership fund, basic operational needs, etc.). We have relied on the generosity of many professional to attend reviews, but feel the responsibility to provide a stipend for their services. Also, the AIAS and the CSI have been active in drawing additional professionals to speak in the evenings. A selected list of guest critics includes: Benn Holland (Sydney), Donald Bates (Melbourne), Gregor Kalas (UT), Bruce Danziger, David Lambert, and Amie Nulman (ARUP Consulting Engineers), Walter Meyer, Keving Daly (Daly Genik Architects), Amy Campos, Kim Groves (Morphosis), Andrea Cuellar, Catherine Venard (Dalhousie), David Herd and Matthew Melnyk (Buro Happold), Ian Chin and Paul Kovach (WJE Enigneers), Megan Dorian, Juliam Parsley, Chris Talbot, Scott Gaudineer, Nancy Clark Brown (Autodesk), Alfred Jacoby (Director of the Dessau Bauhaus), Wendy Ornelas (President of NAAB), Robert Condia, Raveevarn Choksubatchai Thom Faulders, Kim Groves (Morphosis), Judy Krasnick, John Trautmann, Andrew Saunders, George Tolosa, Susan Ubbelohde, Tsz Yan Ng, and Paul Adamson.

GOAL E: ENHANCE CONTENT INTEGRATION. To provide a framework that provides integration opportunities for integrating content across a range of courses

Objective E.1 Develop and implement a plan to integrate course content — Year 2010 [Met]

Faculty coordinators and members of the Curriculum Committee provide a leadership role through appropriate assessment strategies.

Objective E.2 Improve the integration of building technology systems across the curriculum — Year 2010 [Met]

The hiring of Profs. Robert Arens and Jim Doerfler to recalibrate the entire ARCH 241/242 and ARCH 341/342 lecture and activity sections of the practice course has brought a much desired integration within those areas. Fourth year and 5th year build on these foundations and are conducting a pilot program to assess a comprehensive approach to technology systems. There are two models of interdisciplinary studios, which constitute tangible examples of the Department’s efforts that are reflected positively in the students' comments. The first is conducted with ARCH, ARCE, CM, and LARCH students and taught by Profs. Margot McDonald, Dan Panetta, and William Benedict (ARCH), Jill Nelson and Brent Nuttall (ARCE), Barbara Jackson and Nick Watry (CM), and Gary Clay (LARCH). The second is conducted with ARCH and ARCE students and is taught by Profs. Mark Cabrinha, Jim Doerfler, Tom Fowler (ARCH), and Kevin Dong (ARCE).

Objective E.3 Develop and implement a plan to integrate course history, theory across the curriculum — Year 2011 [In Progress]

The History/Theory/Criticism faculty regularly teach in the design studio sequence, in particular in 3rd and 4th year, and a renewed integration of historical and contemporary issues is having significant impact on the students’ appreciation of these courses.
In Summer 2009 Profs. Don Choi and Marc Neveu received a Cal Poly teaching grant for their hybrid course development titled “Active Learning through a Hybrid Architectural History Course.” This endeavor has the following goals: improve learning outcomes, increase the foundational knowledge, promote student curiosity and exploration. It continues to be refined with appropriate assessment strategies.

**CATEGORY # 3 KNOWLEDGE-BASED LEARNING COMMUNITY:**

**GOAL F: DEVELOP SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR SCHOLARLY WORK.** To create an academic environment which promotes faculty, staff and student development by encouraging and supporting the pursuit of teaching excellence, scholarly work, and challenging professional development and responsible service.

**Objective F.1 & 2 Define criteria and support faculty in developing their scholarship of teaching, discovery, integration, and application — Year 2009 [Met]**

The Department does not prioritize one type of scholarship (as defined by the Boyer Report) over another. Therefore criteria and support are not differentiated between these types.

A faculty Development Funds Policy defines the department’s responsibilities in providing appropriate funds for all faculty conducting scholarship. Informal mentoring and required yearly reviews enable the Department Head and faculty to review their Professional Development Plan, their teaching and research goals, and how the department can assist them to advance their teaching, research, and service. Adjustment to the Annual Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (ARPT) Committee review process has added an additional level of assessment by discussing with the faculty under review the committee’s draft prior to forwarding it to the Department Head.

Advancement efforts have enabled the Department to maintain yearly guaranteed funds for Faculty Professional Development, and despite the current budget crisis has increased this amount in 2010 from $2,000 to $3,500 per tenure track member per academic year. Because of the support offered to tenure track faculty the Department is now expanding this to include the 1st two years after their promotion ($2,000 per annum). Beyond that point the stipends are granted on a competitive basis ($1,000). Lecturers at Cal Poly are not required to include research and service in their Professional Development Plan. However, the department extends to them the opportunity to apply for funding from the departmental pool. Faculty support in terms of compression of teaching duties from three quarters to two quarters has been initiated. Faculty continue to be awarded sabbaticals/difference in pay leave (ie, In 2010 Prof Jonathan Reich received a sabbatical, and Profs. Dan Panetta and Sandy Stannard received a difference in pay leave). The Department is committed to continuing to secure additional funds for its faculty.

With the establishment of the CAED Planning, Design and Construction Institute (PDCI) faculty have gained additional opportunities to secure research funding. Additionally, the infrastructure of the University Center for Teaching and Learning is very supportive of our faculty. Over the past years they have received several mini grants.

To encourage a culture of scholarship the department creates an annual Faculty Scholarship Book, this compilation of peer reviewed faculty articles allows students easy access to the faculty work and celebrates their achievements amongst the on campus community. (see http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/research/index.html, accessed 8/12.10).

**Objective F.3 Define criteria and support faculty in developing departmental, college, university, community and professional service — Year 2010 [In Progress]**

See Appointment, Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (ARPT) Guidelines that will be in the team room and also are online on the program web site.

**Objective F.4 Formulate a plan that will develop and maintain diversity (e.g., pluralism of cultures, values, philosophies) among students, faculty, and staff in order to build a strong and effective learning environment  — Year 2013 [Not Met]**

See Part One, Section 1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity to review the University Guidelines for diversity. The Department has not yet formulated a discipline specific framework or plan that ties into the University’s plans for improving the demographics of students and faculty. However the Department continues to maintain Student Academic and Support Services advising that improves
access, retention and graduation of students who have been historically, economically and/or educationally disadvantaged. The department will develop a plan to improve the diversity of the department by 2013. The Department also regularly offers elective courses such as ARCH 320 “History of Asian Architecture and Built Environment, and ARCH 326 “Native American Architecture and Place” to encourage a deeper understanding of cultural diversity. Design studios have included lectures on Barrier-Free Environment and we have scheduled in Fall 2010/Winter 2011 Universal Design –Theory and Practice Workshops by Faculty Emeritus Paul Wolf.

GOAL G: IMPROVE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT. To acquire and develop facilities and equipment for educational needs, technological change and future program growth.

Objective G.1 Develop a long range plan for maintaining and enhancing physical facilities and furnishings — Year 2012 [Not Met]

The College of Architecture and Environmental Design is the only College on campus that is required to fund its own furnishings. Approximately fifty thousand dollars in allocated annual funds are insufficient to tackle the needs of one of the largest architecture programs nationwide with 40+ design studios and seminars rooms. However, the one-time JCAIIb/Group II funds were helpful in providing new workstations and chairs for the studios (see Part One, Section 1.2.4 Financial Resources for more information).

Under the leadership of the College Based Fee Committee, in academic year 2009-10 over $70,000 was provided to support facility improvements: CAED shop, [fab]lab upgrades, new Laser cutter, Mac lab equipment and software, Media Resource Center (MRC) scanner, CAED Photo Lab, Plotters, Studio upgrades, F-Stop renovation. In addition these funds supported the student assistants needed to assemble over 1000 tables purchased under the Group II fund.

Objective G.2 Articulate comprehensive technology applications and implementation plan. — Year 2012 [Not Met]

See team room policies for Computer Policy (07/23/04). This document is revised annually or as appropriate given changes in the curriculum.

GOAL H: ENHANCE DEPARTMENT ADVANCEMENT. To plan, coordinate and implement fundraising and outreach programs to secure supplemental public support and increased private support to meet priority needs of the College.

Objective H.1 Develop a plan for improving communication strategies for highlighting the successes of the department. — Year 2009 [Well Met]

While the Dean’s responsibilities focus on external relations with the University and the professional communities relevant to the faculty and the community in general, one of the new roles of the department head is an emphasis on developing resources for faculty and student growth and development. This significant administrative demand has increased the collaborative efforts with the CAED’s Advancement office in pursuit of developing strategic outreach efforts and networking activities with a strong emphasis on alumni based relationships. A formal communication and advancement strategy was set in place in 2006. This strategy was based on the need to communicate the successes of the department, build a network of friends among alumni and professional partners and, finally, build a base of donors.

Communication of the successes of the department is a multi-pronged endeavor as the message must resonate with potential students, current students, parents, alumni, and professionals who are not yet familiar with our program.

A robust means of communicating multiple messages was initiated in the newly designed web page (2006). The design was then adopted by the CAED and other departments. The web is the first access point for potential students, alumni who have lost touch, and potential supporters who have not visited our campus or, perhaps, heard of our program. The site encompasses the widest possible range of activities from course information to alumni news, from scholarships to faculty research, from off campus opportunities to student portfolios. (see http://arch.calpoly.edu)

Secondary to the Architecture Department web site is the use of social media. The Department hosts a Facebook site (intended for current students) that shares news of current events; an Architecture Alumni Facebook site; and, most recently, Architecture Parents at Cal Poly Facebook.
site. At Cal Poly 30% of the parents are donors to the university while their child is here; we want to keep them informed and provide a means of strengthening their connection and positive experience.

In 2009 the Department published the first Architecture Department alumni newsletter in some years. The publication reflects the high quality work in the department and gives alumni and friends a tangible means of communicating support for Cal Poly among their colleagues and friends. (see http://arch.calpoly.edu/publications/arch-newsletters.html)

Part of the overall strategy with outreach communications was the development of a solid range of internal publications. These booklets include reflections on individual studios, special projects, off campus studios, cross-department collections, etc. Between 2007-2010 there have been 23 publications. (see http://arch.calpoly.edu/publications/index.html, accessed 8/12/10) These publications serve to mark moments on campus and create a momentum and sense of pride in accomplishment. As importantly, they provide tangible tokens of the multiple achievements of our students and faculty and are essential to Advancement efforts. We send these booklets to donors as encouragement and as a thank you.

The Department works closely with University public affairs to place our achievements in appropriate media (resulting in television, radio, and newspaper coverage of the senior thesis show, Hearst Lecture Series, special events, etc.) and to assure that our student, faculty and alumni achievements are showcased to internal and external audiences.

Other communications strategies relate more closely to Advancement. Since 2006 the Department Head has sent a personal non-solicitation letter to alumni each Fall, updating them on the program and sharing successes. Contrary to previous efforts these letters go to a broadly defined alumni base – meaning inclusion of former students who did not graduate (this letter and strategy was the basis of the $60 million pledged bequest commitment).

The Department has taken a very active role in the ‘bread and butter’ of fundraising: the Cal Poly Annual Fund. The Department Head participates in crafting the message and supports this by working with telephone callers during the phone-a-thon.

While Alumni giving to Cal Poly remains below 10% of all graduates, a greater percentage of parents contribute while their child is on campus. In addition to web based messaging we are reaching out to parents in targeted ways. This is very new to Cal Poly. One example, initiated in 2009, is an invitation to the parents of soon-to-be graduates to show their support by sponsoring a book for the MRC in their student’s honor (with ex libris).

As friend-raising comes before fundraising, the Department sends various messages including a special letter to each alumni on the multiples of 10 anniversary of graduation (10th, 20th, etc.).

Cal Poly is preparing for a major capital campaign (starting in a few years) and we are focused on strengthening our donor pyramid. The various efforts described above are designed to build the base of new donors and to increase the giving of those who already contribute.

A wide variety of other letters and emails are sent to parents, alumni, donors, and potential supporters throughout the year (see Team Room documentation).

Objective H.2 Identify short-term and long-term needs, prioritize needs and update program for support of important initiatives — Year 2009 [Met]

The sharp economic decline in the past two years has affected the country as a whole and members of the California building and design community in particular. Because of this we have adjusted our objectives to sustain giving levels, broaden our base and maintain friends through these tough times. At the same time we have been receptive to the postponement of pledged commitments; knowing that our support for our friends and alumni will only increase the long term mutual benefits. Despite the sharp economic decline financial support for the department has remained strong and the department has increased its discretionary fund raising activities by 60% since the last accreditation visit in 2005.

Although the University has not placed a high emphasis on revenue generation by faculty members, internal and external grant funding has increased over the past five years. Innovative
strategies such as the partnerships across disciplines with the use of shared resources have benefited many of the architecture faculty. These positive results have enabled the department to expand from a traditional “isolated” research environment to a more integrative and interdisciplinary approach, establishing new and broad connections to other endeavors that have a real impact on other disciplines on the architecture program.

Short Term needs are met through multiple means including Phone-a-thon for Annual Fund and general outreach to parents, alumni and friends. The department has been fortunate in its efforts to obtain discretionary monies. This funding supports a broad base of needs including Student Leadership Development. This provides discretionary support for a wide array of student activities: travel, equipment, competitions, etc. (see http://arch.calpoly.edu/alumni/giving-opportunities.html, accessed 8/11/10)

Mid to Long-Term needs have been identified as follows:
- Student Leadership Development Fund
- Faculty Leadership Development Fund
- Sustainability Fund
- Interdisciplinary Fund
- Metro/Co-op programs
- Workshops (including Technology Workshops)
- MRC Book Challenge
- Publication of Student Work
- Need based support for Student Projects
- Need based support for Student Laptops
- 2nd/3rd/4th year Travel Fellowships
- Digital Media
- Final Quarter Design Review
- Endowed Guest Professorship
- Facility enhancement (new/renovated review and exhibit space)

Strategies to meet this list of mid to long-term needs are more targeted than those for short-term needs. These strategies include long-term cultivation of prospects and the creation of programs such as five year naming for Studios (established 2008).

Objective H.3 Establish a financially healthy department, so students can graduate on time — Year 2010 [Met]

Despite budget cuts to the Department, all students continue to have access to all required classes in order to graduate on time. To achieve this goal, the Dean mandated increased class efficiency, faculty agreed to teach occasional overloads, and discretionary funds covered deficit where necessary.
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I.1.5a A description of the school’s self-assessment process, specifically with regard to ongoing evaluation of the program’s mission statement, its multi-year objectives and how it relates to the five perspectives.

Introduction

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 [website link]).

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.
I.1.5b A description of the results of faculty, students', and graduates' assessments of the accredited degree program's curriculum and learning context as outlined in the five perspectives

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

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, InDesig, 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 from 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 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 AI 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
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 Cal Poly, 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.

1.1.5c A description, if applicable, of institutional requirements for self-assessment.

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 year-long 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.
I.1.5d  A description of the manner in which results from self-assessment activities are used to inform long-range planning, curriculum development, learning culture, and responses to external pressures or challenges to institutions (e.g., reduced funding for state support institutions or enrollment mandates).

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

I.1.5e  Additional pertinent information

No additional information to report.
1.2 Resources

1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development

Faculty/Staff
1.2.1a A matrix for each of the two academic years prior to the preparation of the APR, that identifies each faculty member, the courses he/she was assigned during that time and the specific credentials, experience, and research that supports these assignments. In the case of adjuncts or visiting professors, only those individuals who taught in the two academic years prior to the visit should be identified.

1.2.1b A resume for each faculty member, full-time and adjunct who taught in the program during the previous two academic years prior to the preparation of the APR.

1.2.1c A description of the institution’s policies and procedures relative to EEO/AA for faculty, staff, and students.

1.2.1d A description of other initiatives for diversity and how the program is engaged or benefits from these initiatives (see also Part I, Section 1.2)

1.2.1e The school’s policy regarding human resource development opportunities, such as:

Faculty
1.2.1e1 A description of the manner in which faculty members remain current in their knowledge of the changing demands of practice and licensure.
1.2.1e2 A description of the resources (including financial) available to faculty and the extent to which faculty teaching in the program are able to take advantage of these resources.
1.2.1e3a. Evidence of the school’s facilitation of faculty research, scholarship, and creative activities since the previous site visit; including the granting of sabbatical leaves and unpaid leaves of absence, opportunities for the acquisition of new skills and knowledge, and support of attendance at professional meetings.
1.2.1e3b. Evidence of balance of faculty workloads
1.2.1e4. A description of the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty appointment, promotion, and when applicable, tenure.
1.2.1e5. A list of visiting lecturers and critics brought to the school since the previous site visit.
1.2.1e6 A list of public exhibitions brought to the school since the previous site visit.
1.2.1e7 IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed, is trained in the issues of IDP, has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and, regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.

Students
1.2.1f1. A description of the process by which applicants to the accredited degree program are evaluated for admission.
1.2.1f2. A description of student support services, including academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship placement where applicable.
1.2.1f3. Evidence of the school’s facilitation of student opportunities to participate in field trips and other off-campus activities.
1.2.1f4 Evidence of opportunities for students to participate in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other campus-wide activities.
1.2.1f5. Evidence of the school’s facilitation of student research, scholarship, and creative activities since the previous site visit, including research grants awarded to students in the accredited degree program, opportunities for students to work on faculty-led research, and opportunities for the acquisition of new skills and knowledge in settings outside the classroom or studio.
1.2.1f6 Evidence of support to attend meetings of student organizations and honorary societies
1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

Faculty/Staff

1.2.1a A matrix for each of the two academic years prior to the preparation of the APR, that identifies each faculty member, the courses he/she was assigned during that time and the specific credentials, experience, and research that supports these assignments. In the case of adjuncts or visiting professors, only those individuals who taught in the two academic years prior to the visit should be identified.

(See Part 4, Section 4.4 Faculty Credential Matrix)

1.2.1b A resume for each faculty member, full-time and adjunct who taught in the program during the previous two academic years prior to the preparation of the APR.

(See Part 4, Section 4.3 Faculty Resumes)

1.2.1c A description of the institution’s policies and procedures relative to EEO/AA for faculty, staff, and students

Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) Policy Statement:
Cal Poly is an equal opportunity employer subject to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that prohibits discrimination in employment and to Executive Order 11246 that requires federal contractors to take affirmative action as a means of achieving equal employment opportunity. The University is committed to increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, administrators, and students to mirror the increasing diversity of the State of California. For more information, please visit the Employment Equity website. Additional information on Non-Discrimination/Affirmative Action Programs is available on the CSU Policies Website (http://www.calstate.edu/HRAdm/policies.shtml, accessed 8/10/10)

An Employment Equity Facilitator (EEF) is present on every staff and faculty hiring committee to assure that the process for equitable hiring is followed. The role of the EEF is to ensure the staff or faculty screening committee they serve on adheres to equal employment opportunity (EEO) practices during all phases of the search and selection process; and to address concerns and respond to all questions concerning the equal consideration of all applicants. The Department has two EEF’s who serve on faculty hiring committees and there are several EEF’s among the staff in the CAED, who serve on staff hiring committees.

1.2.1d A description of other initiatives for diversity and how the program is engaged or benefits from these initiatives

Cal Poly, at the University level, and the Architecture Department have committed themselves to achieving a culturally diverse community, as well as one that protects the rights of individuals in an arena of academic freedom. The following University policies reflect this commitment.

Sexual Harassment Training:
Assembly Bill 1825 is a state law (enacted in September 2004) that mandates all members of the CSU community identified as supervisors to take two hours of sexual harassment prevention training. Each individual, identified as a supervisor, will be required to take this training on a two year cycle, as well as within the first six months of their assumption of supervisory duties.

Cal Poly’s Statement on Diversity:
At the heart of a university is the responsibility to provide its students with a well-rounded education, an education that fosters their intellectual, personal and social growth. For students preparing to embark upon work and life in the 21st century, a critical element of a well-rounded education is the ability to understand and to function effectively in a diverse and increasingly interdependent global society. As noted in a statement from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), “the argument for the necessity of diversity is perhaps stronger in higher education than in any other context . . .The ultimate product of universities is education in the broadest sense, including preparation for life in the working world.” In this regard, it is in the compelling interest of Cal Poly, the State and the nation to provide our students with an education that is rich with a diversity of people, ideas, perspectives and experiences. Thus, diversity serves as a fundamental means to enhance both the quality and value of education. It cannot be a mere adjunct to such an education, but must be an integral element of the educational experience, infused throughout the community (faculty, students, and staff), the curriculum and the co-curricular programs of the University. We must be dedicated to the principle of ensuring that all of our students routinely encounter diverse people, ideas, and experiences. As a University whose motto is “to learn by doing,” Cal Poly explicitly understands
the importance that experience brings to education. When students are exposed personally and directly to faculty, staff and other students from diverse backgrounds, their stereotypes about “the others” are challenged. Such personal interactions give students an understanding of the range of similarities and differences within and among groups that no textbook or computer can provide. For this reason, both the formal and informal classroom (i.e., the rich learning experiences that occur for our students during their co-curricular activities) must be constituted in a way that reinforces the value of encountering and considering diversity. Moreover, diversity in the curriculum is a fundamental component of a well-rounded and beneficial education. The perspectives provided by the University are contingent upon the content and purpose of its courses. Since the curriculum is the principal expression of our educational goals and values, it should signal the importance of diversity to the Cal Poly mission, to the institutional culture and to our teaching and learning environment in clear and unambiguous terms. Only through intellectual and first-hand personal exposure to diversity in its myriad forms—racial, ethnic, cultural, gender, geographic, socio-economic, etc.—will students gain the understanding, empathy and social skills that they will require to be effective, engaged citizens in an increasingly crowded and interrelated global community. The benefit of diversity is universal. Cal Poly’s commitment to diversity signals an affirmation of the highest educational goals of this University, including mutual respect, civility, and engaged learning. [The definition of diversity is specifically inclusive of, but not limited to, an individual’s race/ethnicity, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, cultural heritage, disability and sexual orientation.]

Non-Discrimination Policy

Pages 15-17 of the 2009-2011 Catalog cover the campus Policies on the Rights and Responsibilities of Individuals, including on the following campus Non-Discrimination Policy:

Cal Poly does not discriminate in admission or access to, or treatment or employment in its programs and activities, including intercollegiate athletics. Cal Poly and its auxiliary organizations are committed to maintaining and implementing policies and procedures in compliance with applicable CSU, State, and federal nondiscrimination and affirmative action laws, regulations, and policies. Cal Poly supports and environment free of unlawful discrimination on the basis of:

i. Race
ii. Color
iii. Religion
iv. National Origin
v. Ancestry
vi. Age
vii. Sex
viii. Sexual Orientation
ix. Gender Identity
x. Marital Status
xi. Physical Disability
xii. Mental Disability
xiii. Medical Condition
xiv. Veteran Status

The Policies also cover Federal, State and CSU Mandates, Protection from Retaliation, Reporting Guidelines, Academic Freedom and Student Academic Rights and Responsibilities, and Accessibility of Cal Poly electronic and Information Technology Resources.

In 1999, the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) established a special case study project to work with a small number of “low-performing” high schools in California. The goal of the CAPP Partnership Initiative (CPI) is to support the schools in moving towards full implementation of the State Mathematics and English Language Arts Standards, preparing the students to pass the high school exit exam, and improving overall college eligibility rates. CAPP's role is to facilitate the integration of existing efforts with areas of need (as identified by the school), provide resources to address those needs, and document the work of the Partnership. Students participating in the CAPP program qualify for admission bonus points when applying to Cal Poly. http://www.calstate.edu/CAPP/ (accessed 8/10/10).

01.2.1e The University’s policy regarding human resource development opportunities

Overview

Cal Poly offers an excellent package of employee fringe benefits administered by the Human Resources Department. These benefits include a range of major insurance benefit plans and programs, retirement and tax-deferred and other savings programs, disability coverage and miscellaneous employee benefits.
The California Faculty Association (CFA) is the exclusive collective bargaining representative for California State University faculty. CFA advocates quality education in the CSU, protects the faculty's interests in the California legislature, advances academic freedom, upholds faculty rights, delivers financial protections for the faculty, promotes faculty participation in the governance of CSU and in CFA and promotes diversity.

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), located in the Kennedy Library, is dedicated to assisting faculty in their professional development. More specifically, the Center provides opportunities for probationary and tenured faculty members at the assistant or associate professor rank to meet the requirements for retention, tenure and/or promotion. The Center offers Faculty Development Grants in support of travel to meetings, assigned time to carry out special projects or mini-grants to support other aspects of faculty development. The Center for Teaching and Learning provides a sense of collegiality, and an understanding that the university is concerned about the instructional development of its entire faculty. The University also offers a University Services Summer Grant Program to assist probationary faculty in their course or curriculum development activities as well as a Community-Based Learning Program, which is funded through the Center for Community Volunteerism and Service Learning.

The Grants Development Office (GDO) is an academic support office within the University's Research and Graduate Studies Program. GDO provides information, guidance, and services to Cal Poly faculty, administrators, and senior staff engaged in externally funded research, curriculum development, and community service projects to:

- identify sources of funding;
- counsel faculty on the preparation of competitive proposal narratives;
- assist in the logistics of large-scale interdisciplinary proposals;
- budget proposals;
- prepare required sponsors' forms and assurances;
- communicate with appropriate human subjects or animal subjects committees;
- obtain institutional reviews and approvals;
- reproduce and deliver proposals.

The College's and University's Advancement Offices are also available to assist faculty with identifying sources of funding.

1.2.1e1 A description of the manner in which faculty members remain current in their knowledge of the changing demands of practice and licensure.

See faculty professional development activities this section along with faculty resumes activity section (for additional information, see Part 4, Section 3 Faculty Resumes – Supplemental Information).

1.2.1e2. A description of the resources (including financial) available to faculty and the extent to which faculty teaching in the program are able to take advantage of these resources.

The department’s policy for providing resources faculty scholarship activities can be found http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/administration/policies/development-funds.html, accessed 8/16/10.

The Faculty Development Funds Policy integrates support for professional development and class activities and supplies. The goal is to support faculty in their development and teaching.

A summary of the policy is as follows:

- A maximum of $300 per year of the funds (for tenured, newly tenured, probationary and full-time lecturer faculty members) may be used for travel expenses related to class field trips or to provide materials to students in support of class related activities. In 2008, these funds were discontinued and are now available on a case-by-case basis. This was a result of the Department's interest in assisting studios with specific projects (i.e., field trip to SF for 4 second year design studios) rather than guaranteeing each studio a very modest amount.
- Each tenured faculty member has available up to a maximum of $2,300 per fiscal year.
- Each newly tenured faculty member is allocated $2,300 per fiscal year for two years following receipt of tenure.
- Each probationary faculty member is allocated $3,500 per fiscal year.
- Each full-time lecturer has available (on a case by case basis) up to a maximum of $300 per fiscal year at the faculty member's request. The money may be used for travel expenses related to class
field trips or workshops that would enhance their teaching or to provide materials to students in support of class related activities. Funds are also available to full-time lecturers on a competitive basis for travel and registration expenses related to presenting papers. Each part-time lecturer and FERP has available up to a maximum of $100 per active quarter at the faculty member's request.

1.2.1e3a. Evidence of the school's facilitation of faculty research, scholarship, and creative activities since the previous site visit; including the granting of sabbatical leaves and unpaid leaves of absence, opportunities for the acquisition of new skills and knowledge, and support of attendance at professional meetings.

Faculty are entitled to take a leave without pay, a leave with difference in pay or a paid sabbatical leave over a duration of one to three quarters. Faculty may also elect to "swap" quarters by taking Fall, Winter or Spring Quarter off in exchange for teaching Summer Quarter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Sabbatical/Difference In Pay</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Dan Panetta</td>
<td>Difference In Pay</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Reich</td>
<td>Sabbatical</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Stannard</td>
<td>Difference in Pay</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Christopher Yip</td>
<td>Sabbatical</td>
<td>Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Karen Lange</td>
<td>Sabbatical</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each year, faculty are invited to participate over the course of one or two years in the Washington Alexandria Area Consortium (WAAC) as Director in Residence. The faculty participating since the last accreditation follow:

2010-11 Don Swearingen/Jonathan Foote
2009-10 Don Swearingen/Jonathan Foote
2008-09 Martin Harms
2007-08 Richard Beller
2006-07 Martin Harms/Jonathan Foote
2005-06 Martin Harms

Over the past six years, faculty travel disbursements within the Department have averaged approximately $16,000 per year.

- Each year, the Department sponsors one faculty person to participate in the AIA/ACSA Teacher's Seminar at the Cranbrook Institute. The Department’s ACSA Faculty Councilor is funded to attend the ACSA National and Western Regional Conferences each year. In addition, the Department sponsors one faculty who is a member of the Journal of Architectural Education (JAE) board to attend JAE meetings during the three-year board term, and one IDP faculty coordinator to attend the IDP Educator Coordinator's Workshop each year.

Professional development opportunities are posted on a professional development bulletin board located near the faculty mailboxes. Departmental professional development funds are awarded on the prioritized basis of: tenure-track faculty, faculty who have not recently received funding, and faculty whose teaching specialty relates most closely to the topic of the seminar, conference or workshop and full-time lecturers. The College also has a professional development fund. The CAED Professional Development Committee, comprised of faculty representatives from each Department, ranks applicants in order of merit and benefit to the College (see Part 1, Section 2.4 Financial Resources).

Research activities include computer-aided design and graphics, design process/programming, adaptive reuse, urban design/planning, ecological design, vernacular architecture, history/theory, building science/technology, housing, community design, color, energy, acoustics, professional practice, educational theory, health care, materials of construction, and accessibility (see http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/research/index.html and Team Room documentation).

Starting 2009 - 2010 CAED’s Planning, Design and Construction Institute (PDCI) is a source of seed money for faculty grants on an RFP basis. This group replaces the Innovation in Teaching Fund that was used for
the same purposes during the last visit. Following are the two awards for Architecture faculty research projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Robert Arens</td>
<td>Rapidly Assembled Emergency Shelters. Phase II</td>
<td>PDCI: $2,945.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH: $1,472.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH: $2,214.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Architecture Department taps into various state, trust and foundation accounts to provide faculty supplemental funding for expenses incurred during field trips and travel related to professional development. The Faculty Development Funds Policy was approved at the end of 2005 and integrates support for professional development and class activities and supplies. The goal is to support faculty in their development and teaching, and the Department guaranteed $2,000/yearly for each tenure-track faculty during their probationary years (between 4 to 6 years). Following the increased efforts of faculty to conduct scholarship over the years, the Department increased this amount to $3,500 in 2010. Faculty are responsible to judiciously prioritize how these funds need to be allocated. In addition, the following funds were available for probationary faculty:

1. In 2009 the Department initiated a one-time $2,000 stipend to assist faculty prior to submitting their dossier for tenure during their last tenure-track year.
2. In 2009, the Department offered all probationary faculty an additional one-time $2,000 stipend as many faculty had secured papers to be given at international conferences and needed the extra funds to present their papers. It is noteworthy that during the last two ACSA National Conferences ten Cal Poly faculty presented papers.

In 2010, Tenured Faculty competitive funds were doubled from $1,000 to $2,000 per academic year for presenting or refereeing a paper, organizing a workshop or conference, participating on a conference panel, attending a conference or workshop or other purposes agreed to by the Department Head that advance the faculty member’s professional development goals within the Department and College. In 2009-10 three faculty took advantage of this opportunity: Laura Jones-Novotny traveled for a research trip to the headquarters for worldwide design for IKEA in Almhult, Sweden; Sand Stannard and Tom Fowler attended the ACSA Conference in New Orleans. As probationary faculty have come to expect a stipend, in 2010 the Department initiated a guaranteed $2,000 for the two years following their promotion to assist newly tenured faculty to leverage these funds to secure external funding.

Since 2009, the Department offers to all faculty $2,000 when they achieve a new level of professional credentials, such as completing their Ph.D, or registration. Stephen Phillips and Mark Cabrinha both received their PhD’s and were able to take advantage of this opportunity.

While Cal Poly does not require lecturers to conduct research/service, the Department encourages lecturers to conduct research, and has offered on a case-by-case basis since 2008, funds to travel to conferences and/or other opportunities to present their scholarly activities. Prof. Eric Nulman (part-time lecturer) received funds to attend and present a paper at the ACSA Conference on New Orleans; Prof. Troy Peters (full-time lecturer in 07-08) to present a paper at the American Solar Energy Society in San Diego; and Keith Wiley (full-time lecturer) to present a paper at the National Conference of the Beginning Design Student (NCBDS) in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The Faculty Development Funds Policy is available at http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/administration/policies/development-funds.html.

The Architecture Department expenditures for professional development and field trips for the last six years are to be found in the Team Room documentation.

$8,000 in funds earned by the CAED’s CAD Research Center were re-directed to complement the Architecture Department Professional Development Fund. The Department was also able to transfer $15,000 in funds from our Conference Surplus Funds into the professional development account. These transfers will enable the Department to replace lost State funding in support of faculty professional development over the next two years. Surpluses from the Summer High School Program are redirected to the Professional Development Fund as well.

**College-Based Fee (CBF) Funding for Faculty Initiatives**

Faculty member Mark Cabrinha’s doctoral thesis focused on rapid prototyping and teaching and the CBF has supported his interests through funding of the F Stop renovation (2009-10: $7,566) and d[fab]lab (2008-
09: $55,794, 2009-10: $41,994)

Selected Faculty Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Marc Neveu</td>
<td>Pedagogy of Myron Goldsmith (with Ed Saliklis) – Canadian Centre for Architecture Collection Research Grant</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Jim Doerfler</td>
<td>Architecture Design Solutions Student Projects – Autodesk</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-09</td>
<td>Margot McDonald</td>
<td>Historic Structures Report for Mission San Miguel grant</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Robert Arens and Jim Doerfler</td>
<td>Research the pedagogy of architectural technology in lecture format courses – Cal Poly Information Technology Services Grant</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Stephen Phillips</td>
<td>New LA Schools: A Site of Massive Change – Graham Foundation</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Margarida Yin</td>
<td>Globalization’s Impact in Chinese Architecture – Travel Fellowship</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.1e3b. Evidence of balance of faculty workloads

The Collective Bargaining Agreement between The Board of Trustees of the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA), Unit 3 – Faculty, defines all faculty workloads. The current CFA/CSU Memorandum of Understanding ends June 30, 2010. Article 20, titled WORKLOAD defines the professional responsibilities of instructional faculty, the work year, and substitute assignments, pp 71-78 (see team room documents).

1.2.1e4. A description of the policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty appointment, promotion, and when applicable, tenure.

The ARPT and Post-Tenure Review Procedures and Criteria for the Architecture Department were established to supplement (establish 09/24/04 and 06/04/09 revision adopted) the criteria given in the Campus Administrative Policies (CAP) and agreement between the Board of Trustees of California State University and The California Faculty Association Unit 3 - Faculty (MOU), which are over-riding policy manuals of the University and are incorporated by reference. The role and scope of responsibility for the candidate, tenured faculty, peer review committee, and Department Head are incorporated into the ARPT and Post-Tenure Review Procedures and Criteria to offer clarification of the process and respective responsibilities of the participants in the review process. If conflicts arise between this document and the MOU or CAM, then the MOU or CAM shall prevail, with the MOU superseding.

1.2.1e5 A list of visiting lecturers and critics brought to the school since the previous site visit.

The Architecture Department’s speaker and visiting critic programs are alive and well. The College’s speaker program has averaged 15-20 lectures per year over the past six years. These distinguished guests not only provide a public lecture on current affairs in architecture and the allied disciplines but also often participate in design reviews, seminars and sometimes workshops during their stay. These visits vary from one to two days to a week or more. The Hearst Lecture Series is made possible by the generosity of the Hearst Foundations, Inc.

A faculty member from the CAED (typically from Architecture) is selected for a one to two year period to organize the series. The lecture series themes and topics attempt to interest students and faculty from the entire CAED. A greater majority of invited speakers are architects, but the series also includes landscape architects, artists, planners, environmentalists, and so on.

The College holds an Open House each April and invites distinguished architects to speak on this occasion. A number of student clubs within the College organize their own speaker series and workshops.
A partial listing of lectures and visiting critics since the last site visit is included below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heart Lecture Series</th>
<th>2009-10 Theme: Integrative Design Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Sharples - Principal, SHoP Architects, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Dyson - Director, Center for Architecture Science and Ecology (C.A.S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Horton - Mark Horton / Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Haeggland - BAR Architects/Alumnus of the Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Landy - Principal, AECOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will Bruder - Will Bruder + Partners, LTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea Ponsi - Andrea Ponsi Architect, Adjunct Professor, Syracuse University, Kent State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Manferdini - Principal, Atelier Manferdini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Marble - Founding Partner, Marble Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierluigi Serraino - Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Forsyth - Architect/Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Hughes - Associate Professor, University of Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benjamin Ball - Ball-Nogues Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl Daubman - Principal, PLY architects/Associate Professor, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preston Scott Cohen - Preston Scott Cohen Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Radziner - Principal, Marmol Radziner and Associates/Alumni of the Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Gates and James Brown - Principals, Public Architecture/Alumni of the Architecture Department, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph Roesling - Founding Principal, Roesling Nakamura Terada Architects (RNT Architects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Klinger - Associate Professor of Architecture, Ball State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008-09 Theme: Research in its relation to practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guy Nordenson - Principal Structural Engineer, Guy Nordenson and Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafi Segal - Architect/Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium: &quot;Research Practice&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatriz Colomina - Director of Graduate Studies, Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Wigley - Dean of Columbia University’s Graduate School of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Inaba - Director of C-Lab at Columbia University’s Graduate School of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raveevarn Choksubatchai - Associate Professor, Architecture, University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Keller - Founder and Director, MediaSCAPES Masters Degree program, Southern California School of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Iwamoto and Craig Scott - Partners, IwamotoScott Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Leatherbarrow - Professor, Architecture/Chair of the Graduate Group in Architecture, University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Payne - Architect/Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincenzo del Rio - Professor, City and Regional Planning, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinhold Martin - Associate Professor of Architecture, Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hartman - Fernau + Hartman Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Leddy - Principal, Leddy Maytum Stacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Plath - General Contractor, President, Plath &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Sanders: Joel Sanders Architect - Architect/Associate Professor, Yale University School of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Kudless - Assistant Professor, California College of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Hinds - Director, County of Marin Community Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Oubrerie - Principal, Atelier Wylde-Oubrerie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Watson - Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nader Tehrani - Office dA, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Luis Obispo</th>
<th>March 3, 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Tomb - Architect/ Cal Poly SLO alumnus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitoshi Abe - Architect, Atelier Hitoshi Abe, Japan</td>
<td>Feb 24, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Scarpa and Angela Brooks - Architects, Pugh + Scarpa</td>
<td>Feb 3, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Cohen - Architect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Stannard and Rob Pena - Faculty of the Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Jan 20, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elias Crouch - Principal, FUTURE invisible</td>
<td>Nov 4, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Grawunder - Designer/Cal Poly SLO alumna</td>
<td>Oct 14, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Steely - Architect, Craig Steely Architects</td>
<td>Oct 13, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Segal FAIA - Architect/Principal, JMAN Development Companies</td>
<td>Oct 7, 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional information on the Hearst Lecture series, see: http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/news-events/hearst-lectures.html

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visiting Critics</th>
<th>March 12, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Alfred Jacoby, Director of the DIA Bauhaus, Dessau, Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Wendy Ornelas, FAIA, Associate Dean at Kansas State University, and President of the NAAB, Cal Poly SLO alumna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Robert Condia, AIA, Professor at Kansas State University, Cal Poly SLO alumna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer Chris Talbott, Cal Poly SLO alumnus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Year Best of Show – 2010</th>
<th>March 14, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Golden, Associate Professor, University of Washington, Seattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsz Yan Ng, Ph.D. student, McGill University, Montreal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Adamson, Senior Associate Hornberger + Worstell, San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Martinez, heads up Morphosis's advanced technology shop, Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Year Best of Show – 2009</th>
<th>March 15, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex Wuo, AIA, Associate, Richard Meier &amp; Partners Architects LLP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Saunders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Robinson, Ph.D. student, Department of Architecture, University of California Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Strain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Tolosa, Cal Poly SLO alumnus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Susan Ubbelohde, Associate Professor, Department of Architecture, University of California Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Year Best of Show – 2007</th>
<th>March 17, 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raveevarn Choksumbatchai, Associate Professor of Architecture, Department of Architecture, University of California Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom Faulders, Cal Poly SLO alumnus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Groves, Architect with Morphosis, Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Krasnick, Assistant Director of the California College of the Arts (CCA), San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Trautman, John Trautmann Architects, Santa Monica, Cal Poly SLO alumnus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vellum Competition Guest Jurors</th>
<th>October 29, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 29, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Radziner: Marmol Radziner Architects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gates: Public Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Allen: CWA Studios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon Hillman: 6 inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Rittenhouse: Rittenhouse Furniture Studios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>November 7, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 7, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Aidlin: Aidlin Darling Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Reich: Cal Poly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Hamachai: KFA Architects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A list of public exhibitions brought to the school since the previous site visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Fabrications&quot;, an exhibit of architectural models,</td>
<td>April 6-24, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curated by Prof. David Leary, College of DuPage, Chicago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition/Silent Auction of Vern Swansen's work, sponsored by Alpha Rho Chi</td>
<td>February 7, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ticinese Architecture in the World&quot;, curated and presented by Virginia Tech</td>
<td>September 24-October 12, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A partial listing of other events, including annual events, since the last accreditation visit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Talent Design Competition Student Entries, Green Building Art Show, Built Green Resource Center, Santa Barbara, CA, host: USGBC California Central Coast Chapter (C4)</td>
<td>July 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 453 Natural Talent Design Competition Student Entries, San Luis Obispo Farmer's Market Exhibition, San Luis Obispo, CA, in conjunction with USGBC California Central Coast Chapter (C4)</td>
<td>June 3, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chumash 5th Year Thesis Show (Coordinated by B. Williams and J. Reich. All 5th year instructors assisted. Event accompanied by a publication by Aed Press –since 2007)</td>
<td>May 28-30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 453 Natural Talent Design Competition LEED for Homes Workshop II, Steve Mann, Home Energy Services</td>
<td>May 17, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 481 Studio Show &quot;Trans/Form&quot;, Cal Poly CAED Berg Gallery</td>
<td>May 14-17, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition: reKinetic: an exhibition exploring kinetic themes in architecture and art</td>
<td>April 15 – June 6, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 481 Studio Presentation at Parson School of Design</td>
<td>March 22, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine Alumni Social at LPA Architects. Presentation by Bauhaus Director Dr. Alfred Jacoby at the LPA Architecture office in Irvine, CA</td>
<td>March 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 453 Natural Talent Design Competition LEED for Homes Workshop I, Antonia Tsobanoudis, Davis Energy Group</td>
<td>April 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vellum_6 exhibition in Santa Barbara</td>
<td>January 14, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIAS Fall Film Series, Fall 2009</td>
<td>May 28-29, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 443: Five Workshops presented by Darden Architects (Cal Poly SLO alumnus)</td>
<td>February 23, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition: Emergency Shelter by Prof. Robert Arens and Prof. Ed Saliklis (ARCE)</td>
<td>December 9, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 481 Furniture Show &quot;Play!&quot;, Cal Poly CAED Berg Gallery</td>
<td>November 20-21, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED Film: Bird’s Nest: Herzog and de Meuron, organized by Prof. Woody Combrink</td>
<td>November 18, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Revit Training by Nancy Clark Brown</td>
<td>November 3-6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Revit and BIM by Ralph Roesling</td>
<td>October 24, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 481 Studio Show &quot;Tranformalism, Cal Poly CAED Berg Gallery</td>
<td>May 5-6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 481 Studio Presentation at Parsons School of Design</td>
<td>March 23, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 481 Joint Studio Presentation with Michael Fox’s studio at Cal Poly Pomona</td>
<td>March 7, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP Presentation along with NCARB representative; Haley Gipe (AIACC IDP State Coordinator North) and Rachel Kros from NCARB. 400 students participated in a full day of IDP presentations</td>
<td>October 12, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Rhino Training by Scott Leinweber and Tam Tran (Architecture Students)</td>
<td>October 7, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Rhino Training by Matt Moran, Reid Nystrom, Ryan Ouiumette (Architecture Students)</td>
<td>October 3, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Revit Training by Nancy Clark Brown</td>
<td>September 29-30, October 1-2, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Rhino by Scott Leinweber and Tam Tran (Architecture Students)</td>
<td>September 23, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lange’s Exhibition (Faculty of the Architecture Department) at the Blue Line Gallery in Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>July 18-19, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates’ ”Round Table” conducted by members of the CAED Advisory Council, twenty students attended</td>
<td>May 15, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 481 Studio Show “Tranformalism, Cal Poly CAED Berg Gallery</td>
<td>May 5-6, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vern Swanson Exhibition. Hosted by Alpha Rho Chi at the downtown Art Center</td>
<td>April 1-28, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour in Oakland of The Cathedral of Christ The Light by alum David Diamond, Associate Director with SOM, San Francisco</td>
<td>April 29, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture by Geoffrey and Rita Payne (London-UK). In conjunction with CRP</td>
<td>April 20-23, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 481 Studio Presentation at Parsons School of Design</td>
<td>March 23, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 481 Joint Studio Presentation with Michael Fox’s studio at Cal Poly Pomona</td>
<td>March 7, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Fair/Resume Building Preparation Workshop sponsored by Alpha Rho Chi</td>
<td>February 12, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture by Johanne Riegels Østergård (Copenhagen-Denmark)</td>
<td>February 23, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 443: Five Workshops presented by Darden Architects (Cal Poly SLO alumnus)</td>
<td>February 17, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Show: Prof. Laura Joines-Novotny, Arts Center in San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Dec – Jan 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Grasshopper (Rhino Plugin) by Mark Cabrinha</td>
<td>November 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Introduction to Rhino by Christopher Nikkel</td>
<td>November 8-9, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Rhino Scripting by Andrew Kudless (Matsys)</td>
<td>November 15, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Grasshopper (Rhino Plugin) by Mark Cabrinha</td>
<td>November 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture Department Student Fall Exhibition</td>
<td>October 30-31, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Neil Watson (Artist worked with students and faculty on watercolor techniques)</td>
<td>October 18, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Getty project for Mission San Miguel, CA, lead by Prof. Margot McDonald</td>
<td>January 26, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop: Andrew Kudless &quot;Workshop&quot;</td>
<td>November 15, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture by Jose Oubrerie. Alumni Social in San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>October 23, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture by Julius Shulman. Alumni Social in Westwood, CA</td>
<td>September 25, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor: Dr. Huining Zhao of Nanjing University of Technology, China</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Poly hosts 7th Annual UC/CSU/CCC Sustainability Conference. (faculty and students invited to the event)</td>
<td>July 31- August 3, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop/Lecture: Julius Shulman</td>
<td>May 20, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio weeklong workshop led by Prof. Gary Dwyer and Prof. Brian Ridley. Co-sponsored with the Deadalus Chapter of Alpha Rho Chi</td>
<td>April 28 –May 2, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of Welcome (WOW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vellum Competition (furniture competition juried by national jurors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall/Winter/Spring:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED and Architecture Department (every spring but ended 2009) Job Fairs. Event is accompanied by an alumni social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Institute of American Students (AIAS) events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Construction Specifications Institute Student Club (CSI) events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department hosts events for faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearst Lecture Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly exhibitions in the CAED Lobby Gallery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year Best of Show Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Poly faculty recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter/Spring:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Shows in the Berg Gallery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chumash 5th Year Thesis Show (Coordinated by B. Williams and J. Reich. All 5th year instructors assisted. New publication since 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring: Portfolio Workshop sponsored by Alpha Rho Chi (Faculty, alumni)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Village (2 day design/built competition for schools around the country: In conjunction with Cal Poly Open House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year End of the Year Barbeque</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA CCC Award Ceremony (faculty and students' participation that include a show of five Thesis projects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National AIA Convention with an alumni event (2009 features the 45th anniversary of the Architecture Department)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Awards Ceremony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Orientation, Advising and Registration (SOAR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Career Workshop (4 week program coordinated by M. Lucas and M. Cabrinha for high school students interested in architecture)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A student exhibit space is incorporated into the CAED's lobby. Student work rotates here on a weekly or biweekly basis. The Presentation Gallery (Bldg. 05 Rm. 105) serves as an exhibit space and as space for...
lectures and design reviews. An additional Gallery/Jury space has been incorporated into Bldg. 21 Rm. 105. Nine glass cabinets to display student work have been installed in Buildings 05 and 21.

At the end of each quarter, an Open Crit Schedule is posted in order to allow students and faculty to attend end-of-quarter reviews. Exhibits of student work are also organized during the CAED Open House, during the Fifth Year end-of-year celebration, and during the year as opportunities arise.

1.2.1e7 IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed, is trained in the issues of IDP, has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and, regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.

Intern Development Program (IDP) information is provided in the Practice course ARCH 443 (offered to fourth and fifth year students). Since the recent evolving Internship IDP 2.0, the Department has worked to demystify the path to licensure by organizing two sessions in 2009 and one in 2010. In 2009 we invited Rachel Kros (NCARB representative) and alumnae Haley Gipe – B.Arch 2006 (AIACC, IDP State Coordinator, North) - to present the new Intern Development Program (IDP) requirements. During the October 12th, 2009 full day presentation, approximately 400 students participated during studio visits of 3rd and 4th year, and a fifth year presentation. The morning session involved current and past Architecture faculty IDP coordinators with a lunchtime presentation to all faculty. Since the launching of the IDP web page and the Summer 2010 informational letter to student in 3rd year, the department is noticing increased interest in the IDP process.

As of 2010, Prof. Kent Macdonald is the IDP Architecture Department Coordinator, following Profs. Curt Illingworth and Allan Cooper. Prof. Macdonald and Department Head Henri T. de Hahn attended the 2010 Summer IDP Coordinators Conference in Chicago (August 2010). Pertinent information about the IDP Program can be found on the department’s web page under IDP [http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/current/idp.html], accessed 8/10/10.

1.2.1f1 A description of the process by which applicants to the accredited degree program are evaluated for admission

There are three types of applicants to apply for admissions to the Architecture Program: first time freshmen students, transfer students, and change of majors.

First time freshmen students:
The Department enrolled 108 students in 2009.
The University accepts freshman applications for the Fall Quarter only. The application process is defined by Cal Poly’s Admissions’ office and is for Fall applicants only. They need to declare a major to which the student will apply since Cal Poly requires applicants to declare a major on the application and follow the selection criteria define by the major. Per the admissions’ web page for Architecture [http://www.ess.calpoly.edu/_admiss/undergrad/Arch_LandArch.html], accessed 08/31/10. An excerpt from Web page is below:

“Cal Poly comprehensively reviews all applications as we look for students who have strong academic records and are active in and outside the classroom. Beyond the basic qualifications for the California State University, Cal Poly does not require a minimum standardized test score, class rank, or GPA. In fact, it is impossible to predict a candidate’s chances of admission by looking at the academic record and test scores alone. That is why we consider other factors for admission and do so in an objective format. When we review your application, we consider:

- Your program of study in secondary school/college (the major to which you are applying)
- Completion of CSU and Cal Poly program required coursework with a grade of C or better
- Academic performance in your classes (GPA)
- Standardized test scores
- Your extra-curricular activities and work experience.

As the Department is heavily impacted, the freshmen application process does not require the submission of a portfolio.

Transfer students:
The Department enrolled 34 transfer students in 2009.
The Department accepts freshman applications for the Fall Quarter.
For University requirements see [http://admissions.calpoly.edu/_admiss/undergrad/transfer-models/arch.html](http://admissions.calpoly.edu/_admiss/undergrad/transfer-models/arch.html), accessed 08/31/10) and for more specific information see part two, section 2.3 Evaluation of Preparatory/Pre-professional Education for more specific departmental information on the requirements for transferring in.

**Change of Major students:**
The Department enrolled 11 change-of-major students in 2009.

 Applicants must satisfy the same requirements as transfer students. See transfer student information above.

1.2.1f2. **A description of student support services, including academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship placement where applicable.**

The University provides on-campus transportation, special parking, priority registration, interpreters, readers, tutors and note takers for disabled students. The office of Disability Resource Center coordinates these efforts and provides testing, assessment and counseling services for a variety of recognized learning disabilities. The department was successfully able to accommodate DRC students: one student, who is paraplegic, got married and left to be with his wife in San Francisco in 2007; and a hearing impaired student who graduated in 2009 and is working in an architecture firm in Irvine, CA.

The campus Career Services Department (for more information see, part two, section 2.4.3 Access to Career Development Information) helps graduating seniors find full-time employment through on-campus interviews; assists continuing students in locating internships, summer employment, part-time work and Cooperative Education employment opportunities; and provides data on placement of previous graduates; and maintains an extensive career library. Career Counselors also provide occupation and training information; career counseling and planning; job search and resume writing techniques; and ability, interest, or personality assessment. Yearly Graduate Status Reports are printed and contain pertinent statistical information regarding employment rates, annual salary, job titles, employer’s firms, and number of students attending graduate school.

Students receive personal counseling from Psychological Services, a unit of the campus Health Services. In addition to receiving help in times of crisis, students can develop skills in such areas as communication, problem-solving, and decision-making. Health Services also maintains a 24-hour on-campus clinic, with a complete pharmacy, to serve students' health needs.

The University's Financial Aid Office administers a variety of loan funds, scholarships, awards, and Work Study employment opportunities to assist students financially. Since 2008, an increase in private donations has allowed the department to assist students who are in need. Other than assisting with scholarships and competitions related expenses, the Department has also supported students with summer workshop tuition (Terrefarm, Arcosanti), reimbursed/purchased computers/technology for students (Buck McBroom, David Watkins), gave tuition support (Ran Shahar, Matthew Truss), hired a student as an assistant for the Rome Program (David Watkins), and supported Black Commencement where two of our students graduated (Elise McCurley and Erika Peel).

In addition, the Department supported student travel for class field trips Berlin, Germany (Elizabeth Golden - 2007), China (Yin - 2008), Las Vegas (Fowler - 2009), Phoenix, AZ (Doerfler - 2009), Desert SW trip (DiSanto - 2010), Second Year SF and LA trips (Kent Macdonald, Robert Arens, Greg Wynn). Individual students and group competition support the Department has provided include: Chicago Mock Firm Competition (2009 and 2010), and Ghana, Africa (Carisa Nakano - 2010).

Student Academic Services (SAS) runs the Learning Center, which coordinates tutoring and provides training in study and testing techniques. Prospective students are assisted by University Outreach Services, with back-up support from the Poly Reps and the CAED Ambassadors. They provide regularly scheduled general campus tours and assistance on admissions and curriculum planning. Open House, the Summer Advising and Week of Welcome (WOW) programs assist new students by providing tours of academic facilities, career orientation and assistance on curriculum planning and building a suitable class schedule (including portfolio review for transfer credit).

The College of Architecture and Environmental Design has a full-time staff person, the Director of the Advising Center, who is assigned to student progress evaluation; the Associate Dean counsels students on Academic or Administrative Probation; and, until 2009, a Student Academic Services (SAS) Advisor spent eight-hours each week in the Architecture Advising Center assisting all CAED SAS students in issues
related to retention, campus and community services, graduate study opportunities, and other areas of specific interest to underrepresented students. This advisor has retired and the new advisor now provides daily office hours for CAED students at the Academic Skills Center in the Kennedy Library.

The Department has an Advising Center, which is lead by a faculty member who is Head of Advising, which is staffed for several hours each day by approximately 5 department faculty who chose to do this as part of their assigned time committee work. The Architecture Department Staff (i.e., scheduler, receptionist, etc) also assists with providing students needed advising information. The Department Advising Center provides students with curriculum, scheduling, career and personal advising; and also serves as an information clearinghouse and referral center. A Department Advising Reference Manual is available to students and advisors at the Advising Office. The Associate Head advises students on substitution, challenge and transfer credit and advises high school and community college students and parents on both a drop-in and appointment basis. The Department Office functions as an information clearinghouse for the Internship, Cooperative Education, and International Programs. A level of advising also takes place in Departmental clubs including the American Institute of Architects Students (AIAS), Alpha Rho Chi, and the CAED Student Council. Finally, each faculty member schedules five posted office hours per week for individual student counseling.

High school students considering architecture as a career are invited to participate in the five-week Summer Career Workshop. Instruction and hands-on experience are provided, and participants meet with key faculty for one-on-one advising, training and review.

All new students are provided several opportunities for individual counseling and review of their previous work. The first is during the Spring Quarter Portfolio Review and Open House. Another opportunity is a review/advising session held during the Summer Advising Program; and a third review period is held during the Week of Welcome.

The Department's approach to advising has been very creative, open, and supportive of the needs of the students at all levels within the curriculum. Students meet faculty they have not yet met in classes, and the resulting rapport and trust carry over into the classroom setting. Additionally, the department's advising system has been improved since the last visit by moving locations to a more visible place, the improvement of the University's online tools of providing access to student's informal transcripts and progress towards degree evaluation as helped.

1.2.1f3 Evidence of the school's facilitation of student opportunities to participate in field trips and other off-campus activities

San Luis Obispo is located in a fairly rural location equidistant to San Francisco and Los Angeles. The distance from San Luis Obispo is approximately 200 miles to each city. As a consequence, design Lab field trips to metropolitan locations in California are a major part of the curriculum.

The major field trips happen throughout each year, but with emphasis in the fifth year design studios, where the destinations are further away. In the last few years, thesis level field trips have occurred as far away as Barcelona, Boston, China, the Desert Southwest (US), Guanajuato/San Miguel de Allende (Mexico), Italy, Japan, New York City Paris, Seattle, and Switzerland. In addition, field trips are often tailored around faculty research interests, design review in other institutions, and firms such as: Chumash sacred sites, Mission Santa Barbara, Cal Poly Pomona (LA), California College of the Arts (SF), the Parsons School of Design (NYC), Skidmore Owings and Merrill (SF), OMA, REX, TWBTA, Peter Gluck, ARO, Asymptote, Lewis/Tsurumaki/Lewis, Schemata, Christoff-Finio, Orba, SHOP, Rafael Vidulich, FACE, Kiss/Cathcart, Olsen/Sundberg/Kundig/Allen, Jim Jennings, Peter Pfa, Eight, Bohlin/Cywinska/Jackson, Leddy/Myatt/Stacey, Kuth-Ranieri, Mark Horton, Sand Studio, Ververka, Jensen, Fougeron, Aiden-Darling, Jane Cee, Zak/de Vito James Cutler, Bohlin/Cywinska/Jackson, Weinstein A+U, Suyama/Peterson/Delguchi, Lead Pencil Michael Maltzan, Marmol-Radziner, Morphosis, Eric Owen Moss, Koenig-Eisenberg, Lorcan O’Herlihy, Pugh/Scarpa, Callas-Shortridge, Griffin-Enright, Many of the second, third year, and fourth year design labs travel almost every quarter, alternating between San Diego, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, Sacramento and the Napa Valley. As discretionary funds become available the Department has offered to a number of second year design studios the opportunity to travel together to visit the architecture and firms in the Los Angeles and/or San Francisco areas. When the AIA convention happens in California, or close by it becomes the destination of choice and the Department has sponsored students attendance that include the officers of the major architecture clubs.
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The fourth year study abroad programs include extensive formal field trips of Europe, and the students naturally take advantage of the vast European train network to craft their own informal field trips of the continent as well. At the International Program in Florence, the students are required to attend five field trips in the course of one year. These trips in Italy may include: 1) visits to Roman ruins in Pompeii, Paestum and Herculaneum, the Villa d’Este and the Amalfi Coast; 2) the Palladio field trip in the Po Valley; 3) the Carlo Scarpa field trip to La Tomba Brion-Vega, Castelvecchio in Verona, Querini Stampalia, La Scuola di Architettura and the Olivetti Showroom all in Venice; 4) the hilltowns of Tuscany and Umbria, including sojourns to San Gimignano, Pienza, Siena, Montepulciano, Cortona and Umbria; and 5) The Lake Region, including Lago Como and the mosaics of Ravenna. Almost every year, students also participate in a week long collaborative design charrette entitled “Coast 2 Coast” in Ascoli-Piceno, which included Italian students, Cal Poly Pomona, and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo students working in mixed teams (Cal Poly faculty representative: J. Reich). At the International Program in Copenhagen, the students undertake a far-reaching field trip of Scandinavia searching out the work of Jorgen Bo, Jorn Utzon, Alvar Aalto, Gunnar Asplund, and Eilel Saarinen as well as field trips to Germany. Additional extended field trips such as Japan, Thailand, Mexico, and Switzerland offer equal opportunities for students to gain an appreciation of various cultures, with the intend to expand the students’ breath of knowledge and world experience.

For the field trips in California, a small sampling of the buildings toured in Los Angeles include, but are not limited to: Frank Gehry’s Walt Disney Concert Hall, Loyola Law School, Aerospace Museum, his private residence, and the Geffen (Temporary) Contemporary Museum; Rafael Moneo’s Cathedral of Our Lady of the Angels; Arato Isozaki’s Museum of Contemporary Art (MOCA); Frank Lloyd Wright’s Hollyhock and Ennis Brown houses, the Bradbury Building; Ricardo Legorreta’s Pershing Square; Greene and Greene’s Gamble House; various restaurants, homes and the CalTrans District 7 Headquarters by Morphosis, and Roto Architects, the Eames’ House; R.M. Schindler’s Kings Road House and the Silver Lake Homes of Richard Neutra; Richard Meier’s Getty Center and the Getty Villa’s addition and renovation by Machado and Silvetti; as well as classic vernacular Los Angeles architecture, schools such as UCLA and SCI-Arc, and firms owed by alumni of the department –Marmol Radziner, Lorcan O’Herliy.

A small sampling of the buildings toured in San Francisco include, but are not limited to: Mario Botta’s SFMOMA; James Polshek Partner’s and Fumihiko Maki’s Yerba Buena Center for the Arts; Stanley Saitowitz’s Yerba Buena Lofts and the Congregation Beth Sholom; Mitchell and Giurgola’s Yerba Buena Gardens; Frank Lloyd Wright’s VC Morris Gallery; Willis Polk’s Hallidie Building (the world’s first curtain wall system); Herzog et de Meuron’s de Young Museum; Daniel Llsbeskind’s Jewish Museum; Portman’s Hyatt Regency; and Pier Luigi Nervi and Pietro Belluschi’s St. Mary’s Cathedral; as well as classic San Francisco sites, and firms such as Fourgeron Partners, HOK, SOM BAR, David Baker, Gensler, and Mark Jensen. In San Diego, Napa Valley, Sacramento, and Santa Barbara the examples include, but are not limited to: Louis I. Kahn’s original Salk Institute and its extention; Billie Tsien and Tod Williams Neuroscience Institute; Balboa Park, Little Italy by Rob Wellington Quigley, Ted Smith, Public, Richard Brisbois, and Jonathan Siegal; Dominus Winery by Herzog et de Meuron; Clos Pegase by Michael Graves; Dan Friedlander’s Limn Gallery, the Sustainable Housing development known as “Village Homes”; The Blades Residence by Morphosis; and Barton Myer’s own home.

1.2.14 Evidence of opportunities for students to participate in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other campus-wide activities.

Cal Poly has over 400 clubs and organizations. Architecture students at Cal Poly are very involved with the campus - emphasizing the 'hands-on' learning approach to education at Cal Poly.

- Architecture Clubs

The American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS) Faculty Advisor: Robert Arens (ARCH)
The AIAS is the country’s largest organization for students of architecture, providing the best programs, information and resources available. The AIAS is the student affiliate of the AIA and a link to professionals in the fields of architecture and environmental design. The mission of AIAS is to promote excellence in architecture education, training and practice; to foster an appreciation of architecture and related disciplines; to enrich communities in a spirit of collaboration; and to organize architecture students and combine their efforts to advance the art and science of architecture. AIAS has 53 members at Cal Poly. Through the leadership of the AIAS officers, the Cal Poly Chapter will be the first to host the Freedom By Design Program among California’s Architecture Schools, and is bidding to host the 2012 Forum in San Francisco.

Deadalus Chapter of Alpha Rho Chi Faculty Advisor: Tom di Santo (ARCH)
Membership in Alpha Rho Chi is open to all students of architecture, architectural engineering, city and regional planning, construction management, and landscape architecture. The local chapter's 20 members include approximately 15 Architecture students. The objective of the organization is "...to organize and unite in fellowship the architecture students in the universities and colleges of America and to combine their efforts so as to promote the artistic, scientific, and practical efficiency of the younger members of the profession." Cal Poly's chapter is also the custodian of the art work of architecture faculty member Vern Swansen and has organized a number of public events to share the talent of Vern's work. In 2008 a silent auction raised $3,050 towards the first Vern Swansen Scholarship.

Typical of a social fraternity, this group nurtures personalized and close relationships. However, Alpha Rho Chi is more than a social organization. This professionally-oriented fraternity provides the medium through which students with common professional interests can develop lasting relationships, ones that extend well beyond college years and grow into professional associations as well as with current practicing professionals. This organization generally enjoys strong faculty support because it helps to bridge the gaps, real or imagined, between students, faculty, and practicing professionals. Alpha Rho Chi stresses the importance of high professional ethics, rigid standards, and exemplary practices. Alpha Rho Chi emphasizes the importance of professional development programs to supplement the regular scholastic programs of speakers, tours, forums, and research projects designed to broaden the professional experience of their members.

Design Village/Open House Faculty Advisor: M. Lucas (ARCH)
This event was started in 1974 by two architecture students who conceived the idea to allow students from schools around the country to come to Cal Poly Canyon to compete against one another designing and building structures that they could inhabit for a four-day period. The idea was to inspire more student activity in the University during Open House week which was known held during the spring quarter. A Design Village Committee, comprised of the Associate Dean, the Architecture Department Head, the faculty advisor and the student coordinator(s), meets periodically throughout the year. A Design Village Speaker Program is coordinated by a student sub-committee.

- Activities

Annual Awards Banquet recognizing leadership
Each Spring Quarter, the College holds an Awards Banquet to confer CAED and Department Recognition Awards. These awards recognize outstanding service and/or leadership within the community, university, College and Departments. Such awards include: Service to the Off-Campus Community; Contributions to the Objectives and Public Image of the University; Contributions to the Objectives and Public Image of the College; Outstanding Service and Contribution to the College; Service to the Department; Outstanding Student; and, Outstanding Leadership.

Living-Learning Center
The Living/Learning Program (LLP) is a residentially-based program comprised of six residence halls, each associated with an academic college at Cal Poly. Living within these theme halls, the student enjoys living and learning with others enrolled in the same academic college. The student also has opportunities to interact with faculty and other professionals in activities and presentations aimed at developing career interests, academic success skills, campus resources, and social interaction. The goal is to connect the student with his/her peers and faculty on campus. The College of Architecture and Environmental Design Living-Learning Center is the oldest of Cal Poly's LLPs, and has worked directly with several community service projects to bring "concept to life through public action." The goal is to explore Architecture and Design through valuable interaction and hands-on experience. This LLP also provides drafting stations in the halls to assist residents with class work and projects such as:

* Sand castle competition
* Assistance with design projects for the San Luis Obispo Botanical Gardens
* CAD presentation

Some Other LLP Highlights:
* Meet and work with faculty, professionals and other students
* Guest presentations and interactive projects
* Community service projects
• Student sessions and study groups
• Barbecues, cooking classes, events, and lectures with professors
• Career ideas and advising
• Academic skills programs
• Tours and trips relevant to the major
• Leadership opportunities and club fairs
• LLP Honor Society

- College of Architecture and Environmental Design Student Council Clubs

CAED Student Council
Faculty Advisor: K. Richard Zweifel (CAED)
The College Student Council is comprised of representatives from nine student clubs including 2 representatives from Scarab (Arch), and one representative each from AIAS (Arch), Alpha Rho Chi (Arch), Design Village (Arch), SCASLA (Larch), SLA (Larch), SEAOC (ArcE), ASCM (CM), and Assoc. Students in Planning (CRP). Also represented is a student member of the Open House Lecture Series Committee and four CAED Student Council Officers including the President, VP/Fund Raising Chair, Treasurer and Secretary.

Student Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects SCASLA
Faculty Advisor: David Watts (LA)
The ASLA student chapter is a student organization that is affiliated with the National American Society of Landscape Architects whose mission it is to promote education, community involvement, student activities, a sense of spirit and pride, wise planning, and artful design of cultural and natural environments. ASLA involvement is quite extensive from community clean ups, Habitats for Humanity, Open House activities, garden show exhibits, national professional and student conference participation, interdisciplinary activities, and inviting guest speakers to share their knowledge.

Sigma Lambda Alpha Honor Society (SLA)
Faculty Advisor: Joe Ragsdale (LA)
Honor Society for Landscape Architecture students honors those with a 3.2 gpa and higher. The activities are geared toward academic and professional development such as inviting outside professionals to come in for reviews of projects or lectures.

Structural Engineers Association of California (SEAOC)
Faculty Advisor: Abraham Lynn (ARCE)
The function of SEAOC is to provide students with exposure to the world of structural engineering in California through guest speakers, field trips, a day-long job seminar called Structural Forum, membership in a professional organization, and contact to employers. SEAOC is the only structural engineering based club in the CAED. SEAOC also offers a Big/Little Sibling program.

Associated Students of Construction Management (ASCM)
Faculty Advisor: Paul Weber (CM)
The ASCM offers students the opportunity to learn and be involved in the construction management profession, to network and develop relationships with potential employers, and meet fellow students. The student chapter upholds the ideals and standards of two sponsoring organizations - Associated Builders and Contractors and Associated General Contractors - and share the same principles of skill, integrity, honor, and responsibility.

Associated Students in Planning (ASP)
Faculty Advisor: Kelly Main (CRP)
The Associated Students in Planning (ASP) is a group that works to provide city and regional planning students with professional and social activities allowing them to become better acquainted with their peers and professors. ASP serves as the main liaison between students and faculty members. The goal of ASP is to provide a network of support for our members and to bring students from all levels together to increase the success of their educational experience.
- Other Clubs Associated with the College of Architecture and Environmental Design

Renewable Energy Club (REC) Faculty Advisor: Sandy Stannard (ARCH)
The Renewable Energy Club is a cross-disciplinary organization whose mission is to advance and promote renewable energy and to seek out means of creating an environmentally sustainable future. Current project: Creation of Cal Poly entry in the 2005 Solar Decathlon.

CAED Ambassadors Program Faculty Advisor: Ray Ladd (CAED)
The CAED Ambassadors, founded in 2002, is an organization working to open the lines of communication between students, faculty, the industry, and any and all other individuals interested in the college. The Ambassadors aid in CAED-sponsored events and serve as consultants for the CAED student body. Our goal is to encourage interdisciplinary activities and to build a reputation of being a reliable resource for the college.

Design Build Institute of America (DBIA) Faculty Advisor: Dr. Barbara Jackson (CM)
Design Build Institute of America Student Chapter is a professional organization of students from all disciplines (CAED, College of Engineering, College of Business) that deal with designing and building the environment we live in. This group of unique students believe or are interested in integrating their knowledge and skills through a collaborative process with the other disciplines while in education and further developing their interdisciplinary relationships into the professional world.

Society of Women Engineers (SWE) Faculty Advisor: Karen Bangs (CENG), Lily Laiho (CENG)
SWE is a professional organization that provides both a social network between students and a career network with industries. Such programs like Evening with Industry and Show an Engineer assist Cal Poly students in connecting with other engineers to find a co-op, internship or full-time job suitable for them. SWE also has many volunteer opportunities, including tutoring in many ages and environmental clean up. SWE is open to all majors and sexes.

The Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) Faculty Advisor: Jim Doerfler (ARCH)
CSI student club gathers and presents information to be used by all other clubs in the CAED. Students have access to the product samples and manufacturers' binders located in the Evelyn and Harold Hay Media Resource Center (05-101). CSI also specializes in "behind the scene tours" of major building construction and trips to unfinished, newly finished and buildings that are of significant interest and co-sponsors the yearly Construction Sciences Forum.

National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) Faculty Advisor: Scott Kelting (CM)
The National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) Student Chapter provides students in building-related fields an opportunity to learn more about residential building through membership in the industry's largest trade association. The Cal Poly Chapter is sponsored by the Home Builders Association of the Central Coast (HBACC). As the chapter's sponsor, the association serves as an invaluable information source for the chapter. Members of the HBACC work closely with CM faculty and Cal Poly NAHB student members, and participate in club and department activities regularly. Students members of NAHB attend monthly HBA dinners and board meetings, network with HBA members, have access to the NAHB online library, participate in fundraising events and community projects, and compete in the annual NAHB residential competition.

Sigma Lambda Chi Faculty Advisor: Mike Montoya (CM)
The purpose of Sigma Lambda Chi is to recognize outstanding students in construction. Objectives include the rendering of service to the field of construction, the development of good relations among academia, industry, and the public, and the recognition of outstanding professionals in construction and allied fields.

Emerging Green Builders Faculty Advisor: Scott Kelting (CM)
Emerging Green Builders are students and young professionals dedicated to becoming and recruiting the future leaders of the green building movement.

Latinos for Academic Design Advancement Faculty Advisor: Barry Williams (ARCH), Jonathan Reich (ARCH)
Latinos for Academic Design Advancement (LADA) is a network designed to ease the transition into the CAED lifestyle, provide support, guidance, and networking opportunities among the CAED
students, and to exchange knowledge among the different class levels and various disciplines. Membership is open to all CAED and Cal Poly students.

1.2.1f5 Evidence of the school’s facilitation of student research, scholarship, and creative activities since the previous site visit, including research grants awarded to students in the accredited degree program, opportunities for students to work on faculty-led research, and opportunities for the acquisition of new skills and knowledge in settings outside the classroom or studio.

The Department has sponsored various student research and creative activities outside the studio, including the following general off-site studio activities:

1. In 2007-08, the Department supported 15 class field trips to the following locations: China; Mexico; New York City; Seattle, WA; Berkeley, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Jose.
2. Despite reductions to Studio Support in 2008-09, the Department still supported 9 field trips to Berlin; Japan; Madrid; Phoenix, AZ; Las Vegas, NV; Seattle, WA; San Francisco, and Big Sur. The Department also provided materials support for 3 classes.
3. In 2009-10, the Department was forced to maintain a freeze on Studio Support funds due to the budget crisis, but did provide 3 class field trips to: Chicago, IL; a pan-South West Desert trip; and San Francisco.

In addition, the Department also provided monetary support to individual students and student groups for research and scholarship projects:

1. Since Fall 2006, the Department’s Bank of America Low-Income Housing Project IRA funds have sponsored a group of students, led by Prof. Daniel Panetta, to conduct site research in the Salinas Valley and visit firms in San Francisco and Los Angeles for the annual Bank of America Low-Housing competition.
2. In Fall 2007, the Department sponsored two students, Lisa Gallego and Enrique Cervantes, to attend the Monterey Design Conference; supported Brian Yang’s travel expenses to attend the SARA Awards in San Francisco (he was a recipient); and sponsored a group of 8 students to attend the 16th Annual International Neukloster Herbstakademie in Germany.
3. In Spring 2008, with a generous donation, the Department sponsored tuition for Lucia Castello and Magdalena Lojewska to attend the Arcosanti Summer Workshop.
4. In Fall 2008 Scott Mann and a group of his peers submitted a project to the Leading Edge Competition under the direction of Howard Weisenthal, and the Department provided support for their materials and travel expenses.
5. In Winter 2009, the Department provided support for students to compete in the AIA Los Angeles 2x8 Shift Competition.
6. In Spring 2009, John Bellasario and his peers were sponsored by the Department to compete in the Chicago Mock Firm Competition. Again in Spring 2010, the Department sponsored David Lee and Anthony Stahl to compete in the Chicago Mock Firm Competition.
7. In June 2009, the Department’s Kenneth Rodriguez Lab funds provided two new computers to support the sponsored studio’s design research.
8. In 2009 and 2010, the Department sponsored students to attend the AIAS Grassroots Leadership Conference in Washington, DC.
9. In Spring 2010, the Department’s Student Leadership fund supported Carisa Nakano’s thesis research in Ghana.
10. In Summer of 2010, the Department sponsored tuition and travel expenses for Anthony Stahl to attend the Terrefarm Workshop in New York.

1.2.f6 Evidence of support to attend meetings of student organizations and honorary societies.

The Architecture Department remains instrumental in being available and assisting financially student club officers to attend national meetings. The Department has sent officers to the AIAS Grassroots Leadership Conference: Sarah Fleming (2009), Hazel Cruz and Brent Gibbens (2010). In addition, the Department and CAED will commit funds to send eight students to Forum 2010 in Toronto, as well as co-sponsor Forum 2011 in San Francisco (if the AIAS is successful in their bid), and assist with fund raising for the Freedom By Design Program (2010).

AIAS has received additional financial assistance from the Department between 2009 and 2010 to: lower the first time membership dues, thus increasing new memberships; organize a film series where complementary
food and sodas were offered; and support the on-campus Mixer/F-Stop Open House involving alumni and architects from SLO county.
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1.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance

1.2.2a A description of the administrative structure for the program, the academic unit within which it is located, and the institution.

The administrative structure is defined at three levels:
1. The California State University System (CSU)
2. The Institution (California Polytechnic State University)
3. The College (College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED))
4. The Department

The California State University System

The California State University system is a leader in high-quality, accessible, student-focused higher education. With 23 campuses, almost 433,000 students, and 44,000 faculty and staff, it is the largest university system in the United States. As part of this system, the overall administrator includes a CSU Chancellor and a CSU Board of Trustees who set overall system policies, and interact with the Governor and the Legislature in determining overall system student enrollment targets and overall system budgets. These agreements are annual, and secured as part of the State of California Budget approval process each fiscal year. The Chancellor’s Office in Long Beach develops a system in consultation with the Presidents of each of the campus for the allocation of student enrollment targets and campus budgets each year. The University of California system is a separate California higher education system.

California Polytechnic State University’s Organizational Diagram

California Polytechnic State University

The President of Cal Poly serves at the pleasure of the Chancellor, with presidential searches undertaken using a committee reporting to the Chancellor that includes representatives of the Board of Trustees, other
CSU committee appointees, and representatives of the alumni, students, faculty, and administrators of the campus. Cal Poly has a current presidential search in progress as a result of the retirement of President Warren Baker in June 2010, who served as president of Cal Poly for 31 years, the longest serving President of any of the CSU campuses. Chancellor Reid has appointed Robert Glidden, former president of Ohio State University, as the acting President during this presidential search.

The administrative organization at Cal Poly is constituted of a series of senior Vice Presidents who oversee major campus divisions and all directly report to the President and are appointed by the President following a national search model required by the CSU policies for all senior management positions. These include in order of budgetary size the following:

- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Vice President for Administration and Finance
- Vice President for Student Affairs
- Vice President for University Advancement – currently vacant and unit reporting to the Provost

There are smaller administrative units that report to the Vice Presidents all of which are shown on the Universities Organization Chart that is part of the public website.

The Provost oversees the division of Academic Affairs on behalf of the president, which includes the six academic Colleges, and ten non-instructional units that support the academic life and co-curricular life of the University. The Provost has bi-weekly meetings with the nine member Dean’s Council, which includes the core academic units of the University headed by Deans of the following units, all of whom have combined management and academic appointments: College of Agriculture, Food, and Environmental Sciences (CAFES); College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED); College of Engineering (CENG); College of Liberal Arts (CLA); Orfalea College of Business (OCOB); College of Science and Math (CSM); Library Services; Cal Poly Continuing Education; Research and Graduate Programs.

The Provost oversees seven other non-instructional units that provide functional and co-curricular support for the academic units of the University. They participate in Dean’s Council on an as-needed basis when advice and approval of the deans is solicited by the Provost as specific projects or programs are being developed and adopted for Academic Affairs: Vice Provost for Programs and Planning; Vice Provost for IT and Chief Communication Officer; Associate Vice President for Inclusive Excellence; Associate Vice President, Academic Personnel; Assistant Vice Provost for Systems and Resource Management; Assistant Vice President for Admissions, Recruitment, and Financial Aid; Director Intercollegiate Athletics.

In addition to the established formal mechanisms for providing managerial oversight, The Provost forms campus wide working groups and committees to undertake initiatives for enhancing the academic environment of the University, or carrying out charges by the university president. Most recently the Strategic Planning Committee set up by the president, but operated under the guidance of the Provost, completed several years of work leading to the adoption of a new Strategic Plan in 2009. The dean of the CAED was the delegate from Deans Council serving on that working committee. Each year the representative deans and senior managers from the sixteen divisions of Academic Affairs hold summer retreats, as well as academic year special working sessions, to develop joint projects for the year. The Provost established working groups appropriate to those issues charged to develop policy and program recommendations for his adoption and implementation, as approved by the president. Major issues addressed or in progress by these Provost-led initiatives over the last two years include the following improvements in the academic life of students and faculty, all completed and implemented except as noted:

- Budgetary tracking and decision support system
- Student progress to degree policies and procedures
- Campus wide student disqualification policies and procedures
- Campus wide change of major policies and procedures
- New student block scheduling and registration system
- Curricular transparency project
- University progress and success indicators (begun 2010)
- University enhanced student advising and success system (begun 2010)
The administrative structure of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED) is comprised of an overall management group composed of the Dean, an Associate Dean, an Assistant Dean for Advancement and Alumni Relations, and an Assistant Director of Advancement. The Dean is appointed by the President of the University, and reports to the Provost. The Dean is responsible for the overall operations of the college, including oversight of all instructional programs, final approval of all faculty and staff hires and work assignments, review of all promotion and tenure, and sabbatical applications, securing and allocation of public and private financial resources, assignment of space, and development of overall policies and procedures. This also includes coordination of all external relations and communications. The college has an additional unusual operations component which includes stewardship and responsibility for the nine acre Poly Canyon experimental grounds assigned to it by the University, and several other special facilities including staffing and operating the following: Hay Passive Solar House in Atascadero; Evelyn and Harold Hay Media Resource Center (MRC); Photo Presentation Facility; Support Shop; Concrete Fabrication and Testing Yard; High Bay Materials Testing Lab; Solar Decathlon Experimental House.

The College employs fifteen full time employees to support the operations of the Dean’s Office and the various college special facilities as follows: 5 Administrative support staff: Special Projects Coordinator, Administrative Analysis Specialist I Exempt (AA/S), Administrative Analysis Specialist I (AA/S), Administrative Support Assistant (ASA/Receptionist), Administrative Support Coordinator I (ASC Advancement); 6 support staff: Support Shop Manager, Director Hay Media Resource Center, Assistant Support Shop Technician, Photographer/Media Specialist, Director of Advising Center; Advising Assistant, and 4 computer technicians in the following areas: 2 CAED, 1 shared LA/ARCH, and 1 shared CM/ARCE.

The College has five departments that confer five undergraduate degrees, and three graduate degrees:

- Architectural Engineering – Bachelor of Engineering and MS Architecture/Architectural
Engineering Specialization

- Architecture – Bachelor of Architecture and MS Architecture
- City and Regional Planning – Bachelor of Science in CRP, and MCRP
- Construction Management – Bachelor of Science in Construction Management
- Landscape Architecture – Bachelor of Landscape Architecture

The Dean appoints the department heads, after a national open search and consultative approval process initiated by the departmental faculty. All department heads are delegated full operational responsibility over their departmental affairs, and share with the College joint responsibilities for external relations, public affairs, private fundraising, alumni events, strategic planning, faculty and staff recruiting, and coordination of common and interdisciplinary classes and projects. Department and College interface and coordination include work carried out using college wide working groups and special committees in the following manner:

- Department Head/Dean’s Office meetings – every other week
- College-wide permanent faculty committees with representatives from all five departments: College Peer Review Committee, College Assessment Committee, College Scholarship and Awards Committee, College Curriculum Committee
- Ad Hoc College special purpose faculty committees (current committees with multiyear projects) Sustainability Committee, Technology Committee, Metro Program Committee, Haiti/International Engagement Committee, Interdisciplinary Course/Integrated Project Delivery Group

In addition, the College has 10 faculty-led Centers and Institutes: California Center for Construction Education (CCCE), Community Safety and Sustainability Group (CSSF), Collaborative Interactive-Integrative Design-Studio (CIDS), Collaborative Agent Design Research Center (CADRC), Earthquake-Resistant Building Systems, Evelyn and Harold Hay Fund (EHHF), Planning, Design, and Construction Institute (PDCI), Renewable Energy Institute (REI), The Sustainable Environments Emphasis Group (SEE Group), and Geographic Information System Technology (GIST). Three of the Centers have faculty directors and generate research and contract activities that provide sufficient income to support a partial or full time director: CADRC, CCCE, and PDCI. The PDCI is the newly established (2008) center established to foster multiple interdisciplinary faculty endeavors and has faculty from all five departments, plus the dean, on its Advisory Council.

Additional Academic Standing committees of the College that have representatives from one or more departments and have permanent charges include: Instructional Technology (CITC); Design Village; Environmental Studies Minor; Graduate Programs; Hearst Lecture Series; Housing Concentration; Innovation in Teaching Fund; Instructional Technology; MRC Advisory; Professional Development; Real Property Development; Sexual Harassment Prevention; Sustainable Environments Minor.

The College faculty members participate through delegates in the Academic Senate, representing the interests of their department and the college at that body. The Senate has an operating budget and provides some release time for some of the more time intensive officer and committee chair positions. Departmental and College faculty are represented on the standing committees of the following:

University Senate Leadership and Committees:
- Senate Chair; Senator; Caucus; Budget and Long Range Planning; Curriculum; Distinguished Scholarship Awards; Faculty Affairs; Fairness Board; Grants Review; Instruction; Research and Professional Development; Sustainability; General Education Committee (GE); Governance; GE Areas A & C; Japanese Cultural Exchange Club; Korean American Student Association

University Committees:
- ACLU; ATE Steering; Branding; Civil Liberties Alliance Advisor; Commencement; Ethnic Studies; EEP Council; Green Campus Interns; Honors Program; Intellectual Property Review; Solar House Advisory Board; WASC Institutional Proposal

The dean of the College by the nature of its programs is a representative on the following University staffed committees established by the president to seek regular guidance on special matters:

- Campus Planning Committee – meets as needed and minimum of once a year to review and comment on every significant proposed new facility or infrastructure project for the campus, and the overall campus Master Plan, at key stages of design development, and final design approval. Final approval of all capital projects is by the CSU regardless of funding source
- University Sustainability Committee – meets monthly, the dean is appointed chair of the committee. The group provides the Campus Facilities and Planning division with responses to
campus efforts at the program, operations, and facility development efforts to enhance sustainability, helps shape policy recommendations for adoption by the President, and assists in the coordination of student and faculty collaboration with facilities and operations staff on tangible joint sustainability learning and research projects

1.2.2b A description of the program’s administrative structure.
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Architecture Department Overview

Because the Architecture Department is the third largest on campus, its administrative structure is more complex and larger than most other departments within the University.

There are several components to the architecture department’s administrative structure:

1. Department Head
2. Associate Head (9 months)
3. Assistant Head (9 months)
4. Department Staff:
   a. Administrative Support Coordinator
   b. Class Scheduler
c. Accounting Assistant
d. Front Desk Assistant (10 months)
e. Student Office Assistant
f. Support Shop Equipment Tech (.8)
g. Technology Services Equipment Specialist (.5)

5. Tenured Faculty Chair
6. Tenured Faculty
7. Faculty Area Coordinators
8. All Faculty (Tenured, Tenure-Track and Part- and Full-Time Lectures)
9. Committee Chairs

The Department Head and Associate Department Head (the Assistant Department Head is considered a full-time faculty member) are ex officio members of all of the Department’s committees and meet weekly to coordinate the various components of the Architecture Program (staffing, courses, enrollment, resources, advancement, etc.), and to develop and review proposals for change. All Departmental Standing Committees elect annually a new chair that follows protocols of Robert’s Rules of Order, and are responsible for the implementation of the academic content of each stream. Committees meet at the beginning of each quarter to discuss the teaching objectives, assess past learning outcomes, review new initiatives, and to oversee the content of the whole stream. Any new course changes must be submitted and approved by the Curriculum Committee.

Each committee consists of tenured and tenure-track faculty members who teach a required, core, or elective course in a particular stream. Part-time and full-time lecturers are not required by the CFA/MOU to conduct committee work, but the chairs encourage participation. The Department believes that “This commitment of time and energy is necessary to facilitate the model of shared governance adopted by the faculty and counts toward a faculty member’s development in terms of service.” Elected committee members have voting privileges and receive meeting agendas and minutes. Other faculty members are welcome to attend meetings as observers but cannot vote. Committees meetings are typically scheduled on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 11:00am and are announced to all faculty members through the weekly Faculty Digest.

An Architecture Department Governance document is being revised and will include student representatives to participate in select committees as non-voting members.

The following groups and representatives report to the Department:

- Department Head
- Associate and Assistant Department Head
- Graduate Studies Coordinator

Standing committees:
- First Year Design
- Second Year Design
- Third Year Design
- Fourth Year Design
- Fifth Year Design
- Environmental Control Systems
- History/Theory/Criticism
- Practice 1st Year
- Practice 2nd Year
- Practice 3rd Year
- Practice 4th Year
- Graduate Programs
- The Tenured Faculty (TF)
- Curriculum
- Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (PRC)
- Off-campus Coordinators: IP Denmark, IP Italy, Japan/Mexico/Rome/Thailand Extended Field trip, Canberra/Bauhaus/CEPT/Paris Exchange, Professional Studio/Co-op/Internship, San Francisco Urban Design Internship Program, and WAAC.
- ACSA Counselor
- College Base Fees (CBF) Ombudsman
- Employment Equity Facilitator
- Faculty Merit Award
- Library Liaison
- Portfolio Review
• Professional Leaves/DIP
• Publication
• Scholarship and Competitions
• Search and Screen
• Student Advising
• Vellum Furniture Competition

Club Advisors
- AIAS Advisor
- Alpha Rho Chi Advisor
- Cal Poly Green Builders
- California Student Sustainability Coalition
- Construction Specifications Institute Student Club (CSI) Advisor
- Renewable Energy Club
- Scarab

Additional Details of Components of Architecture Department’s Administrative Structure

Department Head
According to the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM) 370.2E, “Common Responsibilities of Department Heads/Chairs”, departmental/director responsibilities include the following:
1) Leadership in recruiting faculty, staff and students
2) Serves as a separate level of review in making recommendations on appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion as determined by the dean in consultation with each department
3) Supervision of staff
4) Oversight and promotion of faculty and staff professional development
5) Leadership in teaching and student advising
6) Allocation of teaching assignments to faculty
7) Responsibility for class scheduling
8) Leadership in curriculum development
9) Service as department liaison to school council and dean
10) Leadership in external activities such as relationships with alumni, foundations, corporations and employers of graduates

The Head of the Architecture Department serves at the pleasure of the Dean, with a review at the end of every three years. The Associate and Assistant Department Heads are appointed by the Department Head.

Associate and Assistant Heads
The Architecture Department is managed by: a full-time Department Head; an Associate Head with .5 administrative assigned time and a .5 teaching assignment; and an Assistant Head with a full time teaching load. The Department Head is responsible for budget administration, faculty and staff personnel, professional development, scheduling, facilities, student progress tracking and development. The Associate and Assistant Heads assist in the areas of curriculum development, accreditation, catalog package and course proposals, transfers and articulation, portfolio review, advising, off-campus programs, external affairs, fundraising and special events. The Head and Associate and Assistant Heads and the support staff meet regularly to discuss and coordinate department business and upcoming agendas.

Department Staff
The Administration Support Coordinator assists the Head on the development and tracking of budgets, personnel decisions, facilities management, property accountability, and publications, as well as providing general administrative and data support and office management. Administrative Support Coordinator II, “Administrative Support Coordinator”, full-time, 12-month. This full-time position supports the Department Head, Associate Head and Assistant Head and supervises all other office staff. Task assignments include personnel-related functions; budget development and expenditure projections; Advancement assistance; faculty meeting minutes; supervision of the departmental filing, record-keeping, and equipment accountability; statistical reporting; and faculty/staff attendance reporting. More specifically, the Administrative Support Coordinator prepares and sends out faculty offer letters; conducts the Retention, Promotion and Tenure processes, and faculty recruitments; maintains a faculty roster; tracks fiscal resources from all sources; approves expenditures; coordinates property maintenance agreements and department contracts; makes Department policy recommendations; develops and implements department procedures and forms; manages a variety of data bases; coordinates faculty office and telephone assignments; and serves as liaison to Cal Poly State and Foundation administrative offices. In addition to
the above duties, the ASCII recruits, trains, supervises and evaluates all full-time clerical positions and as many as three student assistants.

Administrative Support Coordinator-I, “Class Scheduler and Off-Campus Programs Facilitator”, full-time, 12-month. Due to the volume of course sections taught (145 sections per quarter) by the Architecture Department, the tasks assigned to this position are primarily related to scheduling courses and assisting faculty and students with scheduling-related problems. This position’s secondary responsibility is to support the Department's off-campus programs by assisting the Department Head and Faculty Coordinators with preparation and monitoring of exchange agreements, tracking incoming/outgoing exchange participants applications, as well as those enrolled in the professional studios, co-ops and internships, accepting and preparing program applications for faculty review, and maintaining all related records. In addition, the ASC I participates in the training and supervision of office student assistants; maintains the Course Reference Manual, course enrollment records, admissions and transfer files; manages mandatory advising holds on student records; and initiates department correspondence with new incoming students.

Administrative Support Assistant-II, “Accounting Assistant”, full-time, 12-month. The primary administrative function of this position is keeping the department Operations and Expenses (O&E) records, preparing online purchase requisitions, tracking purchases and equipment warranties, and reconciliation of accounts. In addition, the Administrative Assistant distributes Department scholarship information; approves the Department's student payroll; processes donor gifts, prepares all department travel claims and reimbursements; and provides limited typing, data entry and clerical support for the Department Head.

Administrative Support Assistant-I, “Front Desk Assistant”, full-time, 10-month. The Architecture Department has for the past decade supported three staff positions. Due to the increase in enrollments in recent years, and the ever-increasing workload demand at the department level caused by advancement efforts and the decentralization of university functions, the department has added one additional full-time 10-month support staff member effective Fall 2007 to serve as full-time Front Desk Assistant. In direct support of the Department, the Front Desk Assistant assists the Department Head and Associate Department Head with correspondence, meeting arrangements, appointments, and special projects; coordinates the department's contact database, provides staff support to the department; greets, directs and/or assists students, faculty, and visitors to the department office; opens, sorts and distributes mail; issues lab key cards to students; responds to department email inquiries; directs or advises walk-in traffic; takes phone messages and directs calls; maintains department files; produces the on-line student weekly digest; assists with web page updates, and assists faculty with and maintains the copiers, fax and other office equipment.

Student Assistant: This position is filled by part-time Student Assistants. The Student Assistant performs general clerical tasks and provides much-needed backup to the full-time support staff positions, including reception. They perform database input and maintenance, specifically for grades and updating and inputting student data. They assist in preparation and follow-up for student evaluation of faculty, off-campus paperwork follow-up, mailings, completing key cards and key card database input.

The following two non-full time positions are also supervised by the Architecture Department Head and supported through College Based Fees (CBF):

Equipment Systems Specialist, .5, 12 month: The Equipment Systems Specialist’s time is paid half by Architecture and half through the Landscape Architecture Department. She assists the CAED Tech Team in development and trouble-shooting of the CAED Multi-boot Lab Image; installs and maintains the Multi-boot Lab Image provided by the CAED Tech Team in all Architecture labs and studios; monitors and maintains computers, scanners, projectors, and LCD displays in all Architecture labs and studios; monitors and maintains printers in 05-308 lab; provides faculty teaching in 05-308 lab with tech support during class time; provides tech support to faculty and students with hardware and software problems in labs and studios; provides training to faculty in the use of software and hardware; recruits, interview, hires, trains and supervises student lab monitors for 05-308 lab.

Equipment Technician I, Mechanical, Assistant Support Shop Technician, .8, 12 month: The Support Shop Technician provides technical support and assistance to CAED students, faculty and staff in the use of shop equipment and machines; oversees the workflow and assures a safe shop environment; maintains equipment; maintains shop tools and assists with tool check out and database maintenance; provides occasional maintenance repairs; orders supplies and picks up materials from vendors.
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1.2.2c A description of the opportunities for involvement in governance, including curriculum development, by faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program.

The Chair of the Tenured Faculty
- Is elected by the tenured faculty and serves from September through September.
- Is the formal representative of the tenured faculty to the Department Head or Dean and serves as the formal point of contact.
- Sets calendar and agendas of tenured faculty meetings.
- May organize an ad-hoc faculty group or “task force” to address a specific topic.
- Coordinates faculty voting and counts the votes with the Department’s Administrative Support Specialist for elections to the Architecture Department Peer Review Committee.
- Calls for nominations to, and coordinates faculty voting and counts the votes with the Department’s Administrative Support Specialist for elections of the Arch. Dept Rep to the CAED Peer Review Committee and the CAED Professional Development and Leaves Committee.
- Notifies tenured faculty as well as other relevant parties of tenured faculty meetings.

In the “Search and Screen Process Policy” (See: http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/administration/search-screen.html, accessed 8/25/10), the chair of the tenured faculty responsibilities includes:
- Serves as chair of the tenured faculty in its simultaneous role as the Search and Screen “Committee”
- Publishes a call for nominations to the “Search and Screen Subcommittee”
- Sets calendar and agendas of Search and Screen “Committee”.
- Notifies tenured faculty as well as other relevant parties of Search and Screen “Committee” meetings.
- Is responsible for calling and conducting meetings of The Search and Screen “Committee” for “Final List” deliberations.

In the Architecture Department “Faculty Merit Award” process (See: http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/administration/faculty-merit-award.html, accessed 8/25/10), the chair of the tenured faculty responsibilities includes:
- Serves as a member of the “Screening and Selection Committee” to “receive the nominations, determine eligibility and criteria satisfaction, and select the recipient of the award.”

Instructional Area Coordination
Charter: To develop and implement curriculum proposals related to the area of teaching responsibility. The following areas have been defined by the department: History, Theory, and Criticism; Practice (lower and upper division); Design (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th year); Environmental Control Systems; and, Graduate Programs.

Membership: One faculty member representative for each instructional area.

Definitions: Because of the importance of the five-year pedagogical program and to insure curriculum coordination, integration and self-governance, architecture faculty have been elected to serve as Instructional Area Coordinators.

Eligibility: All coordinators shall be taken first from the ranks of tenured faculty members; second from the tenure-track faculty members after their second year as probationary faculty; and third from the entitled lecturers after six year of service.

Roles and Responsibilities: Call meetings at least twice per quarter: during the first week of class to assess enrollment distribution and not less than two weeks before the end of every quarter with the instructional coordinator of the co-requisite class to facilitate better course integration,

Review the application materials submitted by candidates for the part-time and full-time lecturer pool,

Coordinating or coordinating instructional efforts of studio, lecture and studio/activity combinations,

Recommend teaching assignment, schedule and allocation of resources for instructional support,

Administer and forecast enrollments and enrollment distribution,
Overall curriculum content coordination at course level, between co-requisite courses and between quarter and year levels,

Formulate and recommend to the Curriculum Committee course objectives. Keep course objectives current and share with new faculty,

Provide course syllabi, course outlines (including learning outcomes) and representative project materials for accreditation review,

Formulate and recommend to the Curriculum Committee future goals and objectives relating to the overall teaching program,

Responsible for administering independent study, credit by examination, grade challenges ad course substitutions.

1.2.2d A list of other degree programs, if any, offered in the same administrative unit as the accredited architecture degree program.

All five of the allied disciplines represented within the CAED are accredited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAED Programs</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Accrediting Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BArch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NAAB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSArch</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSCRP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PAB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCRP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PAB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ASLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSarcE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ABET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSCM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ACCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCRP/MSEng</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PAB/ABET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BArch/MBA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NAAB/AACSB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All five departments within the College provide one another with service courses and participate in both faculty and student exchanges. When the need arises, the five departments assist each other by pooling together their finances or facilities.
1.2.3 Physical Resources

1.2.3a A general description, together with labeled 8-1/2" x 11" plans of the physical plant, including seminar rooms, lecture halls, studios, offices, project review and exhibition areas, libraries, computer facilities, workshops, and research areas

1.2.3b A description of any changes to the physical facilities either under construction or proposed

1.2.3c A description of the hardware, software, networks, and other computer resources available institution-wide to students and faculty including those resources dedicated to the professional architecture program

1.2.3d Identification of any significant problem that impacts the operation or services, with a brief explanation of plans by the program or institutional to address it
1.2.3 Physical Resources

1.2.3a A general description, together with labeled 8-1/2" x 11" plans of the physical plant, including seminar rooms, lecture halls, studios, offices, project review and exhibition areas, libraries, computer facilities, workshops, and research areas.

Plans of physical plant will be available in the team room.

University Setting and Context (See campus map http://maps.calpoly.edu/, accessed 09.01.10)

Cal Poly began as an institution geared toward agriculture and technology “to contribute to the industrial welfare of the State of California.” As a result, the main campus is large and contains multiple parcel land holdings of ranchlands, farms, and most recently a donated ocean marine pier. For the purposes of the Architectural Program accreditation, almost all activities aside from fourth year off-campus study programs are focused on the main campus and specifically within the main campus core.

The Architecture Program benefits from the assets of a large university including research library, specialized computing labs and student support spaces for residence, dining and activities.

The Architecture Program also benefits from the assets of allied professional disciplines within the college. The principal physical resources of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED) and Architecture Department are gathered about Dexter Lawn in Buildings 05 (Architecture and Environmental Design), 21 (Engineering West), 34 (Dexter), 186 (The Construction Innovations Center – completed Fall ’08), and 187 (Simpson Strong-Tie Materials Demonstration Lab – to be completed Fall ’10). Space allocation is at the direction of the Dean of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design.

Since the last accreditation team visit, The Construction Innovations Center and the Simpson Strong-Tie Demonstration Laboratory were constructed. Also, as part of the equipment money provided by the Joint Collaborative Agreement Phase IIb (JCA IIb) was funding for renovations to buildings 34, and 5 and modifications to building 21, which will be renamed Environmental Design South. See the end of this document for more information in the JCA IIb.

University Resources

University service facilities include the Kennedy Library with its state-of-the-art computer access system, geographic information systems (GIS) lab, studying and writing (word processing) rooms, the McPhee University Union and Bookstore, the Dining Complex, the Cohan Center for the Performing Arts, and the Recreation Center and Complex.

All lecture classrooms are maintained by the University and scheduled by the University scheduler. Rooms traditionally made available to the Architecture Department include the Business Rotunda (03-213) seating 300, with advanced digital and analogue projection/presentation capabilities. Other rooms located around the campus include ‘smart’ rooms, with in-place digital projection and network access (faculty provides own computer) and multi-media rooms with in-place computer, network availability and digital projection.

Laptops, digital projectors and other types of electronic equipment in support of learning and research are available from Instructional Technology (IT) at two locations on campus, and will on occasion have the entire digital projecting capability (currently about 35 projectors) on campus utilized.
Poly Canyon
University assets managed by the College include the 16-acre Poly Canyon. This is a designated portion of a larger geographic component of the University holdings walk-able from the campus core. It is the site of full-scale, experimental, student-built structures. Poly Canyon is also the location of the Annual ‘Design Village’ hosted by Cal Poly, which allows students from other schools to bring in and erect full-scale temporary structures over the course of a weekend. Structures in Poly Canyon are subject to review by the Dean’s office and constructed with Facilities Planning review and in conjunction with all prevailing codes.

Resources of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design

The Evelyn and Harold Hay Media Resource Center (MRC) (05-101)
Contact: Vickie Aubourg, Director
The MRC was created to complement and supplement Kennedy Library holdings with materials specific to the majors within the College. During the time since the last accreditation one prime role of the MRC has been developing the Materials Library Collection and database, along with assisting in the digital archiving of student work and the development of an online Web access. The MRC includes several magazine collections, manufacturer's product catalogues, a materials library, several digital stations with internet access, large format scanners (drum and flat bed), and large format printing. A modest collection of books is available for reference. The MRC has several slide layout/light table areas for faculty and student use. The MRC has also become a permanent gallery for selected senior thesis models collected at the request of the MRC Director. Housed in the lower level of building 05, the MRC is convenient to half of the Architecture Department labs. For a detailed description of the MRC’s collection see 1.2.5 Information Resources.

Support Shop (21-136, 137)
Contact: Doug Allen, Support Shop Manager
The CAED shop includes a wood shop, a metal shop, specialized masonry and welding areas, and materials storage yard. The use of the shop has increased over the time since the last accreditation, and the shop through the support of the Architecture Department Fee Committee has acquired micro equipment tools for students to use for small-scale model making. Additional weekend and evening hours for supervisory personnel continue to be supported by the Architecture Department College Based Fees Committee.

Photographic Presentation Laboratory (05-109,114,115,116)
Contact: Josef Kasperovich, Photographer/Media Specialist
The Photo Lab has complete darkroom facilities, three large photo/model set-up areas with controlled lighting, and two digital editing stations. The Photo Lab is the CAED repository for analog photographic equipment. Due to funding priorities, the Photo Lab is only available on a part time basis.

Berg Gallery (05-105)
A shared Grading/Presentation Gallery (approx 3000sf) is the largest such space within the College resources. It meets the CAED Dean and College Advancement needs for alumni and advising groups meetings. The Gallery abuts the large exterior covered staircourt of building 05 and a rear hardscape patio equipped with a barbeque. The inability to schedule the Gallery for all reviews and exhibitions is a continuing problem due to the large number of design lab sections within the college, which vie for this unique resource.

Fishbowl and Fishtank Gallery Spaces (21-105A and 21-105B)
Previously teaching spaces, these are new gallery spaces since the last accreditation visit and increase the capacity for studio reviews, exhibitions and lectures by 2,899 sf.

Faculty Offices
The CAED controls assignment of faculty offices. All Architecture Department Tenured, and Tenure Track faculty have a private office with computer and Internet access. Office sizes range from 90 to 240 sf with the majority over 100 sf. Some sharing of offices occurs for full time and/or part time lecturers. The current array of offices places the 45+ faculty in seven different structures on campus (buildings 05, 14, 21, 34, 117, 186). This is universally seen as hindering communication and collegiality. The Sustainable Environmental Education (‘SEE’) Group voluntarily affiliated faculty share a suite of offices with a central conference area and this is seen as the model for future office configurations.
Resources of the Architecture Department

Campus Core
The Department currently has an assigned instructional area of approximately 53,279 square feet and, including CAED assigned faculty offices, a total area of approximately 58,207 square feet. The lab area of 52,051 square feet consists of 34 labs. All design studios have 24/7 set-aside space for the exclusive use of each individual student enrolled in that studio. The Department has 32 single-person faculty offices and 7 two-person faculty offices. All studios have at least one networked computer and a 42” LCD monitor. All studios are networked, and all buildings on campus have wireless connectivity. Several special labs integrate digital media into the studio design process. Students have access to the MRC and the Kennedy Library for large format printing and large format scanning (MRC).

The Architecture Department labs are equipped with adjustable height chairs, drafting tables and layout tables (purchased in 2009 with Group II Funds, from Facilities New Building and Renovation Fund Project as part of the JCAII). Entering freshmen and transfer students are required to purchase their own MacIntosh or Dell Laptop in order to participate in the integrated digital and traditional media design courses. The Architecture Department works with El Corral Bookstore (Cal Poly's bookstore) and Apple Computer to assemble a package of hardware and software that is competitively priced.

Building 05 (Architecture and Environmental Design)
Building 05 is a four level concrete frame structure and houses approximately half of the Architecture Department design labs. It is the locale for the Architecture Department Offices, seven CAED assigned departmental faculty offices, Faculty Conference Room, Media Lab, Computer Lab, CIDS Lab, and is convenient for access to the CAED Dean’s office suite, MRC, Photo Lab and Gallery. Characterized by its immense exterior covered multilevel stair court, it is an example of both ‘systems building’ and ‘brutalist’ aesthetics. It is not air conditioned with the exception of the Dean’s Suite.

F-Stop (05-109)
F-Stop is the student lounge run by the American Institute of Architects Students (AIAS) Chapter. The lower level under stair location is an out-of-the-way place, which does not support the mission or visibility of the club. This space was completely renovated by Prof. Cabrinha’s students in 2009-10 as a design/build studio project funded by the CBF.

Architecture Department Suite (05-212, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219)
The Architecture Department Suite is on the Dexter Lawn level and has outstanding access to major pedestrian paths. The suite consists of five private offices and open office space and is used by the Department Head, Associate Department Head, Administrative Support Coordinator, Scheduler, Administrative Assistant, Front Desk Assistant, student staff and the faculty who staff the Architectural Advising Center. A small faculty work area is incorporated into the circulation space. The area also includes Departmental files and storage.

Faculty Conference Room (05-201A)
A 600sf room used for tenured faculty and various committee work, the Faculty Conference Room also contains secure cabinets for the search committees and retention/promotion/tenure submissions. The room lacks adequate soundproofing for confidential conversation and adequate heating. It has a sink, a large counter, and a large conference table. The room has wireless capability, a dual platform Mac mini and a large 42” LCD monitor.

First Year Design and Visual Communication Labs (05-203, 204, 2005)
Contact: Michael Lucas
These labs are outfitted with special digital and audio capabilities including projected instructor demonstration station, and were upgraded with new furnishings and technology in 2009. They accommodate digital and analogue drawing and communications pedagogies and contain additional pin-up and seminar areas.

Collaborative Integrative-Interactive Digital-Design Studio (CIDS) Lab (05-224)
Contact: Thomas Fowler IV
This is a specialized lab with 5 high-end Apple workstations with digital video projection.
05-106 NAAB Accreditation artifact room  
Contact: Arlene Gomez  
This room features student work for the NAAB Visiting Team. Between accreditation cycles, the room is used by faculty as a rotating archival space, with education purposes. The Department Head fondly calls this room the “candy room,” during the tours to prospective students and guests.

05-106 Seminar Room  
Contact: Arlene Gomez  
This room, when not being utilized as the NAAB Visiting Team Room, is a department scheduled seminar room. When not in use for classes, this room is available for pin-ups, small exhibits, or student club meetings.

05-308 Computer Lab  
Contact: Arlene Gomez  
This is a 1,500 sf space for scheduled and open computer lab activities and includes a server and equipment room. The space is currently sponsored and maintained by the Architecture Department after years of University support. The computers were upgraded in 2007 and again in 2009. The 36 lab stations are Apple iMac dual platform (run on Windows 7 and Mac OS 10) Workstations, and provide all students access to high-end site licensed and networked software. High-end digital output is also supported on a fee basis here. The lab was also upgraded with new desks in 2009.

05-308A Archival Room  
Contact: Arlene Gomez  
Previously used by the CAED as a storage room, this space was redesigned in 2010 and will be used as a permanent archival room for educational purposes.

05-313, Seminar Room and “Hot Lab”  
Contact: Arlene Gomez  
This room is scheduled by the Architecture Department, is functioning as a “hot” lab and seminar room and is equipped with a projector and screen.

21-131A + Support Shop, d[Fab]Lab (Digital Fabrication Laboratory)  
Contact: Jim Doerfler and Mark Cabrinha  
This room has two laser cutters and a CNC machine and three teaching assistants are hired to assist with this equipment. This room was designed and remodeled by students.

**Typical Building 05 Labs** (05-107, 108, 201, 205, 206, 207, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 400, 401, 402)  
The typical layout of the building includes exterior covered corridors separated from labs by sink/counter configurations and exposed ductwork and cable trays. The orientation of the divided spaces generates labs with short exterior exposures and long party walls with adjacent labs. This produces an uncomfortable glare effect within the labs. Lighting is via fluorescent fixtures and student supplied task lighting. Each lab is equipped with network capability and has a shared computer station with a dual platform iMac and a 42” LCD monitor. Windows consist of typical north facing large storefront. Because of the building design, first level studios have access to on-grade patio areas for large-scale work (or break area). Third and fourth level studios have roof terrace access, which has been restricted due to possible roof surface maintenance issues.

**Building 21 (Engineering West)**  
Building 21 is a three level concrete frame structure with four-sided enclosure of an open courtyard. It houses approximately half of the Architecture Department design labs. It is the locale for nine CAED assigned architecture department faculty offices, and is convenient for access to the Architectural Engineering, City and Regional Planning, and Construction Management departmental offices and specialized support labs, and CAED Support Shop. Stepping down a hillside from the Dexter Lawn, the upper level north bar of the rectangular footprint supports the entire second year studio array in one collegial manner overlooking Dexter Lawn. A segregated series of labs is located at the south bar separated from other labs by an extended hallway of university classrooms. At the mid level an exterior stair opens to the massive courtyard, largely overgrown with plantings and with a poorly graded brick patio. A hard surface roadway connects the courtyard with the Support Shop and public road network. One Architecture lab pairing fronts the courtyard. The typical lab has the long side open to the north light and is larger than the typical lab in building 05.
Building 34 (Dexter)
This is the renovated former University Library. Seventeen CAED assigned faculty offices, including the 10-office “SEE Group” suite. There is convenient access to Landscape Architecture labs, and Art and Design Departmental Offices, studios and gallery.

Building 14 (Pilling Computer Science)
There are two Architecture assigned faculty office spaces (95sf each) in this building.

CAD Research Center (Building 117)
The Architecture Department features a Collaborative Agent Design Research Center (CADRC) with $1,000,000 research grants each year.

The University has additional computer labs in the Learning Commons in the Kennedy Library

Areas that are improperly configured, inadequately sized or constitute health hazards:
The computer and teaching laboratories, and non-capacity instructional areas, representing more than two-thirds of the total CAED floor area. There is mostly a problem with lack of adequate heating capability (lack of cooling in the computer labs during hot days is also a periodic problem) in these spaces that interferes with the 24-hour use of most laboratory-based courses and self-instruction areas during the winter months. Most heating facilities are inefficient and costly to operate.

Resources of Allied CAED Departments

Architectural Engineering (ARCE)
Contact: Al Estes, Department Head
ARCE supplies structural coursework and architecture students use their specialized spaces and labs. Included are Large Scale Structures (high-bay) Testing Laboratory; Soils, Seismic and Stress/Models Testing Laboratories; Concrete Laboratory and Yard; Low-Speed Wind Tunnel.

Resource Changes Since Last Accreditation

Wireless Network
Since the last visit the campus wireless network has been expanded to the entire university.

Resources Under Construction
Simpson Strong Tie Materials Demonstration Lab – to be completed Fall 2010.
This facility, one of only three on campus to be 100% funded through private contributions, opens October 22, 2010. The 7,800 square-foot space was designed to enhance the College’s multidisciplinary, hands-on curriculum. The design team (architect, engineer, and contractor) were each Cal Poly CAED alumni. Intended uses include both classroom related instruction and guest expert demonstrations. The space will allow for the display and study of large-scale material assemblies. The main hall and mezzanine will also accommodate departmental and interdepartmental student competitions that entail large-scale physical modeling, full scale component prototyping, and related building component demonstrations. There appear to be only two comparable facilities of this size and dedicated use currently on any American university campus. The facility itself is a demonstration of green design, and has been constructed to take a future green roof.

Completed College Buildings
The San Diego firm AVRP designed the new Construction Innovations Center (completed Fall 2007) for the Construction Management Department.

Additional Resources Added Since the Last Visit

Brief Overview of JCA IIb Project
The Joint Collaborative Agreements between the College of Architecture and Environmental Design and College of Engineering constituted the bulk of recent and near term proposed changes for the CAED facilities housing the Architecture Program. While this project began as a single renovation/replacement project in 1998, due to capital constraints, they were divided into two phases. JCA I consisted of a replacement structure for the College of Engineering (building 41). JCA II was chiefly conceived as renovation and limited new construction for the College of Architecture and Environmental Design; it was
again segmented into two parts again due to capital issues. JCA IIa consisted of space trades and consolidations between the colleges primarily with CAED obtaining more space in building 21 and JCA IIb can be best summed up as the following:

- Eleven new studio labs were gained for the College, three of which are dedicated to Interdisciplinary Design Studios or Collaborative Competition Classes that all include the Architecture Department among others.
- The addition of the new labs and faculty offices allowed formerly scattered architecture studios and offices to be more consolidated, including provision of a suite of new offices in the new construction innovations center dedicated to faculty involved in interdisciplinary teaching and research.
- A new digital fabrication lab, and new digital fabrication production space and equipment were added under the stewardship of the Architecture department, for collaboration with other programs.
- Most of the architecture department studios were outfitted with new workstations and chairs and a large format flat panel screen. This is the first wholesale upgrade of furniture in 25 years.
- The Media Resource Center was completely redesigned and refurbished under the direction of Architecture faculty to better accommodate published, digital, and material display collections and student interaction.
- Two new student review spaces were added, formerly one space called the “Fishbowl” and “Fishtank” Gallery Spaces (21-105A and 21-105B), that had been converted to studio space a decade ago were repurposed and refurbished for their original gallery use and also available for events, seminars, and symposia. Additional interior space upgrades are in progress using private funds.
- Upgraded computer and presentation equipment was installed for many of the review spaces, and there was an overall replacement of old equipment plus new equipment was added (micro machines for working on scaled models) in the Support Shop and Photoshop to address equipment and technology deficiencies.

1.2.3b A description of any changes to the physical facilities either under construction or proposed

Currently the department has proposed removing walls in building 05 to bring the 1st year studios into one space. This proposal is under review by the College for a cost assessment.

Enhancement of the outdoor patio space, which extends from the MRC and Berg Gallery has been ‘adopted’ by the Architecture Alumni class of 1980 as a special fundraising project. The current plan is for an Architecture and Landscape Architecture student designed and built project underway within the next year and a half. This space will be used for student and alumni gatherings and appropriate exhibitions.

The former ‘Fishbowl’ (34-105A) will be completely renovated and renamed the KTGY Gallery. This project will include physical upgrades as well as technologic enhancements (smart room). The project will take place over the next year. (Funding is in place)

1.2.3c A description of the hardware, software, networks, and other computer resources available institution-wide to students and faculty including those resources dedicated to the professional architecture program

The primary university-wide computing resources are centered in the Learning Commons in the Kennedy Library (see http://lib.calpoly.edu/learningcommons/ accessed 8/26/10). The resources include:
  - Collaboration Rooms/Study Rooms
  - 8 Collaboration Rooms equipped with white board and a flat screen monitor
  - Labs and Classrooms
  - 1 Mac and 3 windows labs on the 2nd floor; the Windows labs include Auto desk software
  - Laptop and AV Checkout
  - Kindle Checkout Pilot
  - 4 Amazon Kindles available as part of a pilot project
  - Printing
  - Wireless printing is available
  - Technology Support
  - Satellite TV
    - Room 216C - Access to programming from around the world

Wireless access is available campus-wide.
Specific to Architecture students, the Architecture Computer lab (05-308) and all of the Architecture studios are equipped as follows:

05-308
35 Apple iMac multi-booting systems
Processor: 2.93 GHz Intel Core 2 Duo
Memory: 4 GB
3 Wacom DTF-720 Interactive Pen Displays
2 HP Color LaserJet 5550 11”x17” Printers
1 Canon iPF 755 5-Color 36-inch Printer
1 Epson GT-2000 11”x 17” Scanner

Each Architecture studio contains:
An Apple 20” iMac multi-booting system
Processor: 2.16 GHz Intel Core 2 Duo
Memory: 2 GB
Philips 42” LCD HD 1040p Display

with the following software:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macintosh OS X 10.6 (64 bit) Image</th>
<th>Windows 7 (32 bit) Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Acrobat 9 Pro</td>
<td>ArcGIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Illustrator CS5</td>
<td>WinEst v12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe InDesign CS5</td>
<td>West Point Bridge Designer 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Photoshop CS5</td>
<td>Vico Estimator 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Dreamweaver CS5</td>
<td>Urb 2007 Win V9.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bonzoai3d</td>
<td>Structure Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formZ</td>
<td>SPSS Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google SketchUp</td>
<td>Rhinoceros 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Office 2008</td>
<td>Primavera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Earth</td>
<td>PlanSwift8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArcGIS</td>
<td>GSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArcView</td>
<td>Microsoft Office 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MATLAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autodesk Revit MEP 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autodesk Revit Architecture 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td>Adobe InDesign CS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td>Adobe Illustrator CS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Photoshop CS5</td>
<td>Adobe Dreamweaver CS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td>Primavera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Architecture 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodesk Revit Structure 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Revit MEP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ds Max Design 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotect Analysis 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AutoCAD Civil 3D 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• A return to the 2003-04 student-faculty ratio indicates that sufficient and guaranteed funds need to be allocated to hire and maintain faculty teaching assignments over an entire year. This will not happen as long as the point above is in effect.

• The Department’s efforts to reduce the overall student cohort suggests a need by the CAED to reduce overall allocations to the department, necessitating a impoverished CBF income (due to fewer students) to be entirely allocated to instruction, thus annulling any strategic effort to harness the budget crisis.

It is imperative that the CAED and the University commit to a budget allocation that secures and enhances the Department’s educational mission and long-term viability, thus allowing the Department to strategically find a balance between appropriate adjustments to enrollment, curriculum, and allocated funds.

2. Despite substantial improvements to the shop facilities, is important that the CAED establishes a strategic plan to respond to the needs of the department regarding the size of the shop, additional shop assistants, and adequate funds to maintain all equipment available for student use. While the use of digital fabrication is well established as a design tool, the tradition of making remains central to the Department’s pedagogy and needs appropriate support to maintain the learning objectives of the curriculum.

3. While one large new review space has been created, the Department cannot continue to rely on informal spaces (that are open to all 5 college departments to use) to conduct reviews with outside guests. This is particularly true with increased efforts among departments to teach in an integrative and interdisciplinary manner, where larger cohorts of students from each discipline participate.

4. Creative efforts initiated by the Dean to meet University budget expectations have obliged students attending an off-campus program to pay an extra 24% fee for the academic year 2010-11. As fees will increase for 2011-12, students will likely be unable to benefit from studying abroad, resulting in students having to stay on campus, thus obliging the hiring of additional faculty; a solution not viable without appropriate funding. The Department will be forced for the first time to cancel required classes or necessitate cohorts of 18 students to enroll in a co-op and receive studio credit.
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I.2.4 Financial Resources

Overview

Program Financial Issues

1.2.4a Current fiscal year report(s) showing revenue and expenses from all sources.

Section I. Department Budget Summary

I.A. Total Revenue and Expenses Summary Reports

The Architecture Department has both State and non-State sources of funding. The State sources are broken down into two categories: our General Fund and College Based Fees (CBF). These sources cover the bulk of the Department’s faculty salaries and operating expenses. The General Fund is allocated to the Department by the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. CBF revenue is collected from student fees on a quarterly basis. A more detailed description of CBF revenue and expenses is provided in 1.2.4c. Comparative reports, section I.B.ii. CBF Expenses.

Non-State sources are comprised of 8 Foundation (including the Discretionary account) and 6 Corporation accounts. Foundation accounts are gift-based sources, and, with the exception of the Discretionary account, have donor-defined restrictions on how those funds can be spent. The Discretionary funds are unrestricted, and can be spent at the Department Head’s discretion. Corporation accounts are income-based sources; revenue for these accounts is often earned from sales of event tickets, thesis book purchases, competition earnings, and other non-gift income.

The following tables and charts show the Department’s total revenue and expenses for 2009-10, in both State and non-State funds. Section II will provide greater detail for the Department’s State funds and Section III will reveal the breakdown of expenses for non-State funds.

Table 1a. 2009-10 Architecture Department Revenue and Expenses Summary Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Allocations/Revenue</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$3,912,241</td>
<td>$3,867,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBF</td>
<td>$684,890</td>
<td>$687,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subtotal</td>
<td>$4,597,104</td>
<td>$4,531,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>$61,667$^3</td>
<td>$82,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Corp/Fdn</td>
<td>$155,588$^4</td>
<td>$34,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non State Subtotal</td>
<td>$217,255</td>
<td>$116,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,814,359</td>
<td>$4,648,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Based on State mandated 10% furlough salary reduction.
2. Based on State mandated 10% furlough salary reduction.
3. The Department’s Discretionary fund is a Foundation source of funding.
4. See Section III, Table 3a. The Notes to Table 3a explain that, to avoid double-counting, this revenue field does not include $75,000 that was originally donated to the Discretionary fund and later transferred to establish a Student Leadership fund, which is included in the Other Corp/Fdn category. The $75,000 is only included in the Other Corp/Fdn revenue field.
5. Corp is the abbreviation of Corporation, which is a non-State source of funding. Fdn is the abbreviation of Foundation, a gift-based, non-state source of funding.
Table 1b. 2003-04 Architecture Department Revenue and Expenses Summary Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2003-04 Revenue and Expenses Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocations/Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$4,375,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBF</td>
<td>$506,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,881,219</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary3</td>
<td>$86,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Corp/Fdn5</td>
<td>$20,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non State Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$102,906</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,984,125</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1. Comparison of 2009-10 and 2003-04 Total Department Expenses, showing type of funds.

Section II. State Budgets

II.A. State Expenses Summary Reports

Table 2a. 2009-10 Architecture Department State budget summary report, with comparison to the 2003-04 State budget totals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>CBF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty salaries + benefits</td>
<td>$3,556,633 $^7$</td>
<td>$460,855 $^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff salaries + benefits</td>
<td>$195,855 $^6$</td>
<td>$76,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs$^5$</td>
<td>$115,225 $^6$</td>
<td>$126,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$3,867,713 $^7$</td>
<td>$663,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,531,392 $^7$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. See Table 2b. below for detail report of 2003-04 State budget.
2. CBF is the acronym for College Based Fees.
3. Based on the State mandated 10% furlough reduction.
4. Based on the State mandated 10% furlough reduction.
5. See Table 2e. of section II.B.ii. Operating Expenses Detail Reports, for breakdown of this number.
6. Includes Professional Development expenses funded by the Summer Career Workshop revenue that was, for this year only, placed in our O&E account. These Professional Development expenses totaled $30,252.
Table 2b. 2003-04 Architecture Department State budget summary report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>CBF¹</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty salaries + benefits</td>
<td>$3,939,859</td>
<td>$346,371</td>
<td>$4,286,230 (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff salaries + benefits</td>
<td>$304,531</td>
<td>$30,379</td>
<td>$334,910 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs²</td>
<td>$66,148</td>
<td>$129,459</td>
<td>$195,607 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$4,310,538</td>
<td>$506,209</td>
<td>$4,816,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,816,747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. CBF is the acronym for College Based Fees.
2. See Table 2e. in section II.B.ii. Operating Expenses Detail Reports, for breakdown of this number.

II.B. State Budget Expenses Detail Reports

II.B.i. Faculty Salary Reports

Over the past six years, budgeted faculty positions have decreased from 45.1 FTEF in 2003 to 38.48 FTEF in 2009. For 2009 the average Professor salary without benefits was $100,224 (2003: $82,231), the average Associate Professor salary without benefits was $89,760 (2003: $68,279), the average Assistant Professor salary without benefits was $80,580 (2003: $53,885) and the average Instructor salary without benefits was $89,016 (2003: $59,702). Faculty salaries remain competitive relative to the salaries within the University and for architecture programs throughout the nation.

Table 2c. 2009-10 faculty salary detail report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009-10 FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARIES¹</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72,096</td>
<td>100,224</td>
<td>128,340</td>
<td>93,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57,060</td>
<td>89,760</td>
<td>132,460</td>
<td>79,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49,692</td>
<td>80,580</td>
<td>111,456</td>
<td>67,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49,692</td>
<td>89,016</td>
<td>89,016</td>
<td>73,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The above numbers reflect base salaries. They do not reflect the 9.23% reduction due to furloughs temporarily imposed by the State of California for the 2009-10 academic year. Faculty were required to take 2 furlough days per month from September 2009 through June 2010.

Table 2d. 2003-04 faculty salary detail report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69,164</td>
<td>82,231</td>
<td>97,482</td>
<td>76,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61,412</td>
<td>68,279</td>
<td>73,164</td>
<td>62,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43,340</td>
<td>53,885</td>
<td>58,200</td>
<td>48,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49,824</td>
<td>59,702</td>
<td>66,312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.B.ii. Operating Expenses Detail Reports

Over a six-year period from 2003-04 to 2009-10 the Architecture Department’s annual allocations for operating and equipment (O&E) expenses have seen dramatic changes. For instance:

- In 2004-05, the College increased the Department’s O&E allocation from $70,000 to $75,000 to assist in the growing operational needs of the Department. For a department of 55 faculty and 4 staff, this amount was still inadequate, as seen in the General Fund Expenses History report. This amount of money breaks down to an average annual allocation of $1,271 per faculty member to cover supplies, travel, student assistants, telephone costs, printing costs, postage and replacement equipment.
- In 2009-10, the College allocated $100,000 for O&E expenses, in recognition of the non-sustainability of maintaining the department on an O&E budget of $75,000 a year. This
significant increase reflects the College’s recognition of the Department’s growing needs to cover necessary supplies, equipment, maintenance of labs and equipment, administrative travel, student assistants, etc.

- The influx of the State of California ("Lottery Funds") no longer provides funding directly to the Department for replacement equipment or professional development, but the College absorbs the Lottery Funds for its own budget.

The following tables show detailed reports for the Department’s 2009-10 State operating costs, and the 2003-04 State operating costs for comparison. The Department’s operating expenses have increased by 24% since 2004 due in part from increases in General Fund revenue, and also a one-time increase of approximately $30,000 in revenue from the Summer Career Workshop, which is allocated specifically for professional development expenses.

While there have also been slight increases in CBF revenue over the last six years, the CBF funds allotted for operating costs has decreased from 15% to 10%, and will be eliminated during the 2010-11 academic year. The remaining 90% of CBF in 2009-10 was allocated for faculty salaries and support staff.

### Table 2e. 2009-10 State operating costs detail report with comparison of totals for 2003-04 operating costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>CBF</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment¹</td>
<td>$4,946</td>
<td>$57,885</td>
<td>$62,831 (26%)</td>
<td>$98,992 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student assistants</td>
<td>$26,771</td>
<td>$43,372</td>
<td>$70,143 (29%)</td>
<td>$26,069 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$36,238²</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td>$39,758 (16%)</td>
<td>$3,975 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$1,361</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,361 (1%)</td>
<td>$4,459 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, Printing, Supplies</td>
<td>$45,909³</td>
<td>$21,787</td>
<td>$67,696 (28%)</td>
<td>$62,112 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$115,225</strong></td>
<td><strong>$126,564</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$241,789</strong></td>
<td><strong>$195,607</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 2009-10 includes computer hardware/software: $12,231 for replacement computer accessories in 05-308, and software updates for that lab in 05-308.
2. 2009-10 includes faculty professional development travel ($29,197) and staff operations related travel ($7,041). As mentioned in footnote #6 of Table 1a (page 2), we received revenue from the Summer Career Workshop (approximately $30,300) to fund Professional Development expenses through the Department’s O&E account.
3. 2009-10 includes faculty professional development (non-travel) expenses totaling $1,055. As mentioned above, these expenses were funded by revenue from the Summer Career Workshop.

### Table 2f. 2003-04 State operating costs detail report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>CBF</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment¹</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$98,992</td>
<td>$98,992 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student assistants</td>
<td>$16,932</td>
<td>$9,137</td>
<td>$26,069 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$3,975</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,975 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$4,459</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,459 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, Printing, Supplies</td>
<td>$40,782</td>
<td>$21,330</td>
<td>$62,112 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$66,148</strong></td>
<td><strong>$129,459</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$195,607</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 2003-04 includes equipment installation and replacement ($666), computer hardware/software ($77,499 for replacement computers in 05-308 and computers in all studios), and furniture ($20,827 chairs for some design studios).
2. 2003-04 includes faculty professional development ($2,275) and staff operations related travel ($1,700).

The following chart provides a quick glance at how the 2009-10 Department’s State operating costs are divided, and the percentage of each category. Student assistant salaries are the leading Department
operating costs at 29%, followed closely by supplies, printing and postage at 28%, then by equipment purchases at 26%.

Student assistants provide essential support to faculty who teach large lecture classes, help monitor and operate the Department’s Macintosh Lab, Digital Fabrication Lab, and the plotter located in the Media Resource Center, assist in the annual inventory and maintenance of studios, and alleviate the administrative workload in the Department office. The Department has hired student assistants to help professors of Architectural History and Architectural Theory (typically large lecture classes) with clerical support and grading. This additional student assistant support allows our professors to teach larger classes by providing clerical relief, which in turn saves the Department from hiring additional faculty to teach smaller Architectural History and Theory lecture classes. In addition, over the last six years the Department has increased the availability of support services and this has required the help of student assistants to manage our various labs. These changes have necessitated the Department’s sharp jump of allocation to student assistants from 13% in 2003-04 to 29% in 2009-10.

Equipment purchases have dropped by half from 51% in 2003-04 to 26% in 2009-10, but this is a result of recent massive equipment upgrades to the Macintosh lab, the establishment of the Digital Fabrication lab (which houses a laser cutter and CNC router), and new plotters, scanners, and printers during 2007-2009, primarily purchased with CBF funds. In 2008-09, $511,000 in Group II funds was spent in upgrading studio furniture and equipment. Subsequently, we anticipate that equipment purchases are anticipated to be relatively low in the next few years.


Section III. Non-State Budgets

III.A. Non-State Revenue and Expenses Summary Report

The majority of non-state revenue is generated through donations to the Department, and all gifts are deposited into Foundation accounts. Non-gift revenue, such as income from event tickets, book sales, competition earnings, are put into Corporation accounts. The Department’s Discretionary account is the largest gift account, and in the last six years has received an average of $87,000 in gifts per year. However, it should be noted that this average includes an exceptional year in donations during 2009-10, when the Department received an additional $75,000. This amount was used to establish the new Student Leadership fund to support student initiatives, travel for special projects, material support for competitions, etc. In September 2007, the Architecture Department was also named the recipient of a very generous pledged bequest of $60,000,000.
Table 3a. Non-State Revenue Summary Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2009-10 Revenue</th>
<th>2009-10 Expenses</th>
<th>2003-04 Revenue</th>
<th>2003-04 Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>$56,805</td>
<td>$17,315</td>
<td>$13,360</td>
<td>$21,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>$160,450</td>
<td>$99,486</td>
<td>$89,546</td>
<td>$63,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$217,255</strong></td>
<td><strong>$116,801</strong></td>
<td><strong>$102,906</strong></td>
<td><strong>$84,868</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The Discretionary fund received $75,000, which was later transferred into a newly created Student Leadership fund. To avoid double-counting, this field does not include the initial funds donated to the Discretionary fund as revenue, only the amount transferred into the Student Leadership fund is counted. The above numbers show the actual revenue, but if the transferred $75,000 were included as revenue, the 2009-10 Foundation revenue total would technically be $235,450, and expenses $174,486.

III.B. Discretionary Expenses Detail Report

Table 3b. Discretionary Expenses Detail Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees/Other</td>
<td>$6,906</td>
<td>$19,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts, Awards, Scholarships</td>
<td>$22,841</td>
<td>$329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting</td>
<td>$12,795</td>
<td>$11,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$16,175</td>
<td>$123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$3,404</td>
<td>$5,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistants, Contract Svcs</td>
<td>$9,030</td>
<td>$8,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$10,106</td>
<td>$8,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$82,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59,678</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.4b Forecasts for revenue from all sources and expenses for at least two years beyond the current fiscal year.

Section I. State Budget Projections

I.A. Projected State Revenue and Expenses Summary Reports

I.A.i. College’s Two-Year Forecast

It is important to set the context for revenue forecasts of sources and expenses over the next two years to affirm that despite multiyear state and national economic certainty, measures already taken and under consideration by the University and the College are buffering the Architecture program and our other premier professional undergraduate degree programs. These include the following measures:

1. In-state enrollment reduction: As of Fall 2010, the entire College, and most significantly Architecture, has been mandated a multi-year reduction in new freshmen and transfer students to offset budget cuts. The Department's enrollment is expected to decrease in 2011-12 by 12.8% from the 2009-10 academic year’s enrollment (2009-10 enrollment was 835, 2011-12 is projected to be 728). Please see the Projected Enrollment Chart provided in the Team Room for more information on enrollment projections.

2. Out of state enrollment increases: While overall enrollment is being reduced, the number and percentages of out of state students is increasing. Through a pilot program begun this year in the College’s Masters of City and Regional Planning program, it is being demonstrated that the income generated by out of state students just in that one small program can generate more than the funds required to support their education. The College will be working this year with the University to seek...
expansion of that system to the undergraduate programs in Architecture and Architectural Engineering, who each now have over 30% of new students bringing out of state revenue to Cal Poly, and where we see continued growth in the future.

3. Multi-year fee increases adopted by the CSU system and current bipartisan agreement on CSU funding suggest that the next two years will be stable, and possibly yield restoration of prior cuts.

4. The Architecture Department’s leadership in developing off-campus programs and other fee generating endeavors is fully supported by Cal Poly and new ventures over the next two years will yield even greater revenue for the department.

The tables below show the projected State funding sources and uses, not including donation reserves and pledges, for 2010-11 and 2011-12.

**Table 4a. Architecture Department’s Two-Year Forecast, sources of funding.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>General Fund + CBF</th>
<th>Continuing Ed / Off Campus Revenue</th>
<th>Grant Supported Salaries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$4,610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$3,970,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$4,290,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. See 1.2.4c Comparative Reports, Section IV.C.i. Off Campus Programs, for an explanation of this new form of revenue.

**Table 4b. Architecture Department’s two-year forecast, State allocations.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty + Personnel</th>
<th>General Operations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$4,490,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$4,610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$4,190,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$4,290,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The Faculty + Personnel fields are funded by General Fund, CBF, Continuing Ed, and grant money.

I.A.ii. Department’s Projected State Budget Summary Reports

The following tables provide further State budget summary reports, which separate the expected CBF expenses for each projected year from the General Fund expenses.

**Table 4c. Projected 2011-12 Department State expenditures summary report.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>CBF1</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty salaries + benefits</td>
<td>$3,920,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$4,490,000 (97%)</td>
<td>$4,289,603 (95%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs2</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$120,000 (3%)</td>
<td>$241,789 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$4,040,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,531,392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,610,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. CBF is the acronym for College Based Fees.
2. General Fund includes $370,000 in off campus program revenue from Continuing Education and $40,000 in grant-supported salaries.
3. See Table 5c for a break down of the Department’s operating costs projections.

**Table 4d. Projected 2010-11 Department State budget summary report.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>CBF1</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty salaries + benefits</td>
<td>$3,620,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$4,190,000 (98%)</td>
<td>$4,289,603 (95%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs2</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000 (2%)</td>
<td>$241,789 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$3,720,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,531,392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,290,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. CBF is the acronym for College Based Fees.
2. General Fund includes $370,000 in off campus program revenue from Continuing Education and $40,000 in grant-supported salaries.
3. See Table 5d for a break down of the Department’s operating costs projections.
I.B. Projected State Expenses Detail Reports

The following subsection provides detail reports for the Department’s projected State expenses for faculty salaries and operating costs.

I.B.i. Projected Faculty Salary Detail Reports

Table 5a. Projected 2011-12 faculty salary detail report (no anticipated raises – the same as 2009-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011-12 FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARIES ¹</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72,096</td>
<td>100,224</td>
<td>128,340</td>
<td>93,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57,060</td>
<td>89,760</td>
<td>1322,460</td>
<td>79,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49,692</td>
<td>80,580</td>
<td>111,456</td>
<td>67,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49,692</td>
<td>89,016</td>
<td>89,016</td>
<td>73,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5b. Projected 2010-11 faculty salary detail report (no anticipated raises - the same as 2009-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010-11 FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARIES ¹</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72,096</td>
<td>100,224</td>
<td>128,340</td>
<td>93,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57,060</td>
<td>89,760</td>
<td>1322,460</td>
<td>79,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49,692</td>
<td>80,580</td>
<td>111,456</td>
<td>67,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49,692</td>
<td>89,016</td>
<td>89,016</td>
<td>73,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.B.ii. Projected State Operating Costs Detail Reports

These projected State operating costs reports provide a breakdown of how the Department anticipates allocating State funds for specific needs of the Department’s operation, including: equipment, travel, supplies, and student assistants.

As forecasted in Table 5c and 5d, the whole of our projected CBF revenue for the 2010-11 and possibly 2011-12 academic years will be allocated for faculty salaries, per the Dean of CAED. Dean Jones has the authority to allocate the percentages of CBF funds the Department spends on salaries and the percentage for operating expenses. This is not the only time the Dean has reduced the percentage of CBF funds allocated for operating expenses: in 2008-09 the Dean mandated that the percentage allotted to O&E be decreased from 15% to 10%, and this 10% remained for the 2009-10 academic year. While this strategy will certainly help alleviate the overall CAED budget deficit, it will severely impact the Department’s operating budget. CBF operating expenses are typically used to purchase and maintain necessary (and often expensive) lab equipment, from computers in the CAED Macintosh Lab to laser cutters in the Department’s Digital Fabrication Lab. CBF operating expenses also typically fund the student assistant salaries that support the monitoring and operation of these labs.

These labs provide essential support services to Architecture students, allowing them to easily and affordably create quarterly design projects. The Dean’s mandate would place a strain on the Department’s General Fund to provide maintenance of these labs, which were originally established with CBF funds, and will likely require a freeze on the purchase of replacement equipment. This mandate may also result in minimized hours of operation for these labs. However, the Department has been proactive in making both the Digital Fabrication Lab (DFabLab) and the operation of our new plotters self-supporting. In 2009-10 the Department piloted a program for student use of the Digital Fabrication Lab and the new plotter: the Department sells both DFabLab and Plotter punch cards to the El Corral Bookstore, and students can purchase the punch cards for the service they need. The bookstore keeps a portion of the proceeds, but the revenue earned by the Department is collected in separate Corporation accounts and is currently used to pay student assistant salaries, supplies, and maintenance as needed for the DFabLab or plotters.

In essence, the Department is prepared for the cuts in CBF funding usually allocated for student assistants and minor supplies and maintenance required for the upkeep of two of our student service labs. See 1.2.4.c Comparative Reports, Section I.B.ii. for more information about CBF expenses and funding history.
Table 5c. Projected 2011-12 State operating costs detail report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>CBF</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,000 (23%)</td>
<td>$62,831 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student assistants</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000 (25%)</td>
<td>$70,143 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,500 (6%)</td>
<td>$39,758 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500 (1%)</td>
<td>$1,361 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, Printing, Supplies</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$54,000 (45%)</td>
<td>$67,696 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$120,000</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$241,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In 2009, the students had voted for a CBF increase by $300 each year over the next three years, but the CSU Chancellor did not allow the student approved CBF increase to be implemented, and is considering terminating the CBF system altogether. In the meantime, existing CBF funds will remain for the 2010-11 academic year, and it is up to the Dean to determine the percentage of CBF that goes to instructional purposes. Dean Jones has mandated that 100% of 2011-12 academic year’s CBF be used only for instructional purposes. This pending decision is intended to help reduce the overall CAED budget deficit. See the CBF Expenses History in 1.2.4.c Comparative Reports, Section I.B.ii. for more information.

Table 5d. Projected 2010-11 State operating costs detail report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>CBF</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,000 (6%)</td>
<td>$62,831 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student assistants</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,000 (28%)</td>
<td>$70,143 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000 (10%)</td>
<td>$39,758 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500 (1%)</td>
<td>$1,361 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, Printing, Supplies</td>
<td>$54,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$54,500 (55%)</td>
<td>$67,696 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,000</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$241,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In 2009, the students had voted for a CBF increase by $300 each year over the next three years, but the CSU Chancellor did not allow the student approved CBF increase to be implemented, and is considering terminating the CBF system altogether. In the meantime, existing CBF funds will remain for the 2010-11 academic year, and it is up to the Dean to determine the percentage of CBF that goes to instructional purposes. Dean Jones has mandated that 100% of 2010-11 academic year’s CBF be used only for instructional purposes. This decision is intended to help reduce the overall CAED budget deficit. See the CBF Expenses History in 1.2.4.c Comparative Reports, Section I.B.ii. for more information.

Section II. Projected Non-State Budgets

II.A. Projected Non-State Revenue and Expenses Summary Report

The Department had an exceptional year for the amount of non-State revenue it received during 2009-10 due to one $25,000 gift and another $50,000 gift, which was used to establish the Student Leadership fund. Although the Department is increasing its fundraising efforts, it does not anticipate such a high level of generosity in the next two years. The Department is taking big strides in development through continuous networking with alumni and donors, as well as outreach through our annual newsletter, solicitation mailings, the Cal Poly Phonathon, the Department website, and social networking Facebook site. While the Department expects the level of non-State revenue to drop from the 2009-10 level, Table 9a in 1.2.4c Comparative Reports, Section II.A, reveals a slow, but relatively steady increase of revenue from 2003-04. The Department plans to slightly increase non-State expenses over the next two years, but, unlike previous years, it plans to keep expenses lower than the rate of income in order to replenish and save non-State funds in case of special circumstances.
Table 6. Projected Non-State Revenue and Expenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$217,225</td>
<td>$116,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 3. Projected non-State revenue and expenses.

1.2.4.c Comparative reports that show revenue from all sources and expenditures for each year since the last accreditation visit from all sources including endowments, scholarships, one-time capital investments, and development activities.

Section I. State Budgets

I.A. State Budget Comparative Reports: General Fund and CBF Expenses

The table and chart in Section I.A. reveal the Department’s fluctuating budget allocations and actual expenditures over the last six years. These fluctuations range from $450,000 in reductions during 2004-2006, to a sharp increase of expenses by over $900,000 in 2006-07 due to an increase in enrollment. While enrollment fell the following year in 2007-08, the CFA implemented salary increases, which the College didn’t account for in the budget allotment to the Department. Since 2007-08, the College has not allotted the budget necessary to cover the requisite architecture classes students need to graduate (given the Union-imposed increase in faculty salaries). Despite this situation, Dean Jones directed the Department to continue offering all necessary classes, and the deficit incurred as a result was understood to be the responsibility of the CAED, which negotiated for the University to pay for it.

In 2009-10 the Department’s budget allocation plummeted by over $1,000,000 when the Department participated in the State mandated furlough program. Current projections for 2010-11 show a continuation of reduced spending to help recover the College’s deficit, but the Dean expects the Architecture Department’s budget will begin to grow again in 2011-12.
Table 7. Department State revenue and expenses summary by year, including projections for 2011-12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Allotments</th>
<th>Actual Expenses</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Actual Expenses</th>
<th>Allotments</th>
<th>Actual Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$4,210,000</td>
<td>$4,210,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$4,610,000</td>
<td>$4,610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$3,720,000</td>
<td>$3,720,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$4,290,000</td>
<td>$4,290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$3,912,241</td>
<td>$3,867,713</td>
<td>$684,890</td>
<td>$663,679</td>
<td>$4,597,104</td>
<td>$4,531,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$4,329,737</td>
<td>$4,988,202</td>
<td>$797,751</td>
<td>$730,902</td>
<td>$5,127,488</td>
<td>$5,719,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$4,294,035</td>
<td>$4,985,995</td>
<td>$829,333</td>
<td>$688,672</td>
<td>$5,123,368</td>
<td>$5,674,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$4,549,935</td>
<td>$4,278,552</td>
<td>$673,199</td>
<td>$439,345</td>
<td>$5,223,134</td>
<td>$4,717,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$3,756,859</td>
<td>$3,762,756</td>
<td>$682,686</td>
<td>$604,881</td>
<td>$4,439,545</td>
<td>$4,367,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$4,341,419</td>
<td>$4,332,947</td>
<td>$551,006</td>
<td>$425,703</td>
<td>$4,892,425</td>
<td>$4,758,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$4,375,010</td>
<td>$4,310,538</td>
<td>$506,209</td>
<td>$506,209</td>
<td>$4,881,219</td>
<td>$4,816,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. These General Fund figures include off campus program revenue from Continuing Education and grant-supported salaries.
2. CBF revenue figures for 2003-2010 include income as well as rollover funds that were not expended the previous year.
3. Based on the State mandated 10% furlough reduction. Includes $30,763 additional funds from the Summer Career Workshop revenue, allocated for professional development expenses.
4. Based on the State mandated 10% furlough reduction.


1. Includes General Fund and CBF figures for 2003-2010.
I.B. State Expenses Detail Comparative Reports.

I.B.i. General Fund Expenses History.

Table 8a. General Fund Expenses History from 2003-04 to projected 2011-12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>O&amp;E</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$4,090,000</td>
<td>$4,210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$94,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$3,620,000</td>
<td>$3,720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$110,279</td>
<td>$4,946</td>
<td>$3,752,488</td>
<td>$3,867,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$122,062</td>
<td>$8,106</td>
<td>$4,858,034</td>
<td>$4,988,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$89,522</td>
<td>$3,370</td>
<td>$4,893,103</td>
<td>$4,985,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$82,132</td>
<td>$6,640</td>
<td>$4,189,780</td>
<td>$4,278,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$74,406</td>
<td>$6,491</td>
<td>$3,681,859</td>
<td>$3,762,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$60,123</td>
<td>$6,405</td>
<td>$4,266,419</td>
<td>$4,332,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$66,148</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,244,390</td>
<td>$4,310,538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Does not include CBF funding, but does include revenue for the Department's off campus programs through Continuing Education and grant supported salaries.
2. Does not include $511,000 in Group II funds allotted to the Department for furniture and equipment upgrades. We purchased 20 workstations for 24 of our cold labs (second to fifth year studios), 27 workstations for our 3 hot labs (first year design studios), chairs for 31 labs, much needed new blinds in 13 labs, and a new table and chairs for our faculty conference room. Our furniture expenses comprised the bulk of Group II expenditures at $477,550. $5,394 of this total was spent for installation. In addition we spent $33,210 in equipment, such as cameras for our Photo Lab, projectors, scanners, and computers for many labs.
3. Includes funding in addition to the College allocation of $75,000 for normal Department O&E expenses. $5,000 for an ITS Grant received by Professors Doerfler and Arens, $26,371 in revenue from the Sustainability Conference was allotted for operating expenditures, and $8,316 was received and expended for professional development purposes.
4. Includes funding in addition to the College allocation of $75,000 for normal Department O&E expenses. $6,128 for student assistants was funded by the Dean's office, and $7,000 received for Information Technology Systems (ITS) Grant expenditures for Professors Doerfler and Arens.

I.B.ii. College Based Fees – Revenue and Expenses History.

In the 23 campus CSU system only Cal Poly has the College Based Fee system, established by an advisory vote of our students in 2002, and intended to supplement the State funding and cover the cost of our higher cost, professional and polytechnic education. During that 2002 vote, a quarterly fee of $200 per student in the College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED) was approved to help support and enhance instructional programs in the five CAED departments (Architectural Engineering, Architecture, City and Regional Planning, Construction Management, and Landscape Architecture). The distribution of funds received through this college specific fee is directed entirely to the departments by major.

Each department in the CAED has established a consultative committee comprised of students and faculty, and drafted a set of bylaws to govern the distribution, uses, and accountability of these funds. The Dean mandates a percentage of the CBF funds be used for faculty salaries each year. Originally, the percentage of CBF funds allocated to faculty was 85%, leaving 15% for operating and equipment expenses, which the Department CBF Steering Committee could vote on how to spend. In 2008, the Dean reduced the O&E allocation to 10%, which put a strain on the Department's General Fund O&E to cover, and resulted in reduced allocations to the maintenance of labs. See 1.2.4b Forecasts, section I.B.ii. Projected State Operating Costs Detail Reports for further explanation.

The Architecture Department CBF Steering Committee meets several times each quarter to address funding requests and make their recommendations to the Department Head, who has approval authority for expenditures from this fund. Fees within the CAED are to be used exclusively to support the education of students majoring in the degree programs offered by the five departments in the CAED. The students, for example, voted to hire a 1/2 time Equipment Technician for the CAED Support Shop to extend the shop hours into evenings and weekends, as well as voting to place computer work stations in every design studio, and hiring a 1/2 time Computer Technician to support the new computers and to support the department's
Macintosh lab. CBF funds were also used to establish our new Digital Fabrication Lab by purchasing laser cutters and a CNC router, and to improve studios and student resources by purchasing new plotters, scanners, printers, and other equipment. For a comprehensive list of all CBF expenditures and initiatives since 2007, please see the Department’s web site: http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/college-based-fees/index.html, accessed 8/30/10.

During the Spring Quarter 2005, students in the CAED reaffirmed their CBF support through another referendum process wherein the student vote in each department was strongly in favor of slightly increasing the fees to $256 per quarter, per student to account for inflation. In Spring 2009, the students again voted to support an increase in College Based Fees to $356 per quarter in Fall 2009, $456 per quarter in Fall 2010, and $556 per quarter in 2011. These significant increases are meant to help offset the diminishing State budget revenues and allow us to keep necessary classes running and thereby ensure students graduate in a timely manner. However, this CBF increase was held from implementation by the CSU Chancellor’s office, despite the students’ overwhelming vote of approval. The Chancellor is currently considering taking the CBF system out altogether, and this would have a severe impact on the Department’s budget.

The table and chart below show a general rise of CBF expenses over the last six years, which we project will drop in the next two years as we reduce enrollment, and particularly because we can no longer claim CBF revenue for architecture students attending off campus programs run through Continuing Education.

Table 8b. CBF Expenses History from 2003-04 to projections for 2011-12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>O&amp;E</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Lecturer Salaries</th>
<th>Staff Salaries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$68,679</td>
<td>$57,885</td>
<td>$484,440</td>
<td>$76,260</td>
<td>$687,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$136,746</td>
<td>$74,658</td>
<td>$437,735</td>
<td>$81,763</td>
<td>$730,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$17,987</td>
<td>$133,509</td>
<td>$459,000</td>
<td>$78,176</td>
<td>$688,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$1,664</td>
<td>$34,911</td>
<td>$340,606</td>
<td>$62,164</td>
<td>$439,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$5,727</td>
<td>$31,544</td>
<td>$512,487</td>
<td>$55,123</td>
<td>$604,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$5,606</td>
<td>$11,184</td>
<td>$357,160</td>
<td>$51,753</td>
<td>$425,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$51,294</td>
<td>$78,165</td>
<td>$346,371</td>
<td>$30,379</td>
<td>$506,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 5. CBF Total Revenue and Expenses by Year: 2003-04 to 2010-11 projections.
Section II: Non-State Budgets

II.A. Non-State Revenue and Expenses Comparative Summary Report

II.A.i. Overview

Non-State revenue has risen an impressive 111% and expenditures by 37% since 2003-04. There was a brief dip in income in 2005-2006 (which marked the end of the Cal Poly Centennial Campaign), but since 2006-07, with the arrival of the new Department Head, revenue has begun to climb. Non-State expenses in the last six years have typically exceeded the revenue received, slowly draining the Department’s non-State reserves. This was possible because the Cal Poly Centennial Campaign, which ended in 2004, provided a large store of Discretionary funds that allowed spending to exceed revenue for several years without incurring a deficit. While this excessive spending was not ideal, the Dean requested the Department to use Discretionary funds to supplement its operational needs that were not being met by the State budget allocation, including supplies and professional development expenses.

The exceptional boost in revenue in 2009-10 (from $126,994 in 2008-09 to $217,255 in 2009-10) and comparative decline in spending (down by $26,363 from 2008-09) have certainly helped replenish the Department’s non-State reserves. In an effort to further build these reserves (for Discretionary and other funds), the Department will continue to increase fundraising efforts and keep expenditures below annual revenues for the next two years. The non-State funds we plan to build in the next few years will serve to protect the Department in case of future, more extreme State budget reductions.

The sheer number of funds that have been established since 2003-04 gives evidence to the growth of the Department’s non-State revenue, even in times of economic crisis. In 2003-04, the Department had three non-State accounts: the Discretionary account, the Conference Surplus Fund, and the McCafferty/Bagnall fund. As of June 2010, the Department now manages 8 Foundation accounts (including the Discretionary fund), and 6 Corporation accounts. This expansion in terms of the number of accounts is important to note especially when comparing the Discretionary revenue and expenses from 2003-04 to 2009-10 in Table 9d. See section II.B. Discretionary Revenue and Expenses Comparative Report for more information.

Table 9a. Non-State Revenue and Expenses Summary Comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 (projection)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 (projection)</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$217,255</td>
<td>$116,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$126,994</td>
<td>$143,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$131,832</td>
<td>$149,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$127,340</td>
<td>$127,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$94,045</td>
<td>$124,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$84,701</td>
<td>$142,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$102,906</td>
<td>$84,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Revenue includes gifts, sponsorships, and other income from sales (e.g., event tickets, thesis book purchases, etc.).
Table 9b. Department Foundation and Corporation, with Comparative Accounts and Balances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2009-10 End Balance</th>
<th>2003-04 End Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Studio Grant</td>
<td>Autodesk Grant for a Collaborative Studio led by Prof. James Doerfler.</td>
<td>$3,981.56</td>
<td>Est. 2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Surplus Fund</td>
<td>Funds restricted to Department conference purchases and hosting, as well as support of Professional Development expenses; for example, the Department’s Summer Career Workshop revenue is deposited in this account.</td>
<td>$3,138.64</td>
<td>$22,038.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Fabrications Lab</td>
<td>Funds restricted for purchases/payroll to maintain the DFabLab directed by Prof. James Doerfler and Prof. Mark Cabrinha.</td>
<td>$17,718.87</td>
<td>Est. 2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth-Year Interdisciplinary Lab</td>
<td>Funds restricted to expenses for the Fourth-Year Interdisciplinary Lab led by Prof. James Doerfler.</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>Est. 2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Funds restricted to supporting faculty travel, supplies and materials related to professional development.</td>
<td>$476.50</td>
<td>Est. 2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Activities Fund</td>
<td>Funds restricted to Special Activity expenses and revenue, such as student clubs, thesis book sales, the Vellum Design Competition, and Plotter card sales.</td>
<td>$13,048.63</td>
<td>Est. 2004-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,864.20</td>
<td>$22,038.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>Funds expended at the discretion of the Department Head for hosting, supplies, materials, travel, student assistants, awards, etc. for the Department.</td>
<td>$41,175.34</td>
<td>$181,885.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Concepts</td>
<td>Funds restricted to low-income housing projects, directed by Prof. Daniel Panetta.</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>Est. 2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Rodriguez Lab</td>
<td>Funds restricted to studio support, directed by Prof. Thomas Fowler.</td>
<td>$10,304.99</td>
<td>Est. 2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCafferty/Bagnall Endowed Fund</td>
<td>Funds restricted to faculty support for materials, supplies, travel, hosting. Often sponsors the Department’s Watercolor Workshop each spring, led by Prof. Charles Crotser.</td>
<td>$11,418.20</td>
<td>$4,569.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Resource Center Materials Library</td>
<td>Funds restricted to supplies, materials, student assistant payroll, etc. for the maintenance of the Media Resource Center’s Materials Library, directed by Vickie Aubourg.</td>
<td>$4,651.07</td>
<td>Est. 2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leadership</td>
<td>Funds restricted to student projects, travel, awards, scholarships, materials and supplies, competition fees, etc., to enhance student learning and leadership.</td>
<td>$64,588.00</td>
<td>Est. 2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Travel Fellowship</td>
<td>Funds restricted to student travel, field trips, and site visits.</td>
<td>$5,121.79</td>
<td>Est. 2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Account</td>
<td>Funds restricted to projects related to sustainability, directed by Prof. Margot McDonald.</td>
<td>$2,362.84</td>
<td>Est. 2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,522.23</td>
<td>$186,454.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$186,386.43</td>
<td>$208,493.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.A.ii. Architecture Advancement Information

During the past four years, the Architecture Department has had great success in creating new opportunities to cultivate prospective donors including alumni, parents and companies. Architecture alumni have been invited to a number of regional social gatherings and many of these events have featured renowned guest
Communication from the Architecture Department during this time has been improved and expanded, including an annual letter from the Department Head to all alumni, a sophisticated annual departmental magazine first published in 2009, and a new, well-designed website that includes important content for current students, prospective students, alumni, architecture firms and parents.

The Department Head and the Assistant Dean for Advancement have traveled extensively to meet with successful alumni and architectural firms. These visits along with along with all departmental cultivation activities have led to an increase in the department’s annual support from $130,000 in FY 2007 to $184,000 in FY 2010. In addition, the department has received two $50,000 five-year pledge commitments for named studios and an impressively generous bequest commitment of $60 million from an anonymous donor (to be awarded after the donor has deceased) – the largest gift commitment ever received by the California State University system.

Table 9c. Total gifts and projected gifts to Architecture Department and College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Giving</th>
<th>Dept or College</th>
<th># of Gifts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 (projections)</td>
<td>Architecture Dept</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 (projections)</td>
<td>Architecture Dept</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Architecture Dept</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>$184,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>$1,159,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Architecture Dept</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>$105,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>$1,393,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Architecture Dept</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>$151,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>$1,834,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Architecture Dept</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>$130,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>$1,679,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Architecture Dept</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>$111,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>$1,471,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Architecture Dept</td>
<td>677 (^1)</td>
<td>$199,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>$1,078,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>Architecture Dept</td>
<td>697 (^1)</td>
<td>$83,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>$238,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Cal Poly’s Centennial Capital Campaign ended in December 2004, so the number of gifts and total gift amount in this year was significantly higher than following years.

II.B. Discretionary Revenue and Expenses Comparative Report

The Department’s Discretionary fund has historically been Architecture’s largest non-State, gift-based account. The gifts received to this account are unrestricted, which means the Department Head is free to allocate these funds as he/she sees fit for the needs of the Department. Typically these funds have been used to host alumni socials and receptions, student events, student project and competition support, student club support, student and faculty awards, advancement travel expenses, and to supplement professional development expenses when other funds are unable to.

Although calendar year 2004 marked the end of Cal Poly’s Centennial Campaign, the Department has worked hard to maintain its giving levels and slowly increase its Discretionary revenue over the last six years, even in the face of California’s economic crisis. In 2008-09, the Department initiated a giving campaign that asked donors to contribute to specific areas of interest, such as student leadership, sustainability, interdisciplinary labs, and faculty professional development. Thus in the last two years, the Department’s Discretionary revenue has dropped as the establishment and funding of new accounts has risen.
Table 9d. Discretionary Revenue and Expenses Historical report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>O&amp;E</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$61,667</td>
<td>$82,757</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$82,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$81,399</td>
<td>$80,276</td>
<td>$1,167</td>
<td>$81,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$96,500</td>
<td>$124,497</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$124,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$95,637</td>
<td>$79,260</td>
<td>$6,650</td>
<td>$85,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$88,442</td>
<td>$111,055</td>
<td>$9,355</td>
<td>$120,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$75,214</td>
<td>$119,391</td>
<td>$17,857</td>
<td>$137,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$86,633</td>
<td>$54,351</td>
<td>$5,327</td>
<td>$59,678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Revenue includes gifts, sponsorships, and other income from sales (e.g., event tickets, thesis book purchases, etc.).
2. Does not include the $75,000 that was transferred to establish the new Student Leadership fund. Technically, 2009-10 revenue totaled $136,667, and expenses totaled $157,757.

II.C. Other Non-State Revenue and Expenses Comparative Report.

Chart 6. Corporation and Foundation Revenue and Expenses (excluding Discretionary funds).

Section III: Professional Development

III.A. Professional Development Financial Resources

The Architecture Department taps into various state, trust, and foundation accounts to provide faculty supplemental funding for expenses incurred during field trips and travel related to professional development. Our annual Summer Career Workshop for high school students makes approximately $16,000 in revenue a year, which is deposited in the Conference Surplus Fund to be used for non-operational conference activities and our professional development expenses. Currently there remains in this Corporation account an approximate balance of $3,000, but once the revenue from the Summer Career Workshop is deposited in mid-Fall, we will have approximately $19,000. In addition to this revenue, we support professional development expenses with Discretionary and State General Fund accounts. Occasionally, the Department will also receive support for professional development from the Architecture Graduate Program. In 2008, the Graduate Program contributed $6,000 for professional development purposes.
Advancement efforts have enabled the Department to maintain yearly guaranteed funds for faculty professional development and, despite the current budget crisis, has increased this amount in 2010 from $2,000 to $3,500 per tenure track member per academic year. As probationary faculty have come to expect a stipend, in 2010 the Department initiated a guaranteed $2,000 for the two years following their promotion to assist newly tenured faculty to leverage these funds to secure external funding. In addition, the following funds were available for probationary faculty:

1. In 2009 the Department initiated a one-time $2,000 stipend to assist faculty prior to submitting their dossier for tenure during their last tenure-track year.
2. In 2009, the Department offered all probationary faculty an additional one-time $2,000 stipend because many faculty had secured papers to be given at international conferences and needed the extra funds to present their papers. It is noteworthy that during the last two ACSA National Conferences ten Cal Poly faculty presented papers.

Beyond the funds offered to tenure track and newly tenured faculty, professional development stipends are granted on a competitive basis. Lecturers at Cal Poly are not required to include research and service in their Professional Development Plan, however the department extends to them the opportunity to apply for funding from the departmental pool. In 2010 the tenured faculty competitive funds were doubled from $1,000 to $2,000 per academic year for presenting or refereeing a paper, organizing a workshop or conference, participating on a conference panel, or other purposes agreed to by the Department Head that advance the faculty member's professional development goals.

The College also has a professional development fund. The CAED Professional Development Committee, comprised of faculty representatives from each Department, ranks applicants in order of merit and benefit to the College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. Faculty Development Allotment and Expenses Comparative Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 (projections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 (projections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Allotment includes unspent rollover funds from the previous year.

III.B. Opportunities for Professional Development (including sabbaticals, professional leave of absences, facilitating of research and scholarship).

Faculty are entitled to take a leave without pay, a leave with difference in pay, or a paid sabbatical leave over a duration of one to three quarters. In 2010 Prof Jonathan Reich received a sabbatical, and Profs. Dan Panetta and Sandy Stannard received a difference in pay leave. Faculty may also elect to "swap" quarters by taking Fall, Winter or Spring Quarter off in exchange for teaching Summer Quarter. Each year, professors are invited to participate in the yearlong Washington Alexandria Architecture Center (WAAC), as the Director in Residence. The Department supports faculty directors in residence of WAAC with travel and moving expenses.

The Department sponsors a variety of professional development activity in addition to the guaranteed tenure track and newly tenured support. The Department's policy on funding of teaching, field trips, and travel has been recently liberalized to include disbursements for those participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) as well as for full-time and part-time lecturers. Each year, the Department sponsors:

- one faculty member to participate in the AIA/ACSA Teacher's Seminar at the Cranbrook Institute.
- one ACSA Faculty Councillor to attend the ACSA National Conference.
• one faculty who is a member of the JAE board to attend JAE meetings during the three year board term (as of 2010).
• one IDP faculty coordinator to attend the IDP Educator Coordinator’s Workshop.

The once-guaranteed Studio Support funds of $100/quarter allocation for field trips, class supplies, faculty/student research and professional development has been temporarily suspended since 2008. Yet funds are dispersed on a case-by-case basis and generally have been more substantial to assist one or several design studios to conduct a larger field trip. For instance, the funds sponsored a second-year site research field trip to San Francisco in 2009, and the annual second-year final review.

Faculty may also be entitled to one-time expenditures of $200 or $300 depending on the number of requests that they submit over the course of the year. Applicants will be funded, if they qualify, the difference between what they receive from the College Professional Development Fund and what they request (up to the maximum amount allowable) from the Department.

Section IV: Enrichment Opportunities: Scholarships, Endowments, Off Campus Programs

IV.A. Department Scholarships Comparative Report

Thanks to the generosity of alumni, firms, and donors, the Architecture Department alone currently offers 33 scholarships to our students, 24 of which paid a total of over $50,000 to 27 students in 2010. In addition, the College also offers 9 scholarships for which architecture students are eligible, and this year 5 of our students were awarded $10,000 in CAED scholarships.

There are also a handful of outside scholarships that the Department encourages our architecture students to apply for, and which our students are frequently awarded. In previous years, the Department consistently received the highest number of AIA/AAF Scholarships (7-13 each year) in the country, but this scholarship opportunity was discontinued in 2006. It was replaced in 2007 by the AIA Central Coast Chapter scholarship, which gives a comparatively smaller award.

However, since 1991, the AIA Mel Ferris Scholarship has frequently awarded Cal Poly architecture students. In the last three years, 4 of our students received top ranking Mel Ferris scholarships, ranging from $2,500 to $5,000, and including the recently added “Savings by Design” scholarship. In 2008, the founders of the Mel Ferris Scholarship also added the “Dean’s Choice” award, which allows the deans of select California architecture schools to choose one student from their school to receive $500.

Additionally, in 2009, the Department received $75,000, which we used to create a Student Leadership fund. This fund was established to supplement student support by sponsoring student travel to conferences, field trips, entrance fees for competitions, materials for projects, tuition for summer workshops, as well as department awards and direct financial aid to eligible students as determined by the Department Head. The establishment of this account was an important step in providing financial support that has helped students to succeed, and will continue to help students, as individuals or in collaboration with their peers, bring their architectural vision to life.

Overall, the scholarship opportunities for Architecture Department students has increased dramatically in the last six years, jumping from approximately $26,000 to over $65,000 in much-needed financial support. With the promise of rising tuition and fees in our current State budget crisis, we plan to continue fundraising efforts to secure more student scholarships to offset these rising costs and attract a diverse group of talented students.
Table 11a. Department scholarships report comparing scholarships awarded in 2003-04 to those awarded in 2009-10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture Department Scholarships</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Agron Memorial (M.Arch program) (2007)</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily N. Alstot Memorial (2004)</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen O. Anderson Memorial</td>
<td>$300¹</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Design Group (Internship)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred B. Berghell and Joy G. Berghell</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bfgc Architects Planners</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas W. Butzbach Memorial</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darden Architects (2008)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackey Deasy Memorial (2010)</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri and Tracee de Hahn Second Year Award (2007)</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri and Tracee de Hahn Third Year Award (2007)</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lee Fisher Memorial</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. L. Graves Jr. (2007)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thor and Juanita Gulbrand, AIA Memorial</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Stewart Kerr</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don and Caryl Kobert Architecture History</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruger Bensen Ziemer Architects</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Loh Architecture Design Excellence (2008)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew C. Lowery (2008)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Maple (student clubs) (2005)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzetti Architects (2010)</td>
<td>$1,830</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBH Architects</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hifumi Odo Memorial</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$2,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oltmans Construction Company</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Poindexter Memorial (2010)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddle (2010)²²</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRM²¹</td>
<td>$2,175</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Shannon (2010)</td>
<td>$0²⁶</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vern Swansen Memorial (2009)</td>
<td>$0²⁶</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Tanklage (2006)</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vellum Design Competition (2004)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. Whisenant (2007)</td>
<td>$0²⁷</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Peter Young</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,955</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,390</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The Anderson Endowment had insufficient funds to payout in 2010, so the Department supported this scholarship via our Student Leadership funds.
2. Rotational scholarship in the CAED, awarded to the Architecture Department every 5 years.
3. Rotational scholarship in the CAED, awarded to the Architecture Department every 5 years.
4. Not awarded in 2010 due to insufficient funds from low interest earnings. Usual award is $750.
5. Not awarded in 2010 due to insufficient funds from low interest earnings. Usual award is $500.
6. Not awarded in 2010 due to insufficient funds from low interest earnings. Usual award is $1,000.
Table 11b. College scholarships report comparing scholarships awarded in 2003-04 to those awarded in 2009-10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAED Scholarships</th>
<th>2009-10 Amount</th>
<th>2003-04 Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christine P. Brown Memorial (SAEDF)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert E. Collins</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamba Juice</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Ludvigsen Memorial</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice C. Loh</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas J. Martin</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Architects</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARA Award (SAEDF)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Tax and Adam Jarman</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11c. Other scholarships awarded to Cal Poly architecture students, comparing scholarships awarded in 2003-04 to those awarded in 2009-10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Scholarships (Not through Cal Poly)</th>
<th>2009-10 Amount</th>
<th>2003-04 Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIA CCC (2007)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA/AAF (discontinued)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA Mel Ferris</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA Mel Ferris Dean’s Choice</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


IV.B. Department Endowments

Several of our annual scholarships for both students and faculty are funded via endowments that have been in place since the last accreditation visit. The following endowment funds that have been in place since 2003-04:

1. A $10,000 endowment was established in the name of Professor Emeritus Don Koberg and Caryl Koberg to support student scholarships and to encourage the study of architectural history.
2. A $30,000 endowment fund was established from the estate of Kathryn McCafferty. This fund finances innovative instructional programs and faculty endeavors.
3. A $10,000 endowment fund was established by Paul and Verla Neel to support faculty professional development.
4. The George Hasslein Endowed Chair was established as a non-tenure teaching position for prominent practitioners and scholars. Appointments last for a term of one to two years.
5. The Universal Traveler endowment fund was established to support faculty travel for research and projects related to professional development.

New endowments have recently been established and have begun to have any economic benefit to the Department, including the following:

1. A $16,000 endowment was established in the name of Professor Emeritus Larry H. Loh, Architect, in 2008 to support student scholarships and encourage excellence in architecture design. Although the endowment has not earned enough to produce a pay out, Professor Emeritus Loh has been very generous in donating an additional $500 in both 2009 and 2010 so the scholarship may begin to benefit students immediately.
2. A $21,000 Duerk Technology Enhancement Endowment was established by Donna Duerk in 2010. This endowment is designed to facilitate student access to the means of researching, computing, developing, and presenting their work most effectively by purchasing the required software and technology needed for a selected first-year architecture student. Although the endowment has not been established long enough to produce a pay-out, Professor Duerk has contributed an additional $800 to start supporting a freshman recipient in Fall 2010.

The Department is also currently seeking additional endowments from other retiring faculty.
IV.C. Off Campus Programs

The Department offers fourth year students 16 off campus opportunities, both domestic and international, and including internship and professional studio programs. Current off campus programs include:

1. Ahmedabad, India – exchange program
2. Bauhaus, Dessau, Germany – exchange program
3. Canberra, Australia – exchange program
4. Copenhagen, Denmark (Danish Institute for Study Abroad) – funded by CSU
5. Florence, Italy – funded by CSU
6. Fontainebleau School of Architecture, France
7. Japan – available alternating years
8. National Student Exchange (NSE) – exchange program
9. Paris, France – exchange program
10. Professional Studios at LPA, ZGF, Gensler, and RNT Architectural Firms
11. Rome, Italy
12. San Francisco Urban Design Internship
13. SOM Co-op + Design Program in San Francisco
14. Switzerland
15. Thailand – available alternating years
16. Washington Alexandria Architecture Center (WAAC)

The Dean has recently implemented a new process for coordinating the off campus programs through Cal Poly's Continuing Education office, rather than relying solely on the Department faculty and staff. Students applying for off campus programs will now register and pay fees through Continuing Education’s office, but those fees have spiked due to the recent organizational change. The Dean’s initial purpose in making this change was to provide an avenue for generating revenue for the Department by recuperating the faculty program coordinator’s salaries with the program fees from Continuing Education rather than paying their salaries from the regular State General Fund allotment.

However, the reorganization of off campus programs has also encumbered students with a 12% program fee from Continuing Education and another 12% fee from Cal Poly. Per the Dean and current discussions with the Continuing Education office, the program fees may double to 48% of the current amount in the 2011-12 academic year. The Department is concerned that the current total 24% fee increase and anticipated 48% increase in 2011-12 for off campus programs will deter students (with or without financial need) from applying. A decrease in off campus applicants could mean that the programs would not meet the minimum number of students it needs to operate, and that program would either be run on a deficit, be cancelled, or charge even higher fees to the students who wish to attend. A potential consequence of this reorganization is a reduction of off campus programs.

If fewer students attend off campus programs and stay on campus, the Department’s allocated budget is currently unable to afford those additional students taking on campus classes. In response to this predicted crisis, the Department is contemplating requiring fourth year students not attending off campus programs to attend a co-op where students can receive academic credit as a way to offset the lack of State funds to cover classes. This alternative also has the benefit of enhancing the students’ academic tenure as they will graduate with professional experience, be able to apply for the LEED exams, and establish valuable connections with firms.

Another concern the Department has regarding off campus programs pertains to the Denmark program. The DIS program, organized by the CSU, funds approximately $12,500 per student, however, the DIS has recently reduced the number of students it accepts from 30 students in 2007-08 to 15 students in 2009-10. Furthermore, CSU and DIS discussions remain on the table to permanently eliminate the Denmark program in the near future if the budget crisis persists.
1.2.4d Data on annual expenditures and total capital investment per student, both undergraduate and graduate, compared to the expenditures and investments by other professional degree programs in the institution.

Section I. Cost per Student Comparison

I.A. Comparison of CAED Cost per Student to other Cal Poly Colleges, for 2009-10 and 2003-04

The tables below show an increase of approximately $1,000 in cost per full-time enrolled student (FTES) in the College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED) from 2003-04 to 2009-10. When ranked with other colleges at Cal Poly for cost per student, CAED comes in the lead with the highest investment per student, and has retained this rank since 2003-04. The College’s cost of $9,123 per FTES in 2009-10 represents a significant value considering that although Cal Poly’s tuition has nearly doubled from $3,435 in 2003-04 to $6,498 in 2009-10, there is still a College shortfall of $2,625 per student. Although the CAED has increased its cost per FTES, it has still significantly reduced the difference between tuition and cost per FTES by 46%, thereby increasing the College’s efficiency. Unfortunately, even as the CAED has taken enormous steps in making its programs more efficient, tuition remains less than Cal Poly’s average cost to educate a student. Consequently, there has been and will continue to be a deficit until this issue is resolved.

Table 12a. 2009-10 Cal Poly Colleges Report on the Cost per Full-Time Enrolled Student (FTES).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Actual SCU</th>
<th>Actual FTES</th>
<th>Budget: State + CBF</th>
<th>Cost per FTES</th>
<th>Rank Cost per FTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>95,641</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>$18,729,900</td>
<td>$8,813</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>57,148</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>$11,585,736</td>
<td>$9,123</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>130,990</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>$23,419,644</td>
<td>$8,046</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>239,604</td>
<td>5,325</td>
<td>$27,352,713</td>
<td>$5,137</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>74,801</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>$11,174,213</td>
<td>$6,722</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM + COE</td>
<td>211,697</td>
<td>4,704</td>
<td>$26,590,935</td>
<td>$5,652</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>809,881</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,997</strong></td>
<td><strong>$118,853,141</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,604</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. One FTES assumes a load of 15 credits per quarter, 45 credits per year.

Table 12b. 2003-04 Cal Poly Colleges Report on the Cost per Full-Time Enrolled Student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Actual SCU</th>
<th>Actual FTES</th>
<th>Budget: State + CBF</th>
<th>Cost per FTES</th>
<th>Rank Cost per FTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>86,690</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>$15,499,812</td>
<td>$7,777</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>51,795</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>$9,577,036</td>
<td>$8,321</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>118,314</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>$18,012,145</td>
<td>$6,851</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>237,866</td>
<td>5,286</td>
<td>$22,700,754</td>
<td>$4,295</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>92,258</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>$9,391,138</td>
<td>$4,581</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM + COE</td>
<td>181,103</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>$21,773,321</td>
<td>$5,410</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,821</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,169</strong></td>
<td><strong>$96,954,206</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,647</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. One FTES assumes a load of 15 credits per quarter, 45 credits per year.

I.B. Comparison of Individual CAED Departments’ Costs per Student, from 2003-04 to 2009-10

Based on the Architecture Department’s 2009-10 total State fund expenditures (including CBF, but excluding non-State expenditures) and the Department’s percentage of the College’s overhead costs, Architecture’s cost per FTES per academic year was $9,990. This has risen 41% since 2003-04, when the Department’s cost per FTES was $7,071.
Table 13. CAED Departments’ Costs per Student Comparative Report, provided by CAED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Actual FTES²</th>
<th>Budget Expenditures: General Fund + CBF</th>
<th>Cost per FTES</th>
<th>Cost per FTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCE</td>
<td>9924</td>
<td>$2,482,072</td>
<td>$11,255</td>
<td>$12,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>22450</td>
<td>$4,983,680</td>
<td>$9,990</td>
<td>$7,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>7174</td>
<td>$1,560,040</td>
<td>$9,786</td>
<td>$10,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>7880</td>
<td>$1,980,317</td>
<td>$11,309</td>
<td>$15,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>8570</td>
<td>$1,615,816</td>
<td>$8,484</td>
<td>$11,255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. State budget expenditures include each department’s General Fund and CBF expenses, as well as a percentage of the College’s overhead costs based on student enrollment in each department. All figures include costs for sabbaticals and difference in pay leave for faculty in their respective departments, but exclude costs for non-instructional assigned and release time.

2. Costs per FTES are based on Student Credit Units (SCU), and for computational purposes, each FTES is assumed to take 45 SCU per academic year.

Chart 7. CAED Departments’ Costs per Student for 2009-10.

Institutional Financial Issues:

1.2.4e A brief narrative describing:

University financial resources provided to the CAED are allocated internally between the five Departments. Total financial resources are comprised principally of enrollment budget allocation (apportioned by formula), State funding, and College Based Fees. Over the years, the CAED, and the Architecture Department in particular, have been forced to take too many students. This situation was created by Cal Poly’s admissions policy that for the last eight years has not been matched by an appropriate resource allocation. The Department has seen year-to-year increases in demand for the required classes for students to graduate on time through a combination of over ambitious University Admission’s targets, improved retention rates, and increased proportions of students in the upper division years (where almost 75% of their classes are in the Department). Due to the economic crisis of 2008 and the resulting unanticipated budget cuts the Department has been required to reduce its budget by 19.5% in 2009 in addition to State mandated furlough which resulted in an additional 10% savings. In 2010 the budget was reduced by another 12%. To respond...
to this situation, three key financial strategies were considered: increase in institutional support to the CAED from the University through a return to differential funding (given cuts across the board in the CSU this will not happen); increased external support (difficult in current circumstances where donors are unable to increase their contributions); reductions in enrollment among incoming freshmen, transfer students, and change of majors (mandated by the CSU for the academic year 2010-11), and informed adjustments in the Department’s curriculum.

1.2.4f Pending reductions or increases in enrollment and plans for addressing these changes.

The new CSU mandate to reduce student enrollment (contra to former policy) has necessitated that the Department initiate a five-year enrollment plan and regularly adjust its target. The transition from growth to mandated reduction will result in a few difficult years as we are forced to accommodate widely divergent student numbers among the various cohorts. Other consequences include an eventual reduction in the number of faculty, particularly among part-time lecturers.

1.2.4g Pending reductions or increases in funding and plans for addressing these changes.

Dean Jones expects that funding will be further reduced in 2010-11 due to the economic crisis in California and throughout the CSU system, but will increase slightly in 2011-12 (see Table 4a in 1.2.4b Forecasts, section I.A.i.). Increased class efficiency across the curriculum has been in place since the 2009-10 academic year, and will remain for this upcoming year as we continue to educate the large cohorts of students from previous years. Last year’s furlough created a challenging teaching and learning environment for faculty and students. Faculty responded by voluntarily increasing their teaching loads. Elective classes were cancelled, but to maintain timely graduation rates an increase in student faculty efficiency for core design classes was authorized by faculty.

The Department is committed to increasing its own revenue through private funding in order to maintain academic excellence while finding creative opportunities to work with less. Since 2008, a number of initiatives have been discussed with faculty: reduce department’s O&E expenses – initiated Fall 2010; increase scholarship commitments and discretionary funding (ongoing); secure named studios (2008 with two pending); establish a five year enrollment plan (2009); substantially increase co-op, internship, and professional studio offerings as well as establish additional off-campus programs (Fall 2010); convert the ARCH 101 to a safety class (Fall 2009); eliminate ARCH 221 (Fall 2009); convert FERP service to teaching responsibilities (2008); rethink the fifth year methods class ARCH 492 (Fall 2011); assess current retention/graduation/attrition rates (ongoing); integrate the practice activity within the design studio (Fall 2012); shift faculty released time from State to Discretionary (ongoing); and, per the Dean’s request (2009), move summer classes and select off-campus programs to Continuing Education, and increase the College Base Fee (CBF) towards instructional purposes (90% in 2009; 100% in 2010). These efforts are enabling the Department to meet new budget expectations, provide to its students access to all required courses for timely graduation, while increasing an academic and professional quality learning experience.

1.2.4h Changes in funding models for faculty, instruction, overhead, or facilities since the last visit and plans for addressing these changes (include tables if appropriate).

Funding models for faculty are based on the CFA/CSU Contract (MOU) and reflect the Weighted Teaching Units system (WTU’s), and cannot be changed (45WTU’s per year for full-time lecturers and above). Dean Jones continues to lobby for an increase in institutional support for the CAED as the program is one of the three pillars of the polytechnic identity of Cal Poly, comprised of the colleges of Agriculture, Engineering, and Architecture. The implementation of a Master’s Program in Architecture will permit graduate teaching assistants to teach a number of undergraduate classes.

1.2.4i Any other financial issues the program and/or the institution may be facing

University and College Issues

A University initiative to increase the existing College Base Fee in the amount of $300 per student per year over the next three years was voted in by a majority of Cal Poly students; however the CSU Chancellor did not authorize the implementation of the CBF increase. For more information, see 1.2.4c Comparative Reports, section I.B.ii. College Based Fees: Revenue and Expenses History.

Within the CAED, the Department has the highest proportion of out-of-state students applying to Cal Poly State University, NAAB APR, September 7, 2010, Part One, Section 1.2.4 Financial Resources, page 26
Poly. The national reputation of the program helps attract students whose tuition and fees exceed the costs for the Student Credit Units (SCU’s) they take in the College, and so bring real financial benefits to the University. We are seeking a greater portion of these funds.

As the fiscal crisis prolongs, and faculty retirements increase over the next three years, the Department is very concerned with how to attract quality and diverse tenure-track faculty to replenish its ranks. These concerns are exacerbated if furloughs are reinstated, class efficiency maintained, and a collective bargaining agreement stalemate between the CSU and the California Faculty Association (CFA) remains unresolved (there have been no salary increases since the academic year 2008-09).
1.2.5 Information Resources

- A description of the institutional context and administrative structure of the library and visual resources.

- An assessment of the library and visual resource collections, services, staff, facilities, and equipment that does the following:

  - Describes the content, extent and formats represented in the current collection including number of titles and subject areas represented.

  - Evaluates the degree to which information resources and services support the mission, planning, curriculum, and research specialties of the program.

  - Assesses the quality, currency, suitability, range, and quantity of resources in all formats, (traditional/print and electronic).

  - Demonstrates sufficient funding to enable continuous collection growth.

  - Identifies any significant problem that affects the operation or services of the libraries, visual resources collections, and other information resource facilities.
1.2.5 Information Resources

Evaluates the degree to which information resources and services support the mission, planning, curriculum, and research specialties of the program.

Institutional Context

Cal Poly Architecture students are fortunate to be served by two information resource bodies. The Hay Media Resource Center (MRC) located in the ground floor of the Architecture Building and the Robert E. Kennedy Library is nearby to the northeast. The two resources are funded and managed separately, but since it is the practice of the California State University system to support only one main library per campus, the development of the MRC in tandem with Kennedy’s collections has allowed a flexibility and customization of service unique to the polytechnic needs of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. While there is a healthy overlap between the two resource bodies, the Media Resource Center Director focuses on visual resources, digital media, building materials and contemporary print materials, while Kennedy’s liaison has traditionally focused more on the comprehensive collection of general, historical and curriculum-directed architecture monographs, subscriptions and databases. Kennedy Library also has a greater capacity to support faculty and graduate in-depth and long-term study. In recent years, as the corresponding positions have evolved, there has been an increasing degree of collaboration between the Director of the Media Resource Center and Kennedy’s CAED Librarian.

The Hay Media Resource Center (MRC)

The Hay Media Resource Center (MRC) is located in the College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED) building and functions as an information resource unit for the College and its five departments. The MRC is administered by a full time Director who reports to the Associate Dean of the College. The MRC Director is responsible for the MRC operations, including development and maintenance of collections, management of staff and budget and long range planning. Operations of the center support the curriculum and mission statement of CAED and Architecture Department. The quality and the diversity of the Media Resource Center’s resources promote the mission of the Architecture Department by providing resources that encourage students and faculty to study “design excellence, technical knowledge and contextual understanding in the creation of the built environment”.

The MRC’s current collections are comprised of books, serials, CD/DVDs, digital images, slide collection, product samples, and working drawings. These various media strengthen and support the curriculum and mission of the Architecture Department, and supplement Kennedy Library’s book and serial collections. To that end, the MRC offers visual collections and print resources on architectural design, international-global architecture developments, architectural practice, architectural history, building technology, urban planning, and landscape architecture. Continuing to upgrade the MRC’s diverse collections has demanded both the improvement of existing collections and the transformation of these collections into digital and electronic formats. The slide collection is now located in storage spaces and seldom used as book images are now scanned directly from books and the MRC’s ever-growing Image Database supplants the need for the slide collection images. Both the book and image collections are electronically accessible on the CAED server.

http://www.caed.calpoly.edu/facilities/mrc-image-collection.html
http://opac.libraryworld.com/cgi-bin/opac.pl?command=signin&libraryname=mrc%20books

Robert E. Kennedy Library

Cal Poly's Kennedy Library is a progressive and heavily service-oriented institution that has made very strong attempts in recent years to align its service model to accommodate the unique needs of each of the six individual colleges within the University. Since 2007, the College of Architecture has had it’s own designated CAED Librarian, who also spends time weekly working with the staff and students at the Media Resource Center. This is a collaborative relationship that continues to be defined, as it enriches the Library-CAED relationship.

Due to staff turnover, re-organization and changes to budget tracking over the past six years, responsibilities for the architecture collections and subscriptions at Kennedy have changed hands three times since the last NAAB accreditation visit. The current CAED Librarian began in February, 2010, and this is coupled with the even more recent hire of the Director of Information Resources and Archives in March 2010. Additionally, in many cases the continued massive shift of resources and priorities to the online world has left the new Architecture Librarian without a
The corresponding means of extracting the complicated, overlapping collections data to reflect and communicate value to the user. So, while every attempt has been made to accurately portray the evolution of the changes to the architecture budget and collection scope between 2004 and the present, only relatively simple, discreet data is available to reflect changes at this time.

The Kennedy Library is physically located very close to the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. On the first floor, there is an attractive, welcoming current periodicals room, with extended hours, where faculty and students can retrieve print reserve materials, as well as browse current issues and new arrivals, check their e-mail, track down past senior projects, or seek in-person reference help. Also located on the first floor there is a quiet study space, a large group study area and an air-conditioned computer lab, all three of which are accessible around the clock to anyone with a PolyCard (campus ID). Six more computer labs are located on the first and second floors, and are available for student use when no classes are scheduled. Throughout the five floors of the library are individual study carrels and group study rooms.

The library houses a large book collection with 9,663 LC-NA (Library of Congress architecture designation) titles and a large serial collection to support undergraduate and graduate research. Students can access Kennedy Library’s online catalog (PolyCAT) as well as the MRC Book Catalog from six computer stations in the MRC Center, or via the University’s web portal from anywhere. Kennedy Library does not support an in-house architecture slide collection, construction drawing collection or materials collection; but it does house some historically important special collections, such as the Julia Morgan Collection. Kennedy Library also subscribes to the ARTstor digital image database that currently provides access to over two million digital images in the arts, architecture and design. Finally, Kennedy features one of the most attractive and user-friendly websites on the Cal Poly campus, at http://lib.calpoly.edu/.

Comparing and Contrasting MRC’s Architecture Resources and Kennedy Library’s Architecture Resources

With 2,000 books and 55 serials, the MRC print collections emphasize procuring those resources that focus on a more the technically driven design world. The MRC’s print resources promote design creativity by providing access to the diversity and visual richness of contemporary international design. The depth of the MRC Collection does not support graduate level research. In comparison, the Kennedy Library with 10,000 books, 200 periodicals, and 6 architecture-related library databases can support both graduate and undergraduate in-depth research in contemporary, as well as historical architectural research.

As both the MRC and Kennedy Library have architectural image collections (Kennedy’s ARTstor database and the MRC’s in-house Image Database), architecture students and faculty are visually stimulated with digital images from both databases. The ARTstor image database is amassed from various outside image providers and photographic archives. Students and faculty can access the ARTstor database on the Kennedy Library server. The MRC’s image database is a unique subject-specific image collection. It was created with donations from CAED faculty travel images and offers our college a select perspective on architectural history, as seen through the eyes of our faculty. These faculty images of buildings and their details are more specific to our faculty’s course content than ARTstor images.

The MRC has amassed a large Materials Collection of building materials, approximately 4,000 samples that offer students hands-on experience with actual samples of innovative and sustainable materials used in the built environment. The Materials Collection database, currently housed in EmbARK software, will be converted to a web access collection using Gallery Systems’ WebKiosk. In addition, the MRC has a collection of construction drawings and plans of building types that can be viewed in full analog format at the MRC. Kennedy Library does not have a materials sample collection, nor does it have a construction drawing plans collection.

Services

Summary of Combined Services: Media Resource Center and Kennedy Library

Both Kennedy Library and the Media Resource Center provide students with information-seeking skills in the format of group tutorials or one-on-one instruction. The MRC staff is always available immediately for individual assistance 40 hours a week. The CAED Librarian at Kennedy must provide more information skill training to multiple classes or studios in the Architecture Department, thus is not always available at the Kennedy information reference desk. The CAED Librarian, trained in Information Library Science and its research methodology, provides more advanced support with long-term thesis research.
Media Resource Center Services

The MRC Director and her trained student assistants provide both individual and group orientation to the MRC facilities and instruct patrons in the use of:

- a. Print reference material
- b. Discipline-specific electronic resources and their citation formats
- c. Search strategies for keyword and subject classifications
- d. Architecture related databases on the web
- e. Information seeking and evaluation skills for the architecture environment

Print and web-based references for architecture and its related disciplines are available on the MRC’s website. The MRC webpage links to other university websites, and provides access to worldwide curriculum-relevant resources for all CAED majors. The updated MRC Webpage will have a feature page announcing new books, journals and updates to the resources. (See http://www.caed.calpoly.edu/facilities/mrc.html)

In addition, the MRC Director provides:

- a. Individual tutorials in information research methodologies
- b. Group orientations for first and second year studios to MRC’s resources
- c. Annual large lecture hall presentations for Practice Studios on Materials Research and Products’ CSI Specifications.
- d. 40 hours a week of immediate one-on-one research assistance with the Director's 14 years knowledge of architecture related precedents.

Kennedy Library Services

Kennedy Library’s “College Librarian” program is one the country’s most progressive academic librarian outreach programs. One sign of this is that it is rare for a state university library to write college or departmental responsibility directly into the librarian’s job title. This goes a long way towards promoting each college’s “ownership” of its librarian. College librarians visit each of their departments, get to know staff on multiple levels, and seek innovative ways to deliver instruction, reference and resource promotion.

Information Literacy Development Plan

A majority of incoming students to the architecture program are deficient in bibliographic and serial research skills, especially when it comes to using LC subject headings and architecture discipline keywords. The MRC Director and her trained staff regularly provide individual instruction on subject and keyword searching and how they function in PolyCAT (Kennedy Library’s book database), the Avery Index, and of course the MRC’s Book Catalog. The College Librarian for the Architecture Department collaborates with instructional faculty to provide course-integrated instruction. The Library houses six student-centered “smart” classrooms, which have various capacities ranging from 16-36. Instruction in these classrooms includes hands-on exploration of both print and electronic resources relevant to the students’ assignments and projects. The CAED Librarian also provides more generalized direct instruction to larger classes in their regular classroom environments.

The CAED Librarian and MRC Director are working together to establish year-by-year information literacy competencies for architecture students, beginning with freshmen in fall 2010. These competencies have been selectively drawn from the recommendations of the Association for College and Research Libraries Information Literacy Standards, and the Art Libraries Society of North America Information Competencies for Students in Design Disciplines guidelines. The plan is to build on them gradually, introducing new skills each year as students progress through the program. Faculty-initiated library sessions range from basic bibliographic instruction for general courses to customized research guidance for specific class assignments. Courses have been targeted and the “first wave” of instruction was delivered in spring 2010 to all new Bachelor of Architecture freshmen via a group-based research assignment in Arch 133. Future courses targeted for integrated instruction are 101 (theory), 241/242/207 (materials), 341/307/342 (practice/environmental control systems), 420 (history), and 492 (theory).

Since electronic information and bibliographic instruction are not yet a fully integrated part of the architecture curriculum, much of that instruction is done at the MRC and at Kennedy Library on an individual basis, and as group instruction. This provides patrons with skilled information research techniques. The individual assistance offered by the MRC staff supports the College’s mission to enhance students’ critical information-seeking skills and formal analyses so necessary for the practice of architecture and for life long learning.
College Librarians at the Kennedy Library fall within the Public Services group and work with faculty to support research needs and with students to help them complete their assignments and projects efficiently and successfully. Students and faculty can find in-person help and guidance at the Kennedy Library Reference Desk. The CAED librarian is available at least 30 hours per week for drop-in or scheduled one-on-one consultations for students and faculty. On the web, the Kennedy Library portal guides users to general resources as well as to subject-specific, course-related web pages using LibGuides software. The CAED LibGuides serve both general and very course-specific purposes, and are in an ongoing state of evolution, updating, and improvement. Email and chat reference are also now among the most popular methods of communication for students and faculty.

**Media Resource Center Interdisciplinary Collaboration**

a. Material Engineering Department (MAT) and CAED MRC Center.
Beginning Spring 2010 the MRC’s Materials Collection began a collaborative relationship with Material Engineering faculty and students. The aim is to provide access to materials samples for MAT engineering students, and at same time receive material science data and related software access from Materials Engineering Department.

b. Cal State University Visual Collective in DSpace
The MRC Director and the Cal Poly’s Art Department Visual Resource Curator are designing a unified Visual Collective for all CSU campus image collection, in collaboration with the Unified Information Access System, at the Office of the Chancellor, California State University.

- Describes the content, extent and formats represented in the current collection including number of titles and subject areas represented.

- Assesses the quality, currency, suitability, range, and quantity of resources in all formats, (traditional/print and electronic).

**Collections**

The MRC Director evaluates potential acquisitions for MRC collections based on several factors, the most important being the cost, relevance and anticipated use.

Book and serial collection acquisitions emphasize subject developments in:

a. Architecture practice  
b. Innovations and applications of green and smart building materials  
c. Structural design with emphasis on details and building skins  
d. Visual information competency in international architecture design  
e. Ecological and economic aspects of architecture design

Assessment and evaluation of acquisitions are executed in response to:

a. Curriculum changes and course contents  
b. Advise and counsel from faculty, the Associate Dean and the Architecture Department Chair  
c. Assessment of collection content and developments at the main library  
d. Developments in fields of architectural design, sustainability, building-material innovation, and global culture environments.

**MRC Analog Resources:**

New acquisitions moved increasingly toward emphasis on:

a. Digital technologies in architectural design and presentations  
b. Developments in innovative building materials and their effects on building skins, wall claddings and structural designs  
c. In-depth study of precedents and case studies  
d. Exposure to criticism, theory and social responsibility in architecture  
e. Importance of graphic design skills needed for presentations  
f. International developments in architecture practice and design

More specifically, the MRC has focused its book, serial and product collections development to support the department’s revised curriculum emphasis on:

a. New technologies in architecture
b. Energy uses and conservation
c. Sustainability in architecture
d. Innovations in design
e. Explorations of building systems and their materiality
f. Computer 3D modeling and advanced 3D fabrication

MRC Digital Resources:

a. The Architecture History digital image collection has improved international content, including historical and current building details.
b. Materials database provides information on both innovative and traditional materials’ properties and applications.
c. Library World database provides access to MRC’s book collection with full Library of Congress catalog records. In the future, the MRC Library World database will be incorporated into Kennedy Library’s PolyCAT database.

Suitability and Currency of MRC Collections

a. MRC Architecture History Image Collection
   Only quality teaching images are included in the collection. Fortunately, 90% of AH images in the collection come from donated faculty travel images photographed with high quality digital cameras and edited to correct lens adjustments.

b. Book and Serial Collections
   Additions to our book collection are made from scholarly publishers, including Birkhauser, MIT Press, Princeton Architectural Press, ACTAR, etc. The Director places an emphasis on subject titles that reflect a relevance to the Architecture curriculum and which project a potential and anticipated use.

c. Materials Collection acquisitions emphasize collecting those materials that are: sustainable, green, innovative, “smart”, and traditional. The 4,000 + samples collection provides hands-on experience with the dynamics and characteristics of the current material-driven built environment.

Quantity of MRC Collections: Total Holdings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collections</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2003-2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Book Collection</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC-NA Titles</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials Subscriptions</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Images Total</td>
<td>25,630</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Images in MRC Image Database</td>
<td>18,430</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Images not cataloged in MRC Image Database</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>16,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Collection Product Samples</td>
<td>5,258</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Collection Product Manufacturers</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Drawings and Buildings Plans</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kennedy General Collections

Kennedy Library provides both physical and virtual access to all its collections in a timely manner. All books, journals, videos, etc., are fully catalogued and classified by the Library of Congress standards and can be searched through the Library’s online catalog, PolyCAT. Links to electronic resources such as e-journals and e-books are also included in PolyCAT records. Undergraduates can check out materials for 21 days, and faculty and graduate students have an extended loan period of 90 days. Older bound issues are stored off-site, but can be retrieved upon request within 24 hours. Both print and electronic materials can be placed in the Library’s course reserves. Faculty members are provided with an electronic submission form to expedite the process.

Kennedy Library’s collection encompasses books, databases, manuscripts, government documents, journals, maps, and more. Currently the Library has 600,000 books (volumes) down from 780,000 in 2004. This is evidence of two developments. First, it shows the standard trend - especially in the sciences and technical fields - towards providing...
online media, as well as hardware with which to access it. It also reflects a major, library-wide collection-weeding that took place during this period.

Kennedy Architecture Collections

Despite the overall drop in monographs, since 1998 Kennedy Library has aggressively strengthened and enhanced the architecture collection, an initiative that is being pursued with renewed vigor by the new CAED Librarian. Based on past curriculum and faculty/student input, major topics of focus for the collection are architects, design, drawing, details, motives, decoration, history, California, coastal design, materials, special classes, Asia and sustainability. Recently, at the request of the the Architecture Department Head, increased focus has been placed on architectural and aesthetic theory and vernacular architecture. Faculty and students also heavily utilize materials in related subject areas, such as art history, landscape architecture, city and regional planning, architectural engineering, civil and environmental engineering, construction management, etc. The Special Collections and University Archives Department of Kennedy Library houses the largest collection of Julia Morgan materials in the world, including architectural drawings and correspondences. For an online guide to the Julia Morgan Papers, please see http://lib.calpoly.edu/specialcollections/findingaids/ms010/. For more on Cal Poly Special Collections in general, go to http://lib.calpoly.edu/specialcollections/.

Remote access to all electronic resources is available to all Cal Poly students and faculty, on campus or off. The library subscribes to 195 electronic databases, providing access to over 45,000 online journals, and pointing to an additional 750 print journals. Major electronic databases for architecture include Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals, Art and Architecture Complete, and JSTOR. General databases such as Academic Search Elite, Expanded Academic Index, Lexis-Nexis, among others, also index a number of the core architecture journals and magazines. The library also now subscribes to ARTstor, the emerging standard-bearer for academic Art and Architecture-based digital images. ARTstor currently contains 265,813 images in its “Architecture and City Planning” collection. ARTstor recently launched its “Shared Shelf” feature, which allows institutions to make local departmental collections searchable within or alongside ARTstor’s collections, using ARTstor’s interface. Kennedy Library currently subscribes or provides access to 200 architecture and related journals, 95 of which are accessible electronically. Of the titles listed in the 2009 Core list of periodical titles recommended by the Association of Architecture School Librarians, 60% are subscribed to by Kennedy, and 39% are available electronically.

**Kennedy Library Architecture Holdings 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books (NA titles)</th>
<th>9,663</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>200 (108 in full-text electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td>489 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Avery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Art and Arch Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- JSTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grove Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bibliography of the History of Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ARTstor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Images (ARTstor Architecture and City Planning)</td>
<td>265,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that changes in the way this data has been tracked at Kennedy Library between 2004 and 2010 have resulted in the current CAED Librarian’s inability to subdivide the 2004 data in order to make meaningful comparisons of these categories over the 6-year period.

The library’s collection is greatly enhanced by free services such as LINK+ and Inter-Library Loan (ILL) where materials from other libraries can be obtained in a matter of days. LINK+ is a web-based union catalog of 50 academic and public libraries in California and Nevada. Faculty and students at Cal Poly may request a book not available or checked out in our library and have it delivered to Kennedy Library for check-out. For articles, as of this writing, the library also currently uses the ILLiad international consortium of library systems, which delivers articles digitally in an average of 3-6 days. Work is currently underway to implement a new “Rapid ILL” system that will deliver articles in 2-4 days, to be implemented in late summer/early fall 2010.

The CAED College Librarian at the Kennedy Library works closely with architecture faculty to ensure that resources at the Kennedy Library support the undergraduate and graduate level curriculum as well as faculty research within the Architecture Department. All faculty in the Architecture Department are encouraged to recommend and suggest titles (books, journal titles, videos, electronic resources). While many titles are purchased through individual requests and the
librarians’ careful selection, the CAED Librarian also subscribes to an approval plan for reviewing new titles. When there are questions about the suitability of a potential purchase, the expertise of the appropriate faculty member is called upon to help with the decision to purchase. New titles recommended by this plan are based on a subject profile developed for architecture by the subject librarian.

Assessment of Kennedy’s collection with regards to current course offerings and curriculum is an ongoing activity. The Library responds to evolving curricular changes and emphases by working with faculty to acquire materials in new areas and topics in a timely manner. Requests for specific titles are considered from faculty and students, and the subject librarian monitors and orders materials to round out the collection. Reference publications are periodically reviewed and latest editions are ordered for the reference collection. Almost all of the subscribed journal titles have substantial back runs and are available as bound volumes or digital files via databases.

When purchasing new monographs, special consideration is given to the reputation of the publisher and longevity of the topic. Of course, as befits a polytechnic institution, practice and practicality are strongly considered as well. For example, due to the high percentage of students working on projects in the region and going on to professions within the state, books may be chosen for regional topics such as coastal building, semi-arid climates, and planning for earthquakes.

Facilities and Equipment

Media Resource Center Facilities

The MRC is suitably located within the CAED building; this location assures that CAED patrons have quick access to information resources. A major renovation of MRC facility in 2008-2009 created a modern and healthier environment with a “state-of-the-arts” shelving system and designer furniture. The MRC is now a friendly and nurturing place for group meetings and individual study. Relocating the slide and plans collections to an archival storage location provided more space for the growing materials collection and print collection. The Director has allocated space at the MRC for the display of students’ projects, including exhibition space for students’ models, and presentation boards. The MRC provides a small but permanent exhibition space for students’ projects. Kennedy Library has rotating, temporary exhibitions, but no permanent exhibition space for Architecture Department students’ work.
MRC Equipment
a. 6 iMac machines
b. 3 Flatbed scanners
c. 2 Canon ImagePROGRAF Printer/Plotters
d. 1 Vidar SD4430 Large Format Scanner
e. 2 Nikon Super Coolscan ED 5000 Slide scanners

Kennedy Facilities
Kennedy Library administration and staff have worked hard to update an outdated building for the radically different library culture of today and the staff are proud of their ability to listen to the library’s users and sculpt spaces based on their needs. The library is open more hours than any other library in the California State system. Full library access hours average 15.5 per day during the quarter and a large study room and computer lab were recently added that can be accessed by students 24-hours a day. Six more computer labs (five PC and one Mac) are located on the first and second floors, and are available for student use when no classes are scheduled.

Throughout the five floors of the library are individual study carrels and group study rooms, including a special area just for graduate students located on the third floor. The labs and open study areas have taken over the extra physical space afforded by the ongoing transfer of information to the digital realm. This includes a coffee shop, a print shop (Pony Prints) with large-scale capability, additional group study areas, the additional computer labs, a scanner and lockers for graduate students. With this need for digital services, there has been a lack of corresponding upgrades in the abundance of power sources and strength of the power supply, which is currently being addressed by the library’s Facilities Director.

Plans are underway for a major addition to Kennedy Library, to be constructed to the west of the current building. Shepley Bulfinch is the primary design firm behind the addition and the firm brings its renowned expertise with 21st Century academic library architecture. The addition will be a book-free center, housing additional library facilities and services, as well as service-based campus offices. Along with the recent developments of the campus to the north and northwest, this expansion will continue to solidify the library’s reputation as the campus “living room” and as the student-voted number one study spot on campus.

Staffing
The MRC Director holds a BA degree in Art Education from Montclair University, an MS degree in Art Education from Pratt Institute and completed MA degree course work in Art History from University of California, Davis. The Director has acquired vast knowledge of historical precedents, contemporary case studies, building types and building materials through her fourteen years of experience performing architectural information research. Creative information-seeking skill in the architecture subjects is an acquired skill perfected through years of reference work with students and faculty. The MRC Director reports to the Associate Dean of the College and has overall responsibility for the MRC operations, including development and maintenance of collections, management of staff and budget, and long range planning and facility renovations. Support staff for the MRC consists of 5 part time student assistants each working 6-10 hours a week.

Kennedy Library’s CAED College Librarian has an MA-LIS in Library and Information Studies and an MFA and MA in Painting and Drawing. While he has only been employed at Cal Poly since February 2010, he arrived with ten years of experience in education, with subject expertise accumulated through temporary positions at the Yale University Arts Library and the University of Minnesota Architecture and Landscape Architecture Library.

The College Librarian for the CAED at the Kennedy Library reports to the Associate Dean for Public Services. College Librarians hold responsibilities for information competence instruction, research consultation, collection development planning, and knowledge creation. The College Librarian maintains close, working relationships with architecture faculty. The Kennedy Library has a strong complement of support staff working with professional and administrative persons to provide library resources and services to the university community. The CAED Librarian does not currently manage students, but a push is being made to fund more student work that directly supports College Librarian responsibilities.
- Demonstrates sufficient funding to enable continuous collection growth.

Funding

In an effort to assist the College with its mandate to cut spending at a time when the California State University budget has been greatly reduced since 2008, the MRC Director successfully obtained non-CAED funds from the Architecture Students' College Based Fees committee (CBF), and the Materials Library's Funds, donated by the College Based Fee Committee, provided major additions to the MRC budget and greatly offset the College's cut-back on funding for the MRC. In addition, the Manufacturers' Donations Program provided additional relief to the severe College funding reduction for the MRC.

Media Resource Center Budget, Architecture Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2003-2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monographs Budget</strong></td>
<td>$3,178 (CBF Funds)</td>
<td>$3,640 (CBF Funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>NA_LC Titles</strong>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serials Budget</strong></td>
<td>$2,793 (CBF Funds)</td>
<td>$1,473 ($537 CAED funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies</strong></td>
<td>$2,345 (CAED funds)</td>
<td>$2,100 (CAED Funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Assistant Salaries</strong></td>
<td>$17,500 ($12,500 CAED Lydia Humphrey Fund)</td>
<td>$15,000 (CAED Lydia Humphrey Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($5,000 CBF Funds Summer Assistants)</td>
<td>($900 CBF Funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials Collection</strong></td>
<td>$5,300 Manufacturers' Donations Program</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Databases</strong></td>
<td>$1,450 CAED funds</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($200 BuildingGreen)</td>
<td>($200 BuildingGreen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($1,000 EmbARK/ WebKiosk Upgrades)</td>
<td>($1,000 EmbARK/ WebKiosk Upgrades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($250 Materials Connexion Manufacturer's Donation Program)</td>
<td>($250 Materials Connexion Manufacturer's Donation Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$32,566</td>
<td>$22,213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CAED Librarian’s budget for the 2010-2011 school year reflects two encouraging supplemental funds that reflect Kennedy administration's commitment to building the collection. First, because he arrived late in the fiscal year and after a period of vacancy, the CAED Librarian was granted an extra $8,000 to spend on monographs over the summer of 2010. Additionally, due to a reworking of funds, each college librarian has been granted an additional $20,000 to spend on collections over the next three years. (Forty percent of each of these funds, representing an architecture allotment, has been added to the current years budget in the CAED Librarian budget chart).

CAED Librarian Budget and Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-2011 (Projected)</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monographs Budget</strong></td>
<td>$17,300</td>
<td>$12,200</td>
<td>$17,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>40% of CAED budget</strong>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monographs Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>Lib. Of Congress NA section</strong>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serials Budget</strong></td>
<td>$8,800</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
<td>$9,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>40% of CAED budget</strong>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Databases Budget</strong></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,00 P0</td>
<td>$1,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>40% of CAED budget</strong>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Identifies any significant problem that affects the operation or services of the libraries, visual resources collections, and other information resource facilities.

**Significant Problems**

California State University libraries are woefully underfunded. While the College Librarian model provides for dynamic and progressive service, it doesn't entirely compensate for either a high librarian-to-FTE ratio or a notable lack of funding for monograph collections, desirable journals or valuable e-resources such as BuildingGreen Suite or RefWorks. The funding issue is compounded by the lack of recognition of the Cal Poly Architecture program's customized research needs, in relation to the other California State Universities. For example, the Avery Index of Architectural Periodicals is the current gold standard for architectural research, yet Kennedy's access was abruptly cancelled this spring by the CSU's centralized Systemwide Electronic Information Resources (SEIR) administration. Though the CAED Librarian and Kennedy collections staff worked quickly to procure a single-campus subscription, when consulted as to the reason for the cancellation, the response from SEIR was that it was viewed as expendable since “only two of the 23 CSUs had it.” This demonstrates a need for vigilance and advocacy for resources that nurture the Architecture Department's unique needs and contributions to the CSU System.
1.3 Institutional Characteristics

1.3.1 Statistical Reports

Program student characteristics

1.3.1a Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).

1.3.1b Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.

1.3.1c Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.

1.3.1d Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.

1.3.1e 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.

Time to graduation

1.3.1f Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.

1.3.1g 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

1.3.1h Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.

1.3.1i Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.

1.3.1j Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.

1.3.1k Number of faculty promoted each year since the last visit.

1.3.1l Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.

1.3.1m Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.

1.3.1n Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.

1.3.1o Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.
1.3.1 Statistical Reports

Program student characteristics

Overview
Cal Poly students are uniquely professional and job-oriented among the more liberal arts-oriented students of California. They look to the departments on campus as their best channels for entering the world of work as prepared professional practitioners. To this end, they plan throughout their high school years to compete for admission to our continually oversubscribed program. As you can see in comparing the University and College admission statistics to Cal Poly’s Architecture Program, the average Architecture student profiles for both freshman and transfer applicants are higher. Also the statistics of incoming architecture students are higher for 2009 than they were for 2003. Here are some admissions and enrollment statistics:

University Admissions Statistics
- For 2009, the University had 1 opening for every 7.9 applicants (2003: 4.16). There were 36,674 applications received (2003: 24,893) and 4,624 enrolled (2003: 3,876).
- The average GPA for high school applicant students accepted was 3.81 (2003: 3.73) with a combined SAT (Verbal and Math) score of 1,202 (2003: 1995).
- There were 5,185 transfer applications received (2003: 4,066) and 716 enrolled (977), with an average GPA of 3.3 (2003: 3.27).

CAED Admissions Statistics
- For 2009, the CAED had 1 opening for every 9.1 applicants (2003: 5.4). There were 3,068 applicants received (2003: 1,788) and 336 enrolled (2003: 331).
- The average GPA for high school applicant students accepted was 3.96 (2003: 378) with a combined SAT (Verbal and Math) score of 1226 (2003: 1210).
- There were 627 transfer applications received (2003: 448) and 71 enrolled (2003: 113), with an average GPA of 3.5 (2003: 3.22).

Architecture Admissions Statistics
- For 2009, the Department had 1 opening (2003: 1) for every 13.9 applicants (2003: 7.4). There were 1,940 applicants received (2003: 1,044) and 140 enrolled (2003: 141).
- The average GPA for high school applicant students accepted was 4.01 (2003: 3.91), with a combined SAT (Verbal and Math) score of 1293 (2003: 1248).
- There were 405 transfer applications received and 34 enrolled. Average GPA for 2009 not available (Average GPA of 3.30 for 2003).

Architecture Admissions Criteria
- The Department's Admissions Criteria for entering freshmen students is weighted by category, with nearly half of the weighting based on GPA; the remaining weighted categories include SAT, work experience and extracurricular activities. For entering transfer students nearly half of the weighting is based on completion of major specified courses. The remaining weighted categories include: completion of specified general education courses, GPA, work experience and extracurricular activities.
- The University utilizes a multi-valued selection scheme developed by our faculty that combines academic factors with other objective values, including non-cognitive variables deemed important by the campus Trustees, to comprehensively review all applicants for selection. The University has asked each major program to develop the criteria that it utilizes to screen, score, and select all students. Applicants will compete for admission against other applicants applying to the same major at the same level. Decisions will be based upon the available spaces in each major; this number varies from quarter to quarter within each pool.
- With our upside-down curriculum, Cal Poly continues to require every prospective student to apply for a particular major field of study, whether seeking to enter from high school or as an upper-division transfer from a community college or university.
- The campus gives additional selection consideration to recently discharged California veterans, first-generation college students, for geographic location of the applicant’s home domicile, and to California community college transfer students with lower-division transfer pacts. The University also awards additional consideration to applicants from its Hayden Partner High Schools as part of its 1st Generation Initiative.
- Cal Poly faculty has approved the practices followed whereby a student may be considered for admission as a University Interest based upon special interests, experiences, or talents that they can contribute to the campus community.

- Cal Poly has a general articulation agreement with all of the California community colleges.

- For 2009, 71 of incoming students are transfer students (21%) and 265 are first-time freshman (79%). In 2003, 58 of our incoming students were transfer students (29%), and 141 were first-time freshmen (71%).

**Architecture Enrollment Size**

- The student census count is determined using three methods: 1) total number of students enrolled; 2) full-time students, i.e., determined by the number of students who are enrolled in a minimum of 12 units each quarter; and, 3) full-time equivalent students (FTES), i.e., determined by adding up the total number of student credit units (SCUs) and dividing by 15. In Fall Quarter 2009, the Architecture Department enrolled 563 FTES undergraduate students (Fall 2003: 808 FTES) or a headcount of approximately 733 undergraduate students (Fall 2003: 825). In Winter Quarter 2009, there were 740 students enrolled in architecture design studio courses (2003: 649): 1st year: 156 (2003: 97), 2nd year: 144 (2003: 162), 3rd year: 163 (2003: 144), 4th year: 117 (2003: 110), 5th year: 160 (2003: 136).

1.3.1a Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).

1.3.1b Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.

1.3.1c Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.

1.3.1d Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.

1.3.1e 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.

**Overview of Progress-To-Degree and Time-To-Graduation Student Statistics**

- *Longitudinal Study to Facilitate Progress to Degree (see tables 1 – 2)*

- The progress-to-degree rates are developed by the Architecture Department.

Over the last six years the Department has been tracking three groups of freshman and transfer students through the curriculum (entering 2001, 2002, and 2003) to see where students get off track in the program (see team room documents for full study). The 2003 student progress-to-degree report was never completed, so we do not have all the data to compare with the 2009 numbers, but can at least compare the first three years of student progress.

Students who leave the department either change to a different major within the College, a different major within the University, or are disqualified/discontinued (for freshman the average is 18% and for transfers the average is 8.2%). The range of reasons why students are disqualified or discontinued include: not making progress towards degree, failing grades in foundation classes such as math and physics, low grades in design courses, and continuous academic probation (typically 2-3 quarters of low grades). The range of majors that students change to are: within the CAED - Construction Management, Architectural Engineering and City Regional Planning; and outside of the CAED - Math, Biological Sciences, Mechanical Engineering, English, Business Administrative and Political Science.

- *Time-To-Graduation Rates (see tables 3 - 14)*

- The time-to-graduation rates are developed by the University’s office of IP&A.

The average time-to-graduation rates (for both freshman and transfer students entering 2001, 2002, and 2003) are provided for comparison between 2009 and 2003. While improvements still need to be made, there has been a 15% increase in the number of students who graduated within 5 years, from 65% in 2009 compared to 50% in 2003. In looking at the 6-year rate, 80% of students have graduated (do not have 2003 numbers to compare). There are also fewer students changing majors (2009: 12.3%; 2003: 17%) and less being disqualified/discontinued from the program (2009, 19.6%; 2003, 26%). The changes to the curriculum will further improve these 2009 percentage rates (see part 2, section 1.2.3 Professional Degrees and Curriculum).
- Details Longitudinal Study to Facilitate Progress to Degree

### Table 1a. Summary of the freshman students' progress to degree information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average of Freshman Students [Entering Students 2001 &amp; 2002]</th>
<th>Fall—1st Year</th>
<th>Fall—2nd Year</th>
<th>Fall—3rd Year</th>
<th>Fall—4th Year</th>
<th>Fall—5th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Or Failed Design¹</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students Gone Or Off Track²</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students On Track</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals³</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Not enrolled and Not in Or Failed Design numbers are all combined together for the ease of compiling this information. None of the transfer students have failed design, but a few have gotten out of sequence so they have not enrolled in design for selected quarters.

2. This number only reflects the number of students that decide to transfer or are discontinued/disqualified.

3. The totals equals the number of students on track plus the students that have gone off track. The fluctuating enrollment numbers are most likely the students who have gone off track, and are coming back on track a few quarters behind.

### Table 1b. Comparison Summary from 2004 APR of the freshman students' progress to degree information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average of Freshman Students [Entering Students 2001]</th>
<th>Fall—1st Year</th>
<th>Fall—2nd Year¹</th>
<th>Fall—3rd Year²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enrolled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Or Failed Design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students Gone Or Off Track</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students On Track</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals³</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Only two years are averaged from the 2003 freshman entering 2nd year.

2. Only one year shown, since 2002 and 2003 freshman have not reached 2nd and 3rd years.

3. The increasing enrollment numbers are most likely the students who have gone off track, and are coming back on track a few quarters behind.

### Table 2. Summary of the transfer students' progress to degree information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average of Transfer Students [Entering Students 2001,2002,2003]</th>
<th>Fall—1st Year¹</th>
<th>Fall—2nd Year²</th>
<th>Fall—3rd Year²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Or Failed Design²</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students Gone Or Off Track³</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A %</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students On Track</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A %</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals³</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Transfer students obtain credit for all of the first year design courses and start at various places in the second year design sequence.

2. Not enrolled and Not in Or Failed Design numbers are all combined together for the ease of compiling this information. None of the transfer students have failed design, but a few have gotten out of sequence so they have not enrolled in design for selected quarters.

3. This number only reflects the number of students that decide to transfer or are discontinued/disqualified.

4. The total equals the number of students on track plus the students that have gone off track. The fluctuating enrollment numbers are most likely the students who have gone off track, and are coming back on track a few quarters behind.
Time-to-Graduation rates

1.3.1f Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.

1.3.1g Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.

SUMMARY of Time-to-Graduation Rates

Table 3. The time-to-graduation rates averaged for comparison between 2009 and 2003 (includes both freshman and transfer students):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2009 % of Students</th>
<th>2003 % of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 5yr Program</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed major</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified/Discontinued</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Only showing the percentages of students graduating in five years (see duration rates table below).
2. The total percentages don’t add up to 100%, due to a percentage of other reasons that effect time-to-graduation rates of students.
3. Changed major includes both within and outside of the College.

Table 4. The time-to-graduation duration rates for comparison between 2009 and 2003 (includes both freshman and transfer students):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2009 Grad &lt; 5 yrs</th>
<th>2009 Grad in 5 yrs</th>
<th>2003 Grad &lt; 5 yrs</th>
<th>2003 Grad in 5 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen + Transfers</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 7 year time-to-graduation numbers could not be obtained for 2009 numbers. However, there is an average of the following number of students still enrolled after 6 years: for freshman students it is 6% (about 7 students) and for transfer students it is almost 2% (about 1 student).
2. Could not obtain the 6 year or 7 year 2003 percentages.

DETAILS of the Time-to-Graduation Rates

- Entering Freshman

Table 5. Fall 1999\(^1\) Entering Freshman: Total Adjusted Cohort 112\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># Of Students(^2)</th>
<th>% Of Students(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 5 yr. program</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Enrolled after 5 yrs.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified/Discontinued after 5 yrs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Imports/Exports(^3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different major</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different major</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Adjusted Cohort = Original Cohort of 127 minus the major changes into and out of Architecture
2. The total numbers and percentages of students don’t always add up to a 100%, due to other reasons that effect time-to-graduation rates.
3. Separation of changes into and out of major not available.
### Table 6. Fall 2000 Entering Freshman: Total Adjusted Cohort 107

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># Of Students</th>
<th>% Of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 5 yr. program</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Enrolled after 5 yrs.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified/Discontinued after 5 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Imports/Exports:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different College</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7. Fall 2000 Entering Freshman: Total Adjusted Cohort 107

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># Of Students</th>
<th>% Of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated within 6 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Enrolled after 6 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified/Discontinued after 6 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Imports/Exports:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different College</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Adjusted Cohort = Original Cohort of 127 minus the major changes into and out of Architecture

### Table 8. Fall 2001 Entering Freshman: Total Adjusted Cohort 124

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># Of Students</th>
<th>% Of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 5 yr. program</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Enrolled after 5 yrs.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified/Discontinued after 5 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Imports/Exports:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9. Fall 2001 Entering Freshman: Total Adjusted Cohort 124

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># Of Students</th>
<th>% Of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated within 6 years</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Enrolled after 6 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified/Discontinued after 6 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Imports/Exports:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Adjusted Cohort = Original Cohort of 133 minus the major changes into and out of Architecture
2. The total numbers and percentages of students don’t always add up to a 100%, due to other reasons that effect time-to-graduation rates.
### Table 10. Fall 2002 Entering Freshman: Total Adjusted Cohort 104

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># Of Students</th>
<th>% Of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 5 yr. program</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Enrolled after 5 yrs.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified/Discontinued after 5 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Imports/Exports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Adjusted Cohort = Original Cohort of 119 minus the major changes into and out of Architecture
2. The total numbers and percentages of students don’t always add up to a 100%, due to other reasons that effect time-to-graduation rates.

### Table 11. Fall 2002 Entering Freshman: Total Adjusted Cohort 104

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># Of Students</th>
<th>% Of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated within 6 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Enrolled after 6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified/Discontinued after 6 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Imports/Exports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12. Fall 2003 Entering Freshman: Total Adjusted Cohort 130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># Of Students</th>
<th>% Of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 5 yr. program</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Enrolled after 5 yrs.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified/Discontinued after 5 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Imports/Exports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different College</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13. Fall 2003 Entering Freshman: Total Adjusted Cohort 130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># Of Students</th>
<th>% Of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated within 6 years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Enrolled after 6 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified/Discontinued after 6 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Imports/Exports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to different College</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different major w/in CAED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from different College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Adjusted Cohort = Original Cohort of 141 minus the major changes into and out of Architecture
2. The total numbers and percentages of students don’t always add up to a 100%, due to other reasons that effect time-to-graduation rates.
Table 14: Fall 2004\(^3\) Entering Freshman: Total Adjusted Cohort 97\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># Of Students(^2)</th>
<th>% Of Students(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 5 yr. program</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Enrolled after 5 yrs.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified/Discontinued after 5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Imports/Exports:
- Changed to different major w/in CAED: 6
- Changed to different College: 12
- Changed from different major w/in CAED: 12
- Changed from different College: 4

1. Adjusted Cohort = Original Cohort of 99 minus the major changes into and out of Architecture
2. The total numbers and percentages of students don’t always add up to a 100%, due to other reasons that effect time-to-graduation rates.
3. 6 year rates not available for 2004.

Program faculty characteristics

1.3.1h Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
1.3.1i Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
1.3.1j Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.
1.3.1k Number of faculty promoted each year since the last visit.
1.3.1l Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.
1.3.1m Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
1.3.1n Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.
1.3.1o Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.

Faculty: Description of the distribution of effort between teaching and other responsibilities of each faculty member

The following is a list of primary teaching areas and the full-time faculty who have: 1) been assigned to these areas; and 2) expressed a desire to remain teaching in these areas:

- Environmental Control Systems
  Faculty Coordinator: Peters
  Beller, Crotser, Jaggia, Joines, Killing, Macdonald, Peters, Stannard, Wiley, Williams

- Architectural Practice (includes materials, building construction and professional practice) —
  Faculty Coordinator: Arens (2\(^{nd}\) Year), Doerfler (3\(^{rd}\) Year)
  Arens, Beller, Cabrinha, Crotser, Fowler, Illingworth, Jones, J. Lange, Mueller, Macdonald, Schmidt, Wynn, Yin

- History, Theory & Criticism —
  Faculty Coordinator: Neveu
  Choi, Neveu, Nulman, Yip

- Beginning Design
  Faculty Coordinator: Lucas
  Bagnall, Freeby, Grover, Lucas, Ridley, Wiley

- Second Year Architectural Design —
  Faculty Coordinator: Arens
  Arens, Chapman, Duerk, Grover, Macdonald, Schmidt, Wynn, Weisenthal,

- Third Year Architectural Design —
  Faculty Coordinator: Fowler
  Cabrinha, Doerfler, Fowler, Hargrave, Illingworth, Lange, Neveu, Panetta, Yin,

- Fourth Year Architectural Design —
  Faculty Coordinator: Reich
  Beller, Crotser, Dettmer, Doerfler, Killing, McDonald, Miller, Reich, Swearingen
Charts show comparative numbers of students and student-faculty ratios from 2003-2004 to 2008-2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload and Enrollment Tracking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrollment by Academic Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>FTE Faculty</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student-Faculty Ratio For All Courses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>38.325</td>
<td>19.1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>43.946</td>
<td>18.4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>43.91</td>
<td>18.4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>40.407</td>
<td>19.3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>43.88</td>
<td>18.9:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>39.94</td>
<td>20:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18.6:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Student Faculty Ratio for Design Studios |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Level** | **2011-2012 (projection)** | **2010-2011 (projection)** | **2009-10** | **2003-04** |
| 1st Year | 23.43 | 23.43 | 22 | 24 |
| 2nd Year | 19.83 | 19.83 | 18 | 16 |
| 3rd Year | 18.25 | 18.25 | 20 | 16 |
| 4th Year* | 19 | 19 | 17 | 18 |
| 5th Year | 20.78 | 20.78 | 20 | 17 |

| 2009-2010 Design Studio Ratios, Total Number of Sections/Students By Year Level |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Level** | **Student – Faculty Ratio** | **Total Number of Sections** | **Number of Students** |
| 1st Year | 22 | 7 | 158 |
| 2nd Year | 18 | 8 | 146 |
| 3rd Year | 20 | 8 | 163 |
| 4th Year* | 17 | 5 | 79 |
| 5th Year | 20 | 8 | 160 |

| 2003-2004 Design Studio Ratios, Total Number of Sections/Students By Year Level |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Level** | **Student – Faculty Ratio** | **Total Number of Sections** | **Number of Students** |
| 1st Year | 24 | 4 | 97 |
| 2nd Year | 16 | 10 | 162 |
| 3rd Year | 16 | 9 | 144 |
| 4th Year* | 18 | 6 | 110 |
| 5th Year | 17 | 8 | 136 |

*Note: These are the numbers of students that are on campus during the fourth year.*

In addition to teaching responsibilities, faculty are expected to demonstrate service to the Department, College and University; the profession and community; and actively participate in creative research or professional activities. Each of the Architecture Department faculty serve on committees (except for lecturers). Three of the fifteen weighted teaching units (WTU) assigned to each faculty is set aside for instructionally-related activities which include student organization advising, departmental administrative tasks, and membership on University, College and Department committees.
Demographics include the following (tenured and tenure-track faculty):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty*</th>
<th>2009 Dept. of Arch.</th>
<th>'04 Dept. of Arch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2009 Dept. of Arch.</th>
<th>'04 Dept. of Arch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Faculty numbers include faculty members who have participated in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) over the last several years, since faculty that retire still remain tenured.

**Observations on faculty equality and diversity:**
The department has been struggling with attracting diverse faculty. For Fall 2009, the non-white and ethnic minority Architecture tenured and tenure-track faculty has decreased to 12% (3) of the total tenured and tenure-track faculty (down from 21% (6) in 2004).
Students:

The following section reflects the most recent undergraduate demographics available at this time with a comparison to similar data (when available) 6 years ago.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dept. of Arch. Totals</th>
<th>Cal Poly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>733</td>
<td>18,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>795</td>
<td>17,257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dept. of Arch. Totals</th>
<th>Cal Poly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>(48%) 354</td>
<td>(44%) 8,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>(43%) 341</td>
<td>(44%) 7,631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dept. of Arch. Totals</th>
<th>Cal Poly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>(52%) 379</td>
<td>(56%) 10,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>(57%) 454</td>
<td>(56%) 9,626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dept. of Arch. Totals</th>
<th>Cal Poly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>(.4%) 3</td>
<td>(.6%) 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.5%) 4</td>
<td>(.8%) 144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dept. of Arch. Totals</th>
<th>Cal Poly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>(.4%) 3</td>
<td>(.9%) 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.6%) 5</td>
<td>(10%) 166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dept. of Arch. Totals</th>
<th>Cal Poly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Mexican-American &amp; Other Hispanic</td>
<td>(16%) 115</td>
<td>(12%) 2,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>(15%) 121</td>
<td>(10%) 1,656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dept. of Arch. Totals</th>
<th>Cal Poly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>(15%) 110</td>
<td>(11%) 1,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>(13%) 106</td>
<td>(9%) 1,495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dept. of Arch. Totals</th>
<th>Cal Poly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>(2%) 15</td>
<td>(2%) 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dept. of Arch. Totals</th>
<th>Cal Poly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Total Non-White</td>
<td>(34%) 246</td>
<td>(26%) 4,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>(37%) 295</td>
<td>(31%) 4,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dept. of Arch. Totals</th>
<th>Cal Poly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>(55%) 405</td>
<td>(65%) 11,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>(52%) 411</td>
<td>(63%) 10,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dept. of Arch. Totals</th>
<th>Cal Poly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>(11%) 82</td>
<td>(9%) 1,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>(15%) 116</td>
<td>(18%) 2,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations on the student equality and diversity: Although the proportion of non-white students on campus has decreased within the last six years, the number of non-white students in the Architecture Department has increased. Even though the passage of California State Proposition 209 (California Civil Rights Initiative), of 1996 continues to affect how the University can attract non-white students, the Architecture Department continues to exceed campus-wide minority representation (Architecture, 34%; Campus, 26%). The 2004 Department numbers remain the same at 34%, but the Campus numbers have increased from 23%. The proportion of women students in the Architecture Department has increased slightly over this period of time (in 2003: Architecture, 34%; Campus, 23%), and exceeds the University. The proportion of men and women remain unchanged for the University. The proportion of men has decreased slightly and is exceeded by the University proportion.
### 1.3.1k Number of faculty promoted each year since the last visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Architecture Faculty</th>
<th>Promoted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Robert Arens</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Doerfler</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Choi</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Di Santo</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Michael Lucas</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Thomas Fowler IV</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Bruno Giberti</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Jonathan Reich</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Stannard</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3.1l Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number Promoted in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3.1m Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Awarded Tenure in Architecture Dept.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Robert Arens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Choi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Doerfler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Di Santo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Jonathan Reich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Stannard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3.1n Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number Awarded Tenure in Architecture Dept.</th>
<th>Number Awarded Tenure in University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed (Compare number of Reg. Archs from 09 to 04).

The 2009-10 Architecture Department faculty are comprised of: 40 registered architects (2004: 37), 18 AIA members (2004: 5), and 9 PhD’s (2004: 4), 15 full-professors, including 2 FERPs (2004: 20), 3 Associate Professors (2004: 5), 6 Assistant Professors (2004: 3), and 22 full- or part-time lecturers (2004: 18). The majority of faculty are registered in California (25), while others are registered in Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, New York (7), Oregon, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. As well, several faculty are registered outside of the country, including: Australia, Brazil, and Germany.
1.3.2. Annual Reports

Certification Letter Only

Annual Reports located in Part Five, Section 5.1 Appendix 1 – Annual Reports.

July 27, 2010

RE: NAAB 2008 and 2009 Annual Report Submission Data

Dear NAAB:

As the Director for the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, I am the administrator responsible for verifying and reporting statistical data for the campus.

This letter is to certify that all data submitted to the NAAB through the Annual Report Submission system since the last site visit to the Cal Poly Architecture Department is, to the best of my knowledge, accurate and consistent with reports sent to other national and regional agencies.

Sincerely,

Brant Goodman, Director
Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis

cc: Kathi Good, Personnel Specialist, Architecture Dept.
    Henri T. De Hahn, Architecture Department Head
1.3.3 Faculty Credentials

Faculty credentials overview only.

Faculty credentials provided Part Four, Section 4.4 Faculty Credentials Matrix.
1.3.3 Faculty Credentials

Overview

Even though faculty are hired to teach in one or more areas of the curriculum, all faculty also teach a design studio course.

The Areas of the Curriculum

Environmental Control Systems —

Architectural Practice (includes materials, building construction and professional practice) —
  • Lower Division (1st – 2nd years)
  • Upper Division (3rd year)
  • Professional Practice (contracts, management, etc) (5th year)

History, Theory & Criticism —

Building Design Studio
  • Lower Division
    Beginning Design —
    Second Year Architectural Design —
  • Upper Division
    Third Year Architectural Design —
    Fourth Year Architectural Design —
    Fifth Year Architectural Design —

The following information is taken from the Department’s Appointment, Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (ARPT) document (pages 15 – 16). See document in the Team Room.

Criteria for Initial Appointment

The practice of architecture requires an intricate balance of technological competence, humanistic approach, artistic sensitivity, problem-solving ability, and concern for the overall environment. In architectural education it is important that these elements be integrated effectively in the teaching of a total design process. The success of the program is, therefore, dependent upon the effective interaction and collaboration of faculty from varying backgrounds and expertise in a wide range of activities. Excellence in performance is the uniform goal of this faculty in fulfilling the teaching mission of this department.

This section presents the required qualifications and describes the type of activities and performance expectations of a faculty member related to a specific area of expertise and particular level of evaluation.

Each candidate shall be evaluated relative to the stated criteria. Beyond these minimums, decisions will be based on professional judgment as to the quality of the candidate’s work and experience in advancing the program mission of the Department. Deliberation shall necessarily consider the overall faculty composition and profile within the context of program goals and objectives and present and future needs of the Department and the College.

The ultimate purpose of this set of criteria is to ensure the highest quality of professional education possible for future architects from the teaching programs of this Department.

Probationary Appointments (Tenure Track) Requirements

A First Professional Degree (see definitions) in architecture; and
A masters degree in architecture or an Allied Discipline (see definitions) or a DArch; and
Professional Licensure (see definitions) or a Ph. D.; and
Eligibility for Professional Licensure (see definitions) or Ph.D. is acceptable for appointment, but promotion or tenure is contingent upon acquisition of either Professional License or Ph.D.
Experience in Architecture through practice or professional consultation; and
Related college-level teaching experience.
Candidates for Architectural History positions are required to have a Ph.D. with a dissertation on Architectural History or the history of the built environment.

Eligibility for Ph.D. is acceptable for appointment, but promotion and/or tenure for probationary academic rank faculty is contingent upon acquisition of the Ph.D.

**Academic Rank Position Criteria for Probationary Appointments**

Initial appointments to an academic rank position are generally at the Assistant Professor rank.

Appointment at the Associate Professor or Professor rank is possible for experienced individuals to fill key positions in the teaching program. For such cases, the following experience level and qualifications required for the particular rank shall apply:

Candidates for appointment at the Associate Professor rank must, in addition to the Criteria for Initial Appointment, have at least five (5) years of experience in practice and/or teaching.

Candidates for appointment at the Professor rank must, in addition to the Criteria for Initial Appointment have a record of distinguished professional and/or academic accomplishment extending over a period of at least ten (10) years, and must give evidence of the capability to effectively transfer the demonstrated professional qualities into the educational process and fulfill program objectives of the Department and College.

Exceptions to the minimum requirements for Academic Rank Positions require approval by the Provost after consultation with the Tenured Faculty, Department Head, and Dean. If tenure is offered, the President must also approve.

**Exceptions for Probationary Appointments**

On occasions when deemed important to the Department by the faculty, exceptions to the minimum criteria for initial appointment may be made if a candidate meets one or more of the following:

- Possesses exceptional professional knowledge corresponding to the position advertised;
- Possesses exceptional teaching experience corresponding to the position advertised; or
- Has an exceptional body of completed work that has received professional recognition.

Such an appointment requires approval of the Search & Screen Committee, Department Head, Dean and Provost.

**Full- and Part-Time Lecturers**

The Lectureship classification is for temporary appointments, separate and distinct from probationary appointments, and is used for candidates with capabilities useful to the teaching program in accordance with the Department’s mission and objectives.

A First Professional Degree (see definitions) in architecture; and

Professional Licensure (see definitions); and

Eligibility for Professional Licensure (see definitions) is acceptable for appointment, but advancement is contingent upon acquisition of Professional License.

Experience in Architecture through practice or professional consultation.

In addition, lecturers shall have:

- Related college-level teaching experience; or
- Fulfill a specific need in the department in the instructional area(s) for which they apply.

**Lecturer Level Position Criteria**

Qualifications for appointment to a particular level are similar to corresponding rank positions. Initial appointments to a lectureship position are generally at the Lecturer B rank.

Exceptions to the minimum requirements for Lecturer Level positions require approval by the Dean, after consultation with the faculty and Department Head.
Part Two – Educational Outcomes and Curriculum

2.1 Student Performance Criteria (Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation; Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge; Realm C: Leadership and Practice)

2.1a A brief, narrative or graphic overview of the curricular goals and content for each accredited degree program offered or each track for meeting the requirements of the professional degree program.

2.1b A matrix for each accredited degree program offered or each track for meeting the requirements of the professional degree program, that identifies each required course with the SPC it fulfills.

2.1b1 Where appropriate, the matrix should indicate those SPCs expected to have been met in preparatory education prior to admission to the NAAB-accredited program.

2.1b2 The matrix should include only criteria that are demonstrated in the accredited degree program or track. [In all cases, the program must highlight only the 1-2 cells on the matrix that point to the greatest evidence of student achievement.]
2.1 Student Performance Criteria (Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation; Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge; Realm C: Leadership and Practice)

2.1a A brief, narrative or graphic overview of the curricular goals and content for each accredited degree program offered or each track for meeting the requirements of the professional degree program.

Overview Curricular Goals / Content

Architecture epitomizes the "learn-by-doing" pedagogy that is fundamental to Cal Poly. The program is rigorous, lab oriented, and sequential in nature and reflects a balance and integration of design and technology - the theoretical and the pragmatic. The fourth year offers students the opportunity to apply for study off-campus in a number of international and U.S. programs, extended field trips organized by faculty and within California professional studio opportunities (combined internship and design studio opportunity with practitioner firm), metro center programs in San Francisco and Los Angeles (new for 2010-11) along with interdisciplinary design studio experiences on campus + independent design studio opportunities, and the fifth year is a selected year-long project and final exhibit that salutes the architectural creativity of each individual's extended research and design.

The administration, faculty and staff are committed to the program and its primary emphasis on teaching excellence at the undergraduate level. The unusual large size of the program, and the diversity of faculty interests and accomplishments, offer a vast palette of pedagogical teaching strategies, design directions, and addressing global concerns as backgrounds for the range of studios.

2.1b A matrix for each accredited degree program offered or each track for meeting the requirements of the professional degree program, that identifies each required course with the SPC it fulfills.

2.1b1 Where appropriate, the matrix should indicate those SPCs expected to have been met in preparatory education prior to admission to the NAAB-accredited program.

See Part Four, Section 4.1 Student Performance Matrix.

2.1b2 The matrix should include only criteria that are demonstrated in the accredited degree program or track. [In all cases, the program must highlight only the 1-2 cells on the matrix that point to the greatest evidence of student achievement.]

See Part Four, Section 4.1 Student Performance Matrix.
2.2 Curricular Framework

2.2.1 Regional Accreditation

The APR must include a copy of the most recent letter from the regional accrediting commission/agency (the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)) regarding the institution’s term of accreditation.

WASC Letter:
http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/accred_progres/wasc/innovative/finalreport/affirmation_letter.htm
(accessed 08/21/10)

Link to the current WASC page, which includes a timeline:
http://www.wasc.calpoly.edu/ (accessed 08/21/10)
2.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum

2.2.2a Title(s) of the degree(s) offered including any pre-requisite degree(s) or other preparatory education and the total number of credits earned for the NAAB accredited degree or track for completing the NAAB-accredited degree.

2.2.2b An outline, for each accredited degree program offered or track for completing the NAAB-accredited degree, of the curriculum showing the distribution of general studies, required professional courses (including prerequisites), required courses, professional electives, and other electives.

2.2.2c Examples, for each accredited degree offered or track for completing the NAAB-accredited degree, of the minors or concentrations students may elect to pursue.

2.2.2d A list of off-campus programs, description of facilities and resources, course requirements, and length of stay.

2.2.2e A list of the minimum number of semester credit hours or the equivalent number of quarter credit hours required for each semester or quarter, respectively.

2.2.2f A list identifying the courses and their credit hours required for professional content and the courses and their credit hours required for general education for each accredited degree program offered or track for completion of the NAAB-accredited degree.
2.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum

Introduction

The College of Architecture and Environmental Design represents 9.7% of the University's student population and is one of seven colleges within the University. The College offers five fully-accredited undergraduate degrees in Architecture, City and Regional Planning, Architectural Engineering, Landscape Architecture and Construction Management. The Architecture and Architectural Engineering Departments offer a one-year M.S. Arch and the City and Regional Planning offers a M.CRP degree. Architecture and CRP have joint degree programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels, including the Master of City and Regional Planning/Master of Transportation Planning and the Master of Business Administration/Bachelor of Architecture.

The Architecture Department is comprised of approximately half of the College's student enrollment. The Architecture Department is represented on the College Department Heads Committee by the Department Head and an Associate Department Head. The College Department Heads Committee develops College policy and promotes interdepartmental coordination on budgetary and curricular matters.

The Architecture Department participates on college-wide committees including the CAED Curriculum, Computer, Graduate Programs, Professional Development and Leave, Peer Review, and Scholarship and Awards Committees.

2.2.2a Title(s) of the degree(s) offered including any pre-requisite degree(s) or other preparatory education and the total number of credits earned for the NAAB accredited degree or track for completing the NAAB-accredited degree.

2.2.2b An outline, for each accredited degree program offered or track for completing the NAAB-accredited degree, of the curriculum showing the distribution of general studies, required professional courses (including prerequisites), required courses, professional electives, and other electives.

Overview

The Architecture Department offers a 5-year B.Arch undergraduate program with an enrollment of approximately 800 students. The B.Arch undergraduate program is comprised of 8 primary instructional areas: Architectural Science (Environmental Control Systems; Architectural Practice (includes materials, building construction and professional practice); History, Theory and Criticism; Beginning Design and Visual Communication (integrated with the use of digital media); Second Year Architectural Design; Third Year Architectural Design; Fourth Year Architectural Design; Fifth Year Architectural Design/Thesis. Each of these groups is represented by an Instructional Area Coordinator (except for design which is represented by a single person for all years) and a Curriculum Representative. These faculty groups meet frequently throughout the year to advise on teaching assignments and curricular matters. An additional group of faculty, with a strong commitment to natural resource conservation, has formed a Sustainable Environments Emphasis Group (SEEG). This group shares an office "bull-pen" in Building 34 Room 220 and has assembled a reference library while pursuing research grants and contracts. The Department also has a one-year M.S. Arch graduate program with an enrollment of approximately 15 students. The M.S. Arch graduate program is comprised of special study areas: Architectural Science, Computer-Aided Design and Facilities Management. (See detailed curriculum outline starting on page 11.)

2.2.2c Examples, for each accredited degree program offered or track for completing the NAAB-accredited degree, of the minors or concentrations students may elect to pursue.

The primary commitment of the faculty is to focus on the Bachelor of Architecture degree program at the undergraduate level. Additionally, the Department provides several service courses to other departments in the College and the University. Within the University, the Department faculty collaborate with faculty outside the Department to teach 4th yr interdisciplinary design studios, teach the EDES interdisciplinary course, and the ethnic studies course (elective).

Also within the University, the Department provides advanced, elective courses (EDES 408, EDES X406) with an emphasis on sustainable design to students in the Environmental Engineering, Civil Engineering, Environmental Horticulture Science, Agriculture, Journalism, LArch and CRP Departments. Approximately 10% of all Architecture students are currently pursuing a minor. Within the CAED, Architecture students may elect to minor in Construction Management (53 Arch. majors), City and Regional Planning (2 Arch. majors),
Real Property Development (1 Arch. major), Integrated Project Delivery (Design-Build), Sustainable Environments (13 Arch. majors) and Environmental Design (5 Arch. majors). The ArcE Department has a minor and developed a graduate program since the last accreditation visit. There are 57 additional minors that Architecture students can select from outside the College. Within the College, the Department provided introductory level service courses to students within the ArcE and CM Departments: Arch 131 Basic Architectural Design and Visual Communication.

University General Education and Breadth course offerings from Department include: Arch 217, 218, 219 Architectural History; and Arch 370 Native American Architecture and Place.

Minors Within the CAED

The following minors are currently available to architecture majors within the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. They reflect some of the interdisciplinary opportunities within the college:

- Real Property Development
- Sustainable Environments
- Integrated Project Delivery
- Architectural Engineering
- City and Regional Planning
- Construction Management

Over the past six years, an estimated 117 fourth year undergraduate students have completed community based projects, which address such issues as mid-Market area urban design objectives and policies, residential conservation controls, and proposed zoning changes. Additionally, practitioners are invited to become part of the architecture studio experience. Many practitioners have much to offer and are willing to contribute to the formal education process. Professor Miller and practitioners form relationships that encourage visits and the interchange of ideas between the classroom and the office in the San Francisco Bay area.

The primary agenda of the post-professional Master of Science in Architecture Program is to provide post-professional specialization degrees to practicing architects or others expecting to contribute in a specialized manner in the Architecture, Engineering and Construction (AEC) industry. A program is available with the Graduate School of Business which awards a Bachelor of Architecture degree at the end of five years, and an MBA degree at the end of the sixth year, by allowing qualified 5th year architecture students to be concurrently enrolled in both the last year of the undergraduate Architecture program and the first year of the two-year graduate program.

Special Programs

The Department sponsors an Architecture Career Workshop. This workshop is a month-long residential program for high school juniors to explore the opportunities in architectural careers and related professions. The program yearly involves 50+ students and 2 faculty members who coordinate the program, 5-6 teaching assistants and a number of faculty with the College who provide lectures and workshops for the students for instructional and related extracurricular activities. It has been a highly successful public relations mechanism, as well as an effective recruiting program for architecture in general.

Open House is an annual Cal Poly event that showcases the campus to admitted and current students, their supporters, alumni and the San Luis Obispo community. The three-day event is the culmination of an entire year of hard work and dedication by a committee of student volunteers working under Student Life and Leadership’s Orientation Programs, in collaboration with the community, student clubs, faculty and staff.

Poly’s Admitted Students’ Preview Day is a way to get to know the Cal Poly Campus. Students and their supporters have a chance to visit with college deans, faculty and current students, discover the many resources available and take tours of the campus. Saturday’s Cal Poly Showcase is open to the public. Events for the day include demonstrations and concession booths by more than 200 campus groups.

"Design Village" is an interpretive exercise in the practice of design build. In 1974, a team of architecture students conceived the idea of an event where designers would compete against one another designing and building structures that they could inhabit for a three-day period. The idea was conceived to inspire more student activity in the University during Open House week, which has been known as "Poly Royal". A
national competition is held every year that addresses challenges presented by the climate and terrain. Design guidelines provide the framework for the development of provocative and innovative designs to be enjoyed by participants, faculty, and visitors alike. Over the years, the personal rewards of the intense creative process that takes place during this short period of time has allowed "Design Village" to blossom into a national event.

2.2.2d A list of off-campus programs, description of facilities and resources, course requirements, and length of stay.

The Department participates in the following fourth year off-campus and foreign study programs as listed below.

Course Requirements.
Students attending these off-campus programs receive fourth year design credit. If program is for the year, they receive all fourth year design credit and if for one or two quarters they receive credit for that particular period. Depending on the location of the program, students are also able to take general education courses. In the Professional Studio Program students will obtain design studio credit, cooperative course credit, plus credit for the activity portion of the ARCH 443 Course (Professional Practice), they will then take the lecture portion of this course when they return to campus during their 5th year.

The general educational objectives of the off-campus trips are as follows:
1. To learn by doing through professionally related activities in architecture and urban environments that complement typical on-campus settings
2. To heighten student involvement and responsibility in the development of their intellectual, emotional and perceptual faculties
3. To expand student understanding of the mutual relationships among the natural environment, the built environment, and the cultural expression of a given place
4. To encourage self-directed learning by furthering the ability to acquire, process and manipulate information in conducting day-to-day activities in unfamiliar settings

The Department participates in the fourth year off-campus and foreign study programs as listed below. All off-campus programs are featured on the Architecture Department web page: http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/current/fourth-year-off.html (accessed 08.15.10).

a) CSU Program
CSU International Studies Program offers the opportunity to study architecture for a full year in, either Copenhagen, Denmark (12 students) or Florence, Italy (20 students). The classes are taught in English by Danish and Italian faculty from both higher education and the professional communities of each city, and provide immersion in a different culture and a rich urban environment. These two cities offer students endless field trips within the city limits, in the region, and abroad.

Copenhagen one-year program: Address: Vestergade 5-7, 1456 Copenhagen, Denmark http://www.dis.dk/ (accessed 08.15.10)

The academic program is arranged by the Danish Institute for Study Abroad (DIS), an affiliate of the University of Copenhagen, and students from the Department have been attending this program for over three decades. This study abroad is not solely about academics; it is about providing a one-of-a-kind opportunity for students to experience new situations and build and develop leadership skills appropriate for a globalized world. Students living in Copenhagen have an opportunity to choose between living with a host family, a roommate, or in a residence hall.

Facilities: Facilities are housed in the historic downtown Copenhagen in several buildings and are comprised of studio spaces and lectures/seminar rooms, computer facilities, a library, a cafeteria and administrative support.

Typical Coursework: ARCH 451/452/453; ARCH 420; and ARCH 480. In 2009, 19 students were enrolled in this program

Florence one-year program: Via B. Leopardi 12, 50121 Florence, Italy http://www.csufirenze.it/csufi_index.html (accessed 08.15.10)

Established by the CSU in 1966, the 21 Architecture students enrolled in Florence benefit from the humanities-rich program which includes Architecture students from Cal Poly Pomona, in addition to roughly 70 students from other of the 22 CSU campuses studying Art History, Studio Art, Social
Since 2004, students have participated each May in the week long "Coast2Coast" design workshop on coastal design issues at the Università di Camerino, Facoltà di Architettura, Piceno, Italy. Students typically rent apartments, either with California roommates, Italian roommates, or alone in the historic center of Florence within walking distance of the school, markets, and museums. Opportunities to live with a Florentine family are available.

**Facilities:** Facilities occupy two floors of a nineteenth century palazzo situated near Piazza Beccaria, on the edge of the historical center, about a 15-minute walk from the Brunelleschi’s Duomo. Studio spaces, seminar and seminar rooms, computer facilities and a library with more than 4000 volumes are available.

**Typical Coursework:** ARCH 451/452/453; ARCH 420; and ARCH 480.

In 2009, 21 students were enrolled in this program.

---

**b) Rome, Italy Studies**

Rome one quarter program: Piazza delle Cinque Scole 33, 00186, Rome, Italy
http://web.mac.com/scott.romecenter/Rome_Center/Benvenuti.html (accessed 08.15.10)

Established in 2004, the Rome program is now faculty-lead by Prof. Marc Neveu (2010), and conducted in coordination with La Magia Institute, an educational organization located in the very heart of historical Rome.

**Facilities:** The program is located in the 17th century Palazzo Cenci-Bolognetti in the heart of Rome’s historic Jewish Ghetto neighborhood near the Tiber Island. Currently occupying three apartments on three floors, the facilities include offices and a lounge, equipped classrooms and seminar rooms, design studios, computer and printing/coping facilities. Students find the necessary lodging accommodations with the assistance of the on-site faculty, Tom Rankin.

**Typical Coursework:** ARCH 451; ARCH 420; ARCH 480; ARCH 445; and ITAL101.

In 2009, 6 students were enrolled in this program. Eighteen students are enrolled in 2010.

---

**c) Washington-Alexandria Architecture Center (WAAC)**

WAAC one-year program: 1021 Prince Street, Alexandria, VA 22314, USA
http://www.waac.vt.edu/ (accessed 08.15.10)

Established in 1985, Cal Poly Architecture students have attended the WAAC program for 25 years. Currently 10 universities (from Europe, North and South America) are part of the consortium that provides students with an academic environment, which utilizes the Washington metro area as a laboratory. Cal Poly sends 16 to 18 students annually along with a resident director from the Department’s faculty. Students use the resources of the national and international design/development/planning community in the Washington/Baltimore Metropolitan area such as the Smithsonian Institution and the National Building Museum.

**Facilities:** The Center is owned by Virginia Tech and located in a renovated 1923 structure in the middle of historic Old Town Alexandria, one of the centers of early American colonial history. In addition to studio and seminar spaces, there is an extensive library and a shop with a range of equipment from traditional wood and metal-working to digital.

**Typical Coursework:** ARCH 451/452/453; ARCH 420; ARCH 480.

In 2009, 19 students were enrolled in this program.

---

**d) The San Francisco Urban Design Internship Program**

SF one-quarter program: Rented from the Centro Del Pueblo, 474 Valencia Street #158, San Francisco, CA. 94103

Established in 1989 by faculty member Prof. Sandy Miller, the SF Program (1993 AIA Award) is an innovative educational program involving real projects in real world settings. It offers architecture students the opportunity to intern off-campus for eleven weeks with urban design, architecture and planning professionals in San Francisco. Sixteen or more students and a faculty member are involved in this program, which is offered twice each year in Fall and Spring.

**Facilities:** The Department rents spaces in the Centro Del Pueblo for the entire quarter. This building houses the programs of several San Francisco community-based organizations, an ideal place for the students to unfold work on their community-based projects.

**Typical Coursework:** ARCH 451/453; ARCH 480; and ARCH 443.

In 2009, 17 students were enrolled in this program.
e) Los Angeles Metro Program (New as of Winter/Spring 2011).

LA two-quarter program: Address TBD
http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/alumni/giving-opportunities/los-angeles-metro-program.html (accessed 08.15.10)

As part of the new Interdisciplinary Metro Program initiatives in Architecture and Urban Design for Cal Poly students, this program will immerse aspiring architects in a multicultural urban setting—rich with amazing learning, practicing, and networking opportunities. The program is designed to engage local architects, alumni, and the many institutions in Los Angeles in order to best assist the Department to meet its educational ambitions. In addition to the unique curriculum that will focus on the city of Los Angeles—its architecture, history, urbanity, and culture—the Department looks forward to reaching out to the local community to enhance the program's learning structure through visiting lecturers, exhibitions, digital design workshops, internships, and public alumni events.

Facilities: TBD Winter/Spring 2011
Typical Coursework for 2011: ARCH 481; ARCH 480; ARCH 420, and ARCH 443.
In 2010, 18 have expressed an interest in this program.

f) Switzerland Program (New as of Summer 2010)

Switzerland Summer one-quarter Architecture Extended Field Trip program: Ostello Di Scudellate, 6838 Scudellate, Switzerland.
http://www.ostellodiscudellate.com/ (accessed 08.15.10)

The Switzerland program is an 8-week faculty-led extended field trip travel studio for the summer term 2010 (after assessment it may become a permanent offering) based in Ticino, the Italian section of Switzerland. Instruction is shared between extensive field trips, office visits, and on site research and design studio work in an atelier provided by the Ostello.

Facilities: While students are traveling they are accommodated in youth hostels/hotels, otherwise they have permanent residence at the Ostello Di Scudellate with meals provided by a local chef.

Typical Coursework: ARCH 453; ARCH 480; ARCH 400, and ITAL 101 (optional).
In 2010, 23 students were enrolled in this program.

g) Japan Program (Every second year during Spring Quarter: Faculty lead by Prof. Don Choi)

Japan one-quarter Architecture Extended Field Trip program: No permanent facilities
http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/current/off-campus-programs/fourth-off-japan.html (accessed 08.15.10)

Established in 2003 by Prof. Christopher Yip, the Japan Program is a one-quarter faculty-led extended field trip. All courses are Cal Poly courses and are taught by Cal Poly faculty member Dr. Don Choi. Between March 24 and June 8, 2011, students will spend extended periods in Kyoto and Tokyo, and will travel to other locations in Japan during day trips and the two one-week accompanied trips. In 2009, destinations included Osaka, Nara, Kobe, Himeji, Hiroshima, Okayama, Naoshima, Miyajima, Sendai, Kanazawa, Uji, Ainokura, and Yokohama.

Facilities: There are no permanent facilities during this program. The students and the faculty leader will stay at short-term apartments in Kyoto and in the national Olympics Memorial Youth Center in Tokyo. During the trips to central Japan and western Japan, they will stay at hotels and inns.

Typical Coursework: ARCH 453; ARCH 480; and ARCH 453
In 2009, 18 students were enrolled in this program.

h) Mexico Program (Winter Quarter: Faculty lead by Prof. Brian Kesner. Program ended in 2007)

Mexico one-quarter Architecture Extended Field Trip program:
http://www.buap.mx/ (could not access web page 08.15.10)

Established in 2004, students under faculty member Brian Kesner studied during the Winter quarters of 2005/06/07 at the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla (BUAP), Mexico. The program objectives were to expand the students' awareness of a neighboring Latin and so-called 3rd World culture, its histories and contemporary world views, and its range of social/economic/environmental issues, and opportunities for sustainable urban development. Projects focused on the development of new skills and knowledge of urban context analysis, ordering of urban public spaces, and architectural infill design of housing/mixed-uses and neighborhood/barrio redevelopment.
Facilities: The University has all the necessary facilities students need.
Typical Coursework: ARCH 452; ARCH 441, ARCH 472, ARCH 400, and CRP 402

i) Thailand Program (Every second year during Spring Quarter: Faculty lead by Prof. Christopher Yip)

Thailand one-quarter Architecture Extended Field Trip program: No permanent facilities
http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/current/fourth-year-off.html (accessed 08.15.10)

Typically conducted through Cal Poly’s International Programs, the Department conducted its own faculty lead Thailand Program Spring 2008. Students take Cal Poly courses from Cal Poly faculty while studying and traveling in Southeast Asia. Students use the facilities of Chiang Mai University in the north of Thailand, and a major university in Bangkok where most of the classes are taught. As a part of the program, students visit hill tribe communities, the UNESCO World Heritage sites of Sukothai in Thailand and Angkor in Cambodia and have an opportunity to visit Luang Prabang, a UNESCO World Heritage site in Laos. Usually they have an opportunity in the last week is to go to the South of Thailand to take a weeklong diving class that leads to diving certification. At the end of the program many students have traveled to one or more other Asian countries including Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Vietnam, China and Japan before returning to California.

Facilities: During the trips in Thailand and throughout Southeast Asia, students stay at hotels and inns.

Typical Coursework: ARCH 453; ARCH 480; and ARCH 453.


Paris one-year program: 3, Quai Pahnhard et Levassor, 75013, Paris, France
http://www.paris-valdeseine.archi.fr/ (accessed 08.15.10)

Established in 1998, the Paris program is the first exchange program that provided an opportunity for 6-9 students the most culturally immersive program that the Department offers, as all classes are taught in French. Paris is a palimpsest of centuries of cultural, historical, social, gastronomical, urban, landscape, and architectural transformation. Cal Poly students interact with ERASMUS students (from 24 European countries) in addition to students from 10 non European countries (bilateral exchange agreements), and discover a three-century old French Beaux-Art/Polytechnic educational system. Students are taught by experienced faculty members and have the opportunities to study new subject matters relevant to the contemporary European scene. Travel opportunities are endless.

Facilities: As of 2007, the Ecole has state of the art facilities in a seven-story building that offers students all the necessary opportunities similar to those on campus back home.

Typical Coursework: ARCH 451/452/453; ARCH 480; ARCH 420

In 2009, 9 students were enrolled in this program.

k) Australia Program: Exchange Program with The University of Canberra, Architecture Department, Faculty of Environmental Design, Australia

Australia one-quarter program: University of Canberra College Building 11, ACT 2601, Australia
http://www.canberra.edu.au/home/ (accessed 08.15.10)

Established in 1997 students have the advantage of learning from and contributing to Australia’s National Capital, Canberra, an internationally recognized model design city. The architecture program reflects the design ethos of the capital in its education profile, with opportunities for study that complement Canberra as a laboratory for design invention.

Facilities: State of the art facilities are offered by “Australia’s Capital University”

Typical Coursework: ARCH 451/452/453; ARCH 480; ARCH 420

In 2009, no students were enrolled in this program.

l) India Program: Exchange Program with The Centre for Environmental Planning and Technology, Ahmadabad (CEPT), India (Fall 2011)

India one semester program: Kasturbhar Laibhai Campus, University Road, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad 380 009, India
http://www.cept.ac.in/main.php (accessed 08.15.10)
This new exchange program will offer a semester long opportunity for 3 students to study in the leading architecture school in India - founded by Balkrishna Doshi - with a unique philosophy that provides students with “a purpose in life”. Education at the CEPT offers a study plan that is “an initiation into the life of the Spirit, training the human soul in the pursuit of truth and practice of virtue.” In addition, CEPT is engaged in leading architectural and urban research, which will engage our students in framing their projects within a new context.

Facilities: Compared to other Indian Institutions, CEPT has state of the art facilities among a lush campus atmosphere. The Architecture Department offers studios spaces, lecture halls, theatre, workshops, laboratories, library and computer centers, general activity spaces, and Internet access.

Typical Coursework: ARCH 451/452/453; ARCH 480; ARCH 420

m) Dessau Institute of Architecture (DIA), Bauhaus Program (Fall 2011)

Bauhaus one semester program: Bauhaustrasse 5, 06846 Dessau, Germany
http://lehre.afg.hs-anhalt.de/dia/ (accessed 08.15.10)

This new exchange program will offer a semester long opportunity for 3 students to study adjacent to the iconic Bauhaus building of Walter Gropius with international students and faculty. Students have the opportunity to live on campus, nearby, or with a host family. The exchange program will include teaching and research projects between faculty members in both institutions.

It is the Department’s interest to have the Administration of the Bauhaus assist in securing internship experience for all students during or after their studies at the Bauhaus.

Facilities: a contemporary state of the art addition to the historical building provides students with all the necessary amenities.

Typical Coursework: Courses are in English and cover Design Studio, Architecture history and theory, Urbanism, CAD Logic, and two elective- ARCH 451/452, ARCH 420, and ARCH 481.

2.2.2e A list of the minimum number of semester credit hours or the equivalent number of quarter credit hours required for each semester or quarter, respectively.

2.2.2f A list identifying the courses and their credit hours required for professional content and the courses and their credit hours required for general education for each accredited degree program offered or track for completion of the NAAB-accredited degree.

Overview of Curriculum Changes

Overview

The 2009-11 curriculum is comprised of a total of 225 units (‘03: 228/227 units) of required architecture prefix coursework, 51 units (‘03: 49 units) of support courses, which includes 16 units (‘03: 20 units) of professional electives and a mandated minimum 52 units (‘03: 56 units) of general education courses. The core courses in our program required to satisfy the NAAB Student Performance Criteria exclude all electives and general education courses for a total of 173 units (‘03: 169-170 units) for the total of 225 units required for graduation. For information on the Minimum Credit Distribution for B.Arch Program see Table 3 on page 15.
### The Curriculum

For graphic flow charts of curriculums:
- For 2009 – 2010 (2009 – 2011 flow chart), see Table1.2009-’11 Curriculum (see [http://arch.calpoly.edu/documents/flowchart-0911.pdf](http://arch.calpoly.edu/documents/flowchart-0911.pdf), accessed 08/30/10)
- For 2003-2004 (2007-2009 flow chart), see flow chart at the end of this section

The current and past curriculums are shown side-by-side in the outline below to highlight any changes. New courses are shown in **bold**, eliminated courses are shown as strikeout, and notes are shown in the right column:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum 2003-2004 Curriculum 2003-2004 (2007-2009 Flow Chart) Note #1: This flow chart reflects the implemented curriculum changes that were proposed in 2003-’04</th>
<th>2009 - 2011 Curriculum (2009 – 2011 Flow Chart) <strong>UPDATES are in Bold</strong></th>
<th>Curriculum Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST YEAR</strong></td>
<td><strong>FIRST YEAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arch 105 (1)</td>
<td>• Arch 105 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ARCH 121/2/3 (3) OR ARCH 131/2/3 (4)</td>
<td>• ARCH 131, 132, 133</td>
<td>A single sequence developed, starting in 08-09, then refined with the addition of ARCH 101 Theory Course 09-10 (see below where added).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EDES 101 (2)</td>
<td>• EDES 101 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MATH 141 (4)</td>
<td>• MATH 141 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ENGL 134 (4)</td>
<td>• ENGL 134 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ARCH 101 (1)</td>
<td>Theory Course Added 09-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ARCH 122/132 (3 or 4)</td>
<td>• ARCH 122 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHYS 121 or 131 (4)</td>
<td>• PHYS 121 or 131 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MATH 182 (4)</td>
<td>• MATH 182 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GE&amp;B (4)</td>
<td>• GE&amp;B (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ARCH 101 (1)</td>
<td>Theory Course Added 09-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ARCH 123/133 (3 or 4)</td>
<td>• ARCH 123/133 (3 or 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PHYS 122 or 132 (4)</td>
<td>• PHYS 122 or 132 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GE&amp;B (4)</td>
<td>• GE&amp;B (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ARCH 160 (4)</td>
<td>• ARCH 160 (4)</td>
<td>Course eliminated, since content incorporated into 131/132/133 Courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ARCH 101 (1)</td>
<td>Theory Course Added 09-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECOND YEAR</strong></td>
<td><strong>SECOND YEAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ARCH 241 (4)</td>
<td>• ARCH 241 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ARCH 251 (4)</td>
<td>• ARCH 251 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ARCH 217 (4)</td>
<td>ARCH History Courses (217,218,219) moved to 2nd Yr. from Third Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ARCE 211 (3)</td>
<td>• ARCE 224-211 (3)</td>
<td>ARCE Course Re titled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GE&amp;B (4)</td>
<td>• GE&amp;B (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 242 (4)</td>
<td>ARCH 231 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 252 (5)</td>
<td>ARCH 252 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 218 (4)</td>
<td><strong>ARCH History Course New Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCE 212 (3)</td>
<td>ARCE-224 212 (3) <strong>ARCE Course Re titled</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE&amp;B (4)</td>
<td>GE&amp;B (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 207 (4)</td>
<td>ARCH 207 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 253 (5)</td>
<td>ARCH 253 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 219</td>
<td><strong>ARCH History Course new location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCE 226 (3)</td>
<td>ARCE 226 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE&amp;B (4)</td>
<td>GE&amp;B (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIRD YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 341 (4)</td>
<td>ARCH 341 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 351 (5)</td>
<td>ARCH 351 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 217 (4)</td>
<td>**ARCH 217 (4) <strong>ARCH History Course Moved to 2nd Yr.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCE 315 (4)</td>
<td>**ARCE 324 (3) <strong>ARCH History Course Re titled</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 307 (4)</td>
<td>ARCH 307 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 352 (5)</td>
<td>ARCH 352 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 218 (4)</td>
<td>**ARCH 218 (4) <strong>ARCH History Course moved to 2nd Yr.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCE 316 (4)</td>
<td><strong>ARCH History Course moved to 2nd Yr.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE&amp;B (4)</td>
<td>GE&amp;B (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 342 (4)</td>
<td>ARCH 342 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 353 (5)</td>
<td>ARCH 353 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 219 (4)</td>
<td>**ARCH 219 (4) <strong>ARCH History Course moved to 2nd Yr.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOURTH YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 451 (5)</td>
<td>ARCH 451 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 420 (4)</td>
<td>ARCH 420 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE&amp;B (4)</td>
<td>GE&amp;B (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Electives</strong> (4)</td>
<td><strong>Professional Electives</strong> (4) <strong>Professional Electives Moved Into 4th Yr. See note #2 provided in fifth Yr.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 443</td>
<td><strong>ARCH 443 moved to Fifth Yr and merged into one course.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 452 (5)</td>
<td>ARCH 452 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Electives</strong> (4)</td>
<td><strong>Environmental Behavior Elective</strong> (3) <strong>Professional Elective (4)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE&amp;B (4)</td>
<td>GE&amp;B (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 453 (5)</td>
<td>ARCH 453 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Electives</strong> (6)</td>
<td><strong>CAED Professional Electives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIFTH YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of the curriculum changes for 2009 – 2011 Catalog from the 2005 – 2007:**

Course Deletions (see below for course content titles):
- ARCH 106
- ARCH 121, 122, 123
- ARCH 160

Course Replacements:
- ARCH 131, 132, 133 (Design Studio Sequence using Integrated Digital and Traditional Uses of Media) for ARCH 121, 122, 123 (Design Studio Sequence using Traditional Uses of Media Only)
- ARCH 105 (was Support Shop Course) and 160 (was Computer Course) have had their content integrated into the ARCH 131, 132, 133 series.

New Courses:
- ARCH 101, Survey of Architectural Education and Practice.

Adjustments to the curriculum:
- Course Modifications
  - 131, 132, 133: Design and Visual Communications 1, 2 and 3 (These courses reconfigured to integrate the content of ARCH 105 into this design studio sequence.)
  - Arch 101 content coordinated with ARCH 131, 132, 133.
- On campus Fourth Year Interdisciplinary Design Studios (ARCH 451, 452, 453)

Professional Elective Requirements for total units Changed
- Professional electives unit requirements reduced from 18 to 16 units
Table 3. Minimum Credit\(^1\) Distribution for B.Arch Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Categories</th>
<th>General (non-architecture) Studies(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*87.5 Quarter Units Minimum for General Studies (45 Semester-Credit-Hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required courses with other than architecture content</td>
<td>18 (12) Support Courses(^3) + 52 (34.68) GE&amp;B(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses with architectural content required of all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122 (81.37) Major Courses(^5) + 17 (11.33) Structures Courses(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal 70 (46.69) Subtotal 139 (92.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective courses with other than architectural content</td>
<td>8 (5.33) Elective courses with architectural content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal 78 (52.02) Subtotal 147 (98.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNITS(^2)</td>
<td>78 General Studies + 147 Professional Studies = 225 (150) Quarter Units of Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note #1: Quarter Units X .667 = Semester Units or Semester X 1.5 = Quarter Units. For both General Studies and total units for B.Arch minimums set by NAAB indicated. Quarter units are shown and semester unit equivalents are shown in parenthesis "(" )".

Note #2: Accredited degree programs awarding the B. Arch. Degree are required by NAAB to have a minimum of 225 quarter units (or 150 semester credit hours) in academic coursework in general studies, professional studies and electives) and a minimum of 67.5 quarter units (or 45 semester credit hours) for general studies.

Note #3: The support courses consists of 2 Math Courses, 2 Physics Courses and an EDES 101 Course, Introduction to Architecture and Environmental Design. On top of 52 units of required GE&B courses, students do obtain an additional 16 units of GE&B credit for the two Math Courses (B-1 category) and two Physics Courses (B-3 category).

Note #4: The Curriculum shows a total of 52 units of GE&B. Students select all of there courses from five General Education Areas. See [http://www.ge.calpoly.edu/studentsandadvisors/gerequirements09.html](http://www.ge.calpoly.edu/studentsandadvisors/gerequirements09.html), Accessed 08/30/10).

Note #5: Major courses consists of Design Studios, Practice Lectures/Activities, and History/Theory Lectures/Seminars. Two of the three History Courses allow for other students from the University to take these courses to receive either 4 units of C-3 or C 1-4 Elective GE&B credit.

Note #6: Structures Courses consist of 5 quarters of classes.

Note #7: There are a total of 16 Professional Electives that students are required to take. These units are divided in half between general and professional studies, since students do have the option of taking electives within the department. However, students typically use these elective requirements to satisfy requirements for minors by taking courses in the following departments: EDES, ARCH, ARCE, CM, CRP, LA or ART. And even though the department does not track this information it seems many of he students not pursuing a minor also to take the bulk of their professional elective units outside the department.
# Architecture B. Arch Degree

## College of Architecture & Environmental Design
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

### 2005-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design ARCH 121 or 131 (or EDES 120) 3 or 4 Units</td>
<td>design ARCH 122 or 132 (or EDES 121) 3 or 4 Units</td>
<td>design ARCH 251 (Arch 123 or 191) 5 Units</td>
<td>design ARCH 252 (Arch 192 or 292) 5 Units</td>
<td>design ARCH 253 (Arch 193 or 293) 5 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice ARCH 105 1 Unit</td>
<td>practice ARCH 160 Not required if pre-req is taken at Arch 121, 122, or 191 4 Units</td>
<td>practice ARCH 241 (Arch 190 or 192) 4 Units</td>
<td>practice ARCH 242 (Arch 191 or 193) 4 Units</td>
<td>practice ARCH 244 (Arch 200 or 202) 4 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intro des EDES 10 2 Units</td>
<td>physics PHYS 121 or 141 4 Units</td>
<td>physics PHYS 122 or 142 3 Units</td>
<td>structures ARCE 211 (Arch 190 or 191) 3 Units</td>
<td>structures ARCE 212 (Arch 190 or 191) 3 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calculus MATH 141 4 Units</td>
<td>calculus MATH 142 4 Units</td>
<td>structures ARCE 212 (Arch 190 or 191) 3 Units</td>
<td>structures ARCE 213 (Arch 190 or 191) 3 Units</td>
<td>structures ARCE 214 (Arch 190 or 191) 3 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE&amp;B ENGL 134 must complete first year 4 Units</td>
<td>GE&amp;B ENGL 134 refer to catalog 4 Units</td>
<td>GE&amp;B ENGL 134 refer to catalog 4 Units</td>
<td>GE&amp;B ENGL 134 refer to catalog 4 Units</td>
<td>GE&amp;B ENGL 134 refer to catalog 4 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>15/12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High School and Community College students are encouraged to take Advanced Placement Tests to earn possible credit for Calculus, Physics and other lower division GE&B courses. See your High School or Community College for information on AP testing.

Refer to the Cal Poly Catalog for General Education & Breadth (GE&B) choices to fulfill curriculum requirements. Refer to the University Catalog for information on A/P testing.

This curriculum diagram is to be used in conjunction with, and does not supersede, the 2005-2007 University Catalog.

### Notes

- This curriculum diagram reflects the recommended sequence of courses based on pre- and co-requisites for a student without previous college experience.
- Prerequisites are shown in parenthesis ( )
- Co-requisites are shown in brackets [ ]

Courses not constrained by pre- or co-requisites may be taken any time they are offered.

Not completing prerequisites could alter the amount of time required to fulfill all degree requirements.

- Class offerings are online: [http://power.calpoly.edu](http://power.calpoly.edu)
- Students admitted to the Fall Quarter may choose to commence studies in the Summer Quarter. Consult the Summer Quarter schedule or online at [http://www.calpoly.edu/~ias/oci_search.html](http://www.calpoly.edu/~ias/oci_search.html) to determine course offerings.

### Definitions

- **4th Year Standing:** Completion of all 3rd year major and support courses.
- **5th Year Standing:** Completion of all 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th year major and support courses.
- **Professional Elective:** Any EDES, ARCE, ARCH, CM, CRP, LA or ART course.
- **Any course included in an EDES, ARCE, ARCH, CM, CRP, LA or ART minor.**

Any course included in an EDES, ARCE, ARCH, CM, CRP, LA or ART minor.

- Students must complete the University U.S. Cultural Pluralism requirement. Refer to the University Catalog for information on A/P testing.

The Architecture Dept. requires all new transfer students to meet with a faculty advisor to assess Portfolio Review credit and curriculum requirements prior to registration.

It is strongly recommended that all new students participate in the Spring New Admitted Student Day, Summer Advising Program, and the Fall Week of Welcome.

All students are required to meet with an advisor the quarter prior to registration for 3rd year design.

This curriculum diagram is Revised 6/24/04.
2.3 Evaluation of Preparatory/Pre-professional Education

2.3a A description of the process by which the preparatory or pre-professional education of students admitted to the accredited program is evaluated. This description should include the process for verifying general education credits, professional credits and, where appropriate, the basis for granting “advanced standing.”

2.3b These are to be documented in a student's admissions and advising record.

2.3c SPC that are expected to have been met in preparatory education are in a SPC matrix.
2.3a A description of the process by which the preparatory or pre-professional education of students admitted to the accredited program is evaluated. This description should include the process for verifying general education credits, professional credits and, where appropriate, the basis for granting “advanced standing.”

Coursework with a Grade of C or Better

Courses listed below are important in applying to this/these majors and maximize (but not guarantee) your chance of selection by taking the number of desired units in each of the areas.

Courses in bold are required for selection to this/these majors. Fall Quarter applicants must complete these units by the Spring, not Summer, preceding their initial enrollment.

Courses in brackets are mandated by the CSU and the campus. Students must earn a ‘C’ or better in these subjects by the time of transfer. Fall Quarter applicants must do so by the Spring, not Summer, preceding their initial enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[English Composition]</td>
<td>3 required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Critical Thinking]</td>
<td>3 required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Speech]</td>
<td>3 required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics (Trig-based)</td>
<td>8 required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Analytical Geometry/Calculus/Diff. Eqs.]</td>
<td>4 required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Architectural Design and Drawing</td>
<td>6 required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Applications</td>
<td>3 required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Education (GE) or IGETC completion

Academic Performance: GPA

Work Experience/Extra-curricular Activity Participation


Table 1 Multi Criteria Admissions (MCA) Model for Transfer Student Evaluation for Admission into Program

Overview

See Part One, Section 1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development for additional information regarding the University’s admissions process.

The department does not have pre professional students.

The above MCA document evaluates the preparatory education for both change of major and transfer students from 2-year community colleges. See program’s transfer requirements http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/prospective/transfer.html, accessed 08/31/10.

The program has articulation agreements with many of the 2-year community colleges in the state of California. For more information, see Assist Web Site http://www.assist.org/web-assist/welcome.html, accessed 08/31/10.

The MCA is currently in the process of being updated, since it needs to be adjusted to catch up with the 2009-11 curriculum changes (see Part Two, Section 2.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum). The proposed MCA changes to be discussed Fall 2010, and will update the courses in this document.

2.3c SPC that are expected to have been met in preparatory education are in a SPC matrix

See Part Four, Section 4.1 Student Performance Matrix, to graphically see the core courses in the SPC matrix that entering transfer students obtain credit for. Approximately 50% of the entering students start directly into third year design studio sequence, and 50% start at the beginning of the second year design studio sequence. A list of these core courses for the preparatory education requirement for program are as follows:
Core Student Performance Criteria Courses:
- ARCH 131, 132, 133
- ARCH 251, 252, 253
- ARCH 241, 242, 207
- ARCE 211, 212, 226
- EDES 101

Core University Courses:
- PHYS 121, 122
- MATH 141, 142
- 40 units of GE&B
  - Transfer students typically enter into program being GE&B Certified (All GE&B courses are satisfied except for 12 units of upper division GE&B)
  - Transfer students more likely select a minor, since space in their schedule is freed up by completing 77% of their GE&B courses before arriving into the program

Preparatory Process

For both the transfer and change of major applications are due early in spring for Fall entry. Applicants are evaluated and total points are tallied, based on the MCA criteria. Accepted students are required to assemble a portfolio of prior work for all design studios (131/2/3 and 251/2/3 design studio series) and practice activity/lecture courses (241/2 and 207), and have it reviewed by a group of faculty that teach these courses, to determine what credit will be given for prior course work.

2.3b These (see 2.3a) are to be documented in a student’s admissions and advising record.

This information will be available in the Team Room.
2.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

The APR must include a description of the composition of the program's curricular review process including membership of any committees or panels charged with responsibility for curriculum assessment, review, and development. This description should also address the role of the curriculum review process relative to long-range planning and self-assessment.

Overview
The curriculum review process is conducted by the curriculum committee – composed of tenured and tenure track faculty and open to the general faculty. The Department Head and Associate Department Head participate on the Curriculum Committee as non-voting members.

Department Curriculum Committee

Charter: The Curriculum Committee shall review, develop, modify, recommend, and implement educational policy, strategies and procedures related to the curriculum in the department; advises the Department Head in matters related to the educational objectives of the department; makes recommendations on the provision of physical facilities; shall identify and define the changing requirements for instruction with the Department curricula; monitor the effectiveness of the department’s pedagogies; and evaluate matters of content, sequence, and integration for all components of curricula in the department.

Membership: The Curriculum Committee is a subcommittee of the Tenured Faculty; the Tenured Faculty and Tenure Track Faculty will act as a committee of the whole; Chair of the Curriculum Committee shall be a member of the Tenured Faculty; subcommittee to have representatives of each of the instructional areas with a minimum of two years experience at Cal Poly; students will be represented by a fifth year student with voting rights.

Process for Curriculum changes: Items for change are brought to the attention of the Committee by any member of the faculty or department staff. The item is reviewed and discussed by the Committee and voted upon. If passed, the item is presented to the Tenured Faculty Committee, where it may be voted upon, passed and adopted as a curricular change.
2.4.1 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 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5.

In the United States, most state registration boards require a degree from an accredited professional degree program as a prerequisite for licensure. The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), which is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture, recognizes three types of degrees: the Bachelor of Architecture, the Master of Architecture, and the Doctor of Architecture. A program may be granted a 6-year, 3-year, or 2-year term of accreditation, depending on the extent of its conformance with established educational standards.

Doctor of Architecture and Master of Architecture degree programs may consist of a pre-professional undergraduate degree and a professional graduate degree that, when earned sequentially, constitute an accredited professional education. However, the pre-professional degree is not, by itself, recognized as an accredited degree.

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA, College of Architecture and Environmental Design, Department of Architecture offers the following NAAB-accredited degree program:
B.Arch. (225 undergraduate credits)

Next accreditation visit for program: 2011

The accreditation statement in the online 2009-2011 catalog and can be viewed at http://www.catalog.calpoly.edu/2009pubcat/caed/arch_dept/archdept.pdf, (accessed 09/01/10)

Program Web Site, under “accreditation” http://arch.calpoly.edu/administration/index.html, (accessed 09/01/10)

and

http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/current/naab.html, (accessed 09/01/10)
2.4.2 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)

On architecture program Web Site
Under Current Students and then under NAAB Accreditation:
2.4.3 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

There are a number of programs that the Department, working with the Cal Poly Career Services (http://www.careerservices.calpoly.edu/students/job_fairs/workshops.htm, Accessed 08/30/10), provides to students and potential employers in support of career development opportunities:

Services for Students

Career Services provides resources and strategies for choosing a college major, developing career plans, creating resumes, interviewing successfully, finding internships and full-time jobs, contacting alumni, developing graduate school plans, and making successful career transitions. The Career Counselor and Program Coordinator is available to assist students specifically from the College of Architecture and Environmental Design.

Career Services events and workshops for Fall 2010:

1. Career Week 2010 – October 4 – 8
   - How to Work the Job Fair
   - Resume Clinic
   - Professional Branding, presented by Jay Matheson, Apple Computer
   - Interview Skills Employer Panel
   - SAY YES!…to Dress for Success Fashion Show
   - Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn – Oh My!
   - I’m on LinkedIn, Now What?
2. Grad School Week – October 25 – 28
   - Graduate School Admissions Panel
   - Personal Statement Workshop
   - Graduate School at Cal Poly
   - Funding Grad School
   - MCAT Strategy Session
   - LSAT Strategy Session
   - Free Practice Tests!
   - CVs and Resumes: Knowing the Difference
3. Signups for on campus interviews will begin Monday, September 20th on MustangJOBS
   - Ten big-name companies coming on campus: Apple Inc., Microsoft, Cisco Systems, Amazon.com, Lockheed Martin, Abbott Laboratories, St. Jude Medical, Deloitte, Chevron, Foster Farms, and more!
4. Fall Career Fair: October 13th and 14th (wo big days!)
5. Career Counselors are ready to meet with students to help with resumes, interviewing, professional etiquette, networking, internships and just about anything else!
Services for Employers

The programs and services below have been designed to provide a direct link between employers and Cal Poly students and alumni:

1. MustangJOBS is Cal Poly's online job listing service. The types of positions that can be advertised are:
   • Full-time career positions for graduating seniors and alumni
   • Summer jobs, internships, co-ops and seasonal employment
   • Local part-time jobs, in San Luis Obispo County, including student assistant positions on-campus
2. Employers may schedule on-campus interviews for career, co-op and summer positions. We recommend that employers schedule interview dates well in advance to allow adequate time for advertising employment opportunities online to students through MustangJOBS. Interviews are free of charge and are scheduled throughout Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters.
3. Networking Sessions are open to all students and can help increase employer visibility and inform students about employment opportunities. They can be arranged to coincide with on-campus interviews to enhance recruitment efforts.
4. Career Services coordinates career fairs and events throughout Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters. Recruit students from all majors for career, co-op, and internship positions. An informal networking session is followed by optional afternoon interviews.

The Architecture Department Web Site

Current career information is posted (http://arch.calpoly.edu/current/index.html, accessed 08/30/10), under “Resources” and “Career Information and Professional Organizations”.
2.4.4 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.

Physical copy located in the Media Resource Center (MRC):
- 2010 APR
- 2004 APR
2.4.5 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.

The APR must include a list of the URLs for the web pages on which the documents and resources described throughout Part II: Section 4 are available. In the event, documents or resources are not available electronically, the program must document how they are stored and made available to students, faculty, staff, parents, and the general public.

II.4.5a. ARE Pass Rates
II.4.5b. How ARE Information is made available to current, prospective students and their parents

II.4.5a. ARE Pass Rates
See summary of this information in Part One, Section 1.1.3 Response to Five Perspectives (in Architecture and Licensure Perspective).


Chart 1. Comparison of ARE 2009 to 2004 Percent Pass Rates For Cal Poly, SLO Graduates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARE Divisions</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Planning</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Technology</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Construction Documents</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Structural General</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Lateral Forces</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Mechanical &amp; Electrical(^2)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Design/Materials &amp; Methods(^3)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Pre-Design</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Site Planning</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Design and Construction Systems(^4)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Building Systems(^1)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Construction Documents and Services(^1)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Programming Planning and Practice(^1)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Schematic Design(^1)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Site Planning and Design(^5)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Structural Systems(^6)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. New Division
2. Plumbing Eliminated from Mechanical and Electrical
3. Building Design Added to Materials and Methods
4. Construction Systems Added to Building Design
5. Design added to Site Planning
### Chart 2. Comparison of Average Pass Rates Percentages of 2009 to 2003 Pass Rates For of All NAAB Accredited USA Schools (with Cal Poly (CP) 09 comparison):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARE Divisions</th>
<th>CP 09</th>
<th>US 2009</th>
<th>US 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Planning</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Technology</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Construction Documents¹</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Structural General</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Lateral Forces</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Mechanical &amp; Electrical²</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Design/Materials &amp; Method³</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Pre-Design</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Site Planning</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Design and Construction Systems⁴</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Building Systems¹</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Construction Documents and Services⁷</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Programming Planning and Practice¹</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Schematic Design¹</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Site Planning and Design⁵</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Structural Systems¹</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Notes for Chart 1.

### Chart 2. Comparison of Average Pass Rates Percentages of 2009 to 2003 Pass Rates For of All NAAB Accredited California Schools (with Cal Poly (CP) 09 comparison):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARE Divisions</th>
<th>CP 09</th>
<th>CA 2009</th>
<th>CA 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Planning</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Technology</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Construction Documents¹</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Structural General</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Lateral Forces</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Mechanical &amp; Electrical²</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Design/Materials &amp; Method³</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Pre-Design</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Site Planning</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Building Design and Construction Systems⁴</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Building Systems¹</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Construction Documents and Services⁷</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Programming Planning and Practice¹</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Schematic Design¹</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Site Planning and Design⁵</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Structural Systems¹</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Notes for Chart 1.

### II.4.5b. How ARE Information is made available to current, prospective students and their parents

A link to this information is posted on the Architecture Program’s Web Site and Catalogues.

Program Web Site:

Under Resources and Licensure.

http://arch.calpoly.edu/administration/index.html (accessed 8/21/10)
3.1 Summary of Responses to the Team Findings

3.1.1 Responses to Conditions Not Met

PART 2 — NAAB Visiting Team Report - "II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation"

CONDITION "NOT MET"

12.29 Comprehensive Design

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.

Response:

Updated 2010 Response

• During 2009/2010 the “Fourth Year Assessment Rubric” was used as the basis for an assessment of Fifth Year Senior Projects at the fall retreat. As described in the section on assessment planning, this exercise was less than completely successful, because of some disagreement about the nature of the artifact and the significant distraction posed by the budget crisis and mandated furloughs. But it is fair to say that it was a symptom of a growing faculty awareness of the importance of systems integration as a defining aspect of comprehensive design. This is evident in all parts of the curriculum, as evidenced by the decision to make comprehensive design at the appropriate level an outcome in Second, Third, and Fifth Years. (Fourth Year was exempted because of the difficulty of insuring the comprehensiveness of projects completed in all off-campus programs, although systems integration remains an important goal for all students.). A growing number of students in fourth year enroll in the Professional Studio where they conduct design projects in a comprehensive manner.

• It should also be noted that the university's strategic plan, which has been developed, circulated, revised, and approved provisionally by the provost pending the arrival of a new president, speaks of "whole-systems thinking" as a defining characteristic of the Cal Poly graduate. The Architecture Department understands such thinking to be manifested in a distinctively architectural way by the twin goals of systems integration and comprehensive design.

Updated 2009 Response

• During 2008/2009 a “Fifth Year Assessment Rubric” was developed by the curriculum committee and is based on NAAB’s Student Performance Criteria. Submitted fifth year portfolios were reviewed using this rubric at the beginning of the 2009-10 academic year at the fall faculty retreat after much discussion in 2008/2009. As a result, there seems to be further support for broadening the application of this evaluation rubric to all upper-division years. Several initiatives have resulted from this process:

• Three faculty members in third year (Cabrinha, Fowler and Neveu) have agreed to pilot a two-quarter studio (two - winter and spring and one - fall and winter) with the focus on having the students produce more comprehensive projects over a 20-week period. The lessons learned from these pilot studios will be used to make decisions for improving the building systems integration in all third year studios.

• A pilot e-portfolio system is being developed in collaboration with the Information Technology Systems (ITS) division on campus. This system is being developed to eventually allow for all studio and activity courses to have students submit portfolios at the end of each quarter, which will allow the department to assess the quality of student work outcomes across the entire curriculum.

• A third year studio will have students submit portfolios to test the use of this system in the fall quarter 2009, with the idea that we will ask all faculty to require that students submit portfolios for each design studio and activity course in the curriculum by the beginning of Fall 2010.

• Assessment rubrics will be developed by each year tailored to a particular set of learning objectives.

• Pilot vertical studios between third and fourth year will be explored over the next year to improve the development of comprehensive projects.

2008 Response

• During 2007/2008 all year-level design studio and activity courses had learning objectives confirmed via presentations to the general faculty. A “Fourth Year Assessment Rubric” was developed by the curriculum committee and is based on NAAB’s Student Performance Criteria. Submitted fourth year portfolios were reviewed using this rubric at the beginning of the academic year at a faculty retreat. As a result, there seems to be support for broadening the application of this evaluation rubric to all upper-division years. First Year is working on revisions that should lead to a comparable lower-division rubric. The rubric that will be applied
for all years has three points of evaluation (e.g., fails/meets/exceeds expectations), and it details appropriate forms of visible evidence to consider for evaluation. There is a plan for ongoing assessment and continuous improvement, based on a portfolio policy that would collect multiple years worth of work from all students, with a portion of the program being assessed every year.

• After discussions with a number of fifth year faculty during 2007/2008, the Department initiated during the students’ final thesis year, a comprehensive design studio that took place during the Fall quarter of 2007. Four faculty members joined this pilot program and a book is being published to disseminate the success of this approach.

• See Interdisciplinary design studio opportunity started during 2007/2008 mentioned in the updated response for “ongoing concern about the limited range of opportunities for on-campus studios and instructors for the fourth year”.

2007 Response
• The adoption of curriculum changes (started 2005-6) have improved technical support course sequencing (Structural Engineering, Environmental Control Systems and Professional Practice Courses), and content integration, along with reducing the total number of B.Arch units; the department is in the process of establishing program-level learning outcomes and methods for monitoring student attainment of learning outcomes through appropriate direct and indirect assessment methods. The design level coordinators in collaboration with the other area coordinators (practice, history & ECS) developed a draft white paper June 2006 that proposes a series of recommendations for improving learning outcomes assessment of all courses within the curriculum. The area coordinators have continued to meet during the 2006-2007 academic year to discuss the implementation priorities so the department can focus on improving the visible manifestation of mechanical systems in design studio projects.

CONDITION “MET” WITH COMMENTARY

Condition 5: Human Resources (met with commentary)
Limited staffing impedes access and/or use of the photo lab, the shop, and the Media Resource Center (MRC). The university administration indicates that these issues are in the process of being resolved.

Response:

Updated 2010 Response
Starting in 2007, the Architecture department has specifically designated a portion of College Based Fees to fund an additional technical position (.80 time base) in the Support Shop to assist with providing further student access to this facility. As a consequence of the addition of this permanent position, the Support Shop has been able to add Saturday open hours to its schedule.

In addition to helping ensure adequate student access to the college’s support facilities the department also assists in coordinating use with the faculty and the supervisor of the facility. In this way open hours are adjusted based on assignments and facility demand.

The Support Shop as well as the other shared technical facilities within the college (Media resource Center and Photo Presentation Lab) receive annual funding to hire student assistants through the State General Fund allocation to the College.

An additional source of funding to hire student assistants comes from interest earnings generated by the CAED’s Lydia Humphrey Endowment. Based on a formalized agreement with the University Foundation, a portion of the interest earnings from the College’s Linda Humphrey Endowment (approximately $55,000 annually) are used to fund “internships” for CAED students to provide assistance in the operation of the shared support facilities within the college AND the Architecture Department’s Cids Lab.

Starting in 2006 the University’s Kennedy Library has assigned a professional Librarian to work specifically with the Director of the Evelyn and Harold Hay Media Resource Center (MRC) in order to offer further service support to CAED students. The Librarian’s schedule includes 4hrs per week working in the MRC as well as additional time based on specific projects and shared grant writing with the MRC Director. Individual assistance, courses and workshops are provided for students on a range of topics including basic Library orientation, in-depth information literacy, and focused thesis research.
2007 [This response satisfied the Condition, per a NAAB’s letter in 2007]

• The ability of the college to hire students again as part of the Lydia Humphrey Scholarship Program to help in the staffing of these resources has been resolved as of Summer 2005. Under the new scholarship guidelines the annual award amount has been increased and students can now be hired from any one of the five departments (not limited to architecture students anymore) in the college. Plans are currently in progress to increase the Shop Technician from part-time to full-time in the 2007-08 academic year.

Condition 7: Physical Resources (met with commentary)

Current studios are filled to capacity with 18 students per section. These studios do not currently accommodate space for in-class reviews. This is a hardship. Due to the lack of gallery space, final project reviews are difficult.

Response:

Updated 2010 Response

• While it is a priority for the Department to maintain a faculty student ratio at 1:18 in the design studios, the dramatic budget cuts have since 2008 obliged the Department to increase the studios to 20 students per section. Faculty were consulted on this issue and agreed that it was important for students to graduate on time. The Department has shared with the faculty a five-year enrollment plan that shows a return to studios with 18 students by 2012 (see Enrollment Projections document in Team Room).

• In addition to our response to 1.1.4 Goal D.1, (influx of Group II funds), two new review spaces, which can be used as a gallery, have been created in the former fishbowl studio spaces (rooms 21-105A, and 21-105 B). The Berg Gallery (room 05-105), the central stair court in building 05, and the Fireplace room in Dexter (34-210) remain the major review spaces for the Department.

2007 [This response satisfied the Condition, per NAAB’s letter in 2007.]

• A priority of the department is keeping enrollment at this capacity level.

• During the summer of 2005 the department installed pinnacle board (tack surface) in several rooms, and converted an additional classroom to a seminar setting with tack board on the walls. These changes will provide much needed pin-up and critique space throughout the year.

• Several design studios are pursuing fundraising options for the purchase of workstations that are more efficient and have smaller footprint in the available.

Condition 12.22: Building Systems Integration (met with commentary)

While there was overall evidence of the ability to integrate various building systems, there was only general evidence of the ability to integrate mechanical systems. The team found this criterion minimally met.

Response: See the response to 12.29 Comprehensive Design.
3.1.2 Responses to Causes of Concern

PART 3 — NAAB Visiting Team Report - "5. Causes of Concern"

- 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 (CBF) are not a viable long-term solution for covering state funding shortfalls.

Response:

Updated 2010 Response
- The CBF continues to be used accordingly to its original purpose, voted on by the students in 2002, that includes the hiring of faculty and student assistants, purchasing, maintaining and repairing instructional equipment and information technology, and the support of instruction-related activities (see 1.2.4.c Financial Resources, Section I.B.ii). The CBF is deemed successful enough that the students, in 2009, voted overwhelmingly to increase it. Despite this vote, the Initiative has not yet been approved by the CSU Chancellor. The Initiative would have contributed an additional $300 per student/quarter over the next three years to the existing CBF.

- The Consultative Committee process continues to serve the students well, and substantial improvements under their leadership have enhanced the students’ learning environment. In particular, funds have been allocated to technology upgrades and teaching assistants (see http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/college-based-fees/cbf-2009-2010-initiatives.html).

The Department acknowledges the Team’s Cause of Concern and has responded strategically by increasing its Non-State Revenue by 64% over the past six years, thus assisting in covering the partial state funding shortfalls. We expect to receive in 2010, and over the next years, the annual contribution of $25,000 by the anonymous donor.

Updated 2009 Response
- Private donations have increased the opportunities for students, while chronic state funding still persists. While we can certainly accomplish more, we are doing quite well, given the past two years of state economic slump. The University awaits the potential challenges of the State reducing the amount of funding to the California State University system. The impacts to the program will not be known until the summer of 2009.

- During 2008/2009 the program went $5,000 over allocated O&E budget to cover additional faculty scholarship activities. These funds were covered from department discretionary monies.

- The Department started a discussion with faculty in October 2008 for the adoption of a series of curriculum initiatives that would enhance the curriculum, while at the same time saving money.

- The College-Based Fees (CBF) were very well managed under the new leadership of a second year student, Scott McCall. A sampling of selected projects includes: a new laser cutter machine and laser cutter computer ($25,000), which added a second cutter/computer to the fabrication lab; teaching assistants money for the fabrication lab ($10,000); Microscribe ($8,000), that allows students to digitally input physical models into the computer; design studio furnishings contribution ($10,000) to enhance the design studio furnishings/digital equipment; permanent archive room shelving system ($3,000); books and furniture for the Media Resource Center ($8,000); money to rent a demonstration large format plotter for the MRC ($325), to pilot establishing a in house strategy for student printing; and support for a number of classroom initiatives - materials for fabricating a new interior space for the AIAAS Chapter ($2,800) as part of ARCH 351 course that will be taught fall 2009; third year end of the winter quarter “Super Reviews” ($3,000), where an outside jury is invited to review two projects from each third year design studio and top projects are recognized; 4th year interdisciplinary design studio ($7,000); and fifth year students final exhibition ($2,000).

- The department secured the students’ vote to increase the CBF by $900 over the next three years. Unfortunately, the students’ vote of confidence for approving this fee increase is pending approval by the CSU Chancellor for the entire Cal Poly campus.

- The Department continues to secure and grow its outreach efforts to secure additional funds from donors. In January 2008 the anonymous donor contributed a corporate gift in the amount of $25,000 and has repeated this in November 2009 with an identical contribution. We are fortunate to have secured a number of new scholarships and endowed scholarships for students. Much has been done to secure additional sponsored studios, but the donors have set on hold temporarily their commitment for this year given the...
down turn of the economy. The named studios that are currently on hold are earmarked for a sustainable studio, two additional interdisciplinary studios, and the exhibition hall (breezeway between ARCE and CM Department, sponsored by the CAEDF Board.

• Additional sponsorship has gone to support the MRC, and in particular, the Sustainable Materials Collection.

• Probationary faculty were provided funds in the amount of $2,000 to use towards scholarship. Also each probationary faculty member going up for tenure received an addition stipend of $2,000 to complete any work needed to be featured in their tenure dossier.

2008 Response
• $511,000 in Group II funds have been provided to the department for the purchase of new workstations for two thirds of all design studios (21 rooms) and digital technology for nearly all design studios (29 rooms), which includes large format LCD screens and new computers, along with videoconferencing equipment and new furniture for the Faculty Conference Room.

• The Department Head has been successful in securing donors who have agreed to name two design studios. The two named studios themed as the “Interdisciplinary Design Studio” and the “Comprehensive Design Studio” will provide $50,000 for each studio over a 5-year period. Additional studio naming opportunities are currently being explored.

• The Department has worked closely with the student officers of the CBF to identify the needs of students at all year levels. Students have indicated the desire to purchase advanced technology equipment (laser cutter and CNC machine) along with updating color laser printers and acquiring large format scanners. During 2007-08 over $260,000 of the CBF money was spent to address the identified student needs.

2007 Response
• The College-Based Fees (CBF), a supplemental fee collected from all students in the department, is considered a temporary solution for offsetting the department’s state funding shortfall. We are working to increase the amount of private funding for the department to offset dwindling state funding. That will allow us to improve the financial support for faculty development and increase the annual allocations for operating and equipment (O&E) expenses.

• The CSU is anticipating some easement in funding shortfalls due to California’s recent economic upswing. In addition, there is pending legislation that will require that all CSU registration and housing fees remain in a trust fund to be allocated strictly to the CSU. If this legislation passes, it is anticipated that there will be less scramble for State general fund dollars, and again should ease the financial stress on the campus and department.

• The new department head is actively pursuing new strategies for improving fundraising from private sources.

• 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.

Response:
Updated 2010 Response
• The University has allowed the department to hire two to three new tenure track faculty for the 2011-2012 academic year. The advertisement has been sent out and the department will start interviews in January 2011.

• Two faculty were advanced to tenure. One was promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, and one from Associate to Full Professor. With the reduction in student enrollment since 2009, the impact of faculty completing the FERP is not as dramatic as previously thought. However, as the profession continues to change dramatically, the Department continues to monitor closely the need to hire additional faculty to replace and expand new areas of expertise.

• In 2010, the Department increased the guaranteed amount of the Faculty Professional Development Fund from $2,000 to $3,500, in addition to increasing funds for faculty in other areas (see 1.1.4. Long Range Planning, Category 3, Goal F, Objective F1&2).
• Housing: Due to the economic downturn, housing costs have declined, yet the decline seems to have stabilized.

Updated 2009 Response
• The University established a freeze on hiring new tenure track faculty, due to state budget challenges for the year.

• Retention: Four faculty were advanced to tenure. Two were promoted from Associate Professor to Full Professor and two from Assistant to Associate Professor. The department anticipates resuming two tenure track positions for fall 2009 in response to two recently completed FERP departures (Allan Cooper and Joseph Amanzi) and the retirement of three additional FERP’s (Faculty Early Retirement Program) over the next two years. As the program is contemplating reducing enrollment to a healthier cohort of 750 students (from current number of about 850 students), the department will need less faculty and is currently assessing the balance between tenured faculty, probationary faculty, and lecturers.

• Housing: The economic downturn still continues to provide reduced cost housing opportunities for faculty. One new tenure track faculty member was able to purchase a house. The new dormitory project was completed during the summer of 2009.

2008 Response
• Four (4) new tenure-track faculty have been hired to start teaching Fall 2008. This is the result of a national search for new faculty conducted in 2007/08.

• Retention: The department does have a good track record of retaining faculty at a high rate (once they come they tend to stay), as does the rest of the University.

• Housing: Due to the economic downturn, housing costs have declined here. Also, the University is providing more student housing on campus (just completed phase 1 of a new dormitory project with phase II projected to be completed in Fall 2009). This reduces demand for off-campus house and, as a result, there are more economical opportunities for housing in the area for faculty.

2007 Response
• The University is attempting to deal with the cost of housing challenge for new faculty with the construction of a faculty housing project with the first phase of homes made available in the Winter of 2007. Two of our probationary faculty, have secured units in this new housing development. The department is unsure at this time what impact of this housing project will have in assisting future probationary hires.

• The department had a 100% acceptance rate of all five of the first choice probationary faculty candidates during the 2004-2005 search. The high quality of the applicant pool allowed the department to hire four faculty as opposed to three.

• After a failed permanent department head search 2004-2005, a new department head has been hired and he started in August 2006.

• In 2005 the department has adopted new guidelines for Appointment Retention Promotion Tenure (ARPT), and the first cycle of faculty to follow these procedures were hired in the 2005 – 2006 academic year. The ARPT guidelines have been helpful to faculty in clarifying the expectations of the department for faculty development.

• To assist faculty in understanding available department resources, the department updated the following policies in January 2005: Sabbatical/Difference In Pay, Computer, and Travel. These policies are now posted on the department’s website for easy reference.

• The result of the department’s Fall 2007 search for new tenured faculty members, three tenured track faculty members were successfully hired and started teaching Fall 2008.

• While advising services are available, they are inadequate in supporting the needs of the majority of the students.
Response:
Updated 2010 Response
• Moving the advising office to a more visible and highly trafficked location has improved the traffic of
students into the advising office.

• A comprehensive advising section ([http://arch.calpoly.edu/current/advising.html](http://arch.calpoly.edu/current/advising.html), accessed 8/25/10) has
been developed and placed on the Department’s Web site (Fall 2008), to answer many common questions
that students have about the program.

• The University’s Web based tools for allowing students to access progress towards graduation and to
obtain unofficial transcripts provides students and advising faculty with the most updated information to
assist in this process.

[Per NAAB’s response to the 2007 Annual Report, no more reporting is needed on this area of concern.]

Updated 2007 Response

• The department is taking steps to clarify and promote the advising services to students. The move of the
advising office in Fall 2005, from a room within the department to a more visible and highly student trafficked
location off of the College lobby next to the College's Advising Center Director, has helped a great deal. The
department's Web Site, redesigned in January 2005, has enhanced the availability of curriculum information
that students can access. Additional advising resources are continuing to be added to the web site as they
are developed.

• Starting Fall 2005, Faculty advisors visited all freshman design classes to introduce themselves and the
advising services available in the department. This mass orientation includes information for all architecture
students on curriculum (architecture, support and general education) requirements, as well as services
offered by the department and college advising centers. This in-depth advising orientation will be conducted
every fall quarter.

• Beginning with grades for Winter Quarter 2006, the department is conducting a more thorough review of
grades and progress in the major for every architecture student. Students who either fail a major or support
course, or who appear not to be making significant progress in the major are being called in to meet with
advisors. The results of this first effort proved very promising, and both students and advisors appreciated
the opportunity to discuss progress and study plans. The new level of mandatory advising has proved
helpful and will be continued.

• As of Fall 2006, the newly implemented PeopleSoft Computer System allows academic advisors to have
online access to a student’s unofficial transcript. Having access to this historical information assists both the
advisor and the student in supporting the needs of the student.

• There is a 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.

Response:
Updated 2010 Response
• With more permanent faculty teaching in the fourth year, and a curriculum offering several integrative
design studios with emphasis on a comprehensive approach to design, students are happy with these
changes.

• Two new exchange programs with the Bauhaus in Dessau (Germany) and the Centre for Environmental
Planning and Technology (CEPT) in Ahmadabad, India are signed and will be offered Fall 2011, thus
offering students on campus the possibility to interact with students from other countries (in addition to our
permanent Paris exchange program). In addition, four students will study in 2010-11 through the CSU
International Programs (IP), and the National Student Exchange (NSE) program, thus bringing thirteen
foreign students to campus in 4th year in 2010, and 18 students in 2012.

• The Professional studios have resumed and the Department will be offering 5-6 studios in 2010-11.

• See 1.1.4. Long Range Planning, Category 1, Goal B, Objective B2.
Updated 2009 Response
• Due to the economic downturn, two of the professional studios (KTGY and WATG) have been temporarily suspended for this year. However, one professional studio was added by SOM in San Francisco, CA. This is an advanced high-rise building systems integration studio also in collaboration with UC Berkeley and the California College of Arts and Crafts.

• The Department’s unique fourth year on-campus interdisciplinary studios continue to gain in popularity with the students that remain in campus during the fourth year.

• Ralph Roesling from Roesling Nakamura Terada Architects, San Diego, CA has joined the professional studio model for firms that agree to run both a design studio and internship for selected 4th year students that participate on a quarterly basis.

• The Faculty teaching in the fourth year have been stabilized and students are happy with this change. This is demonstrated through the substantial reduction in the number of independent study studio requests over this last year.

• An innovative metro program was launched summer 2009 and students from ARCH and CRP worked in Oakland with faculty member Michael Pyatoc, Oakland based architect. On-campus faculty from both departments contributed to the program as well.

• The department is seeking to secure additional exchange program with the Bauhaus in Dessau (Germany), the Academia in Mendrisio, (Switzerland), the FH in Stuttgart (Germany), and several schools in Buenos Aires (Argentina). The outreach with Ahmedabad will unfold with the support of the new Department Head in City Regional Planning. The Australia program is at its beginnings and we hope to see students from Australia come to the department.

• The Interdisciplinary studio between ARCE and ARCH continues to be a great success and has been awarded a $10,000 grant from Autodesk for a proposal called the “Design Collaboratory”.

• The interdisciplinary studio between ARCH and CM is being refined and will include ARCE and LA students as part of this course in 2009/10.

2008 Response
• 2007/08 the Department Heads of Architecture, Architectural Engineering and Construction Management have been working together to develop pilot interdisciplinary courses.

• The Department Head has increased the number of students and permanent faculty in fourth year, which has improved the strength and stability in this part of the program. We now have a permanent 4th year area coordinator who is developing exciting opportunities for 4th year students, along with having a 4th year faculty member who is working with the construction management department to develop a design course that integrates issues of architecture and construction management while working directly with a real client in the development of a project. This integrated project management studio is complemented by a robust series of guest lecturers chosen from the CAED alumni and trade representatives.

• A new fourth year interdisciplinary design (architecture, structural engineering and construction management) studio started during 2007/2008. This two-quarter studio provides an opportunity for all three disciplines to collaborate in the generation of a design problem and provides associated faculty with an opportunity to pursue scholarship activities. A student team placed in the International AISC/ACSA Housing Competition the first time this studio was offered. This interdisciplinary design studio will be offered again for winter and spring 2009 and will also include the involvement of an internationally acclaimed structural engineering firm, Buro Happold, in providing students with an industry perspective on structural and mechanical integration.

• The Department has increased the number of exchange students with the existing Paris Program (from six to ten) and anticipates developing two additional exchange programs with India (Ahmedabad) and Australia (Sydney). The atmosphere for the on-campus students has thus greatly improved, enriching the student body with a diverse and challenging learning environment.
2007 Response
• Since half of the fourth year students go off campus to participate in established study abroad programs, many students that remain on campus fourth year (the reasons for staying range from academic, financial, and personal) feel there should be a greater variety of academic opportunities available. The department is in the process of redefining the role, experiences and overall education goals for fourth year.

While the department is redefining the fourth year, some new plans are underway:

• The department began a pilot program in 2005-06, for interested fourth year students to participate in a quarter long co-op and design studio experience with an architecture firm. This program (The Professional Studio Program) allows students to work on actual firm projects for pay along with taking a fourth year design studio at the firm for academic credit. Students obtain 8 units of Co-op Credit (Professional Elective) and 5 Units of 4th Year Design Studio and Professional Practice activity course credit. The principles in the firm act as the studio design critics and they also work with department faculty to establish project and learning objectives. Following that successful pilot program (10 students participated during the 2005-06 academic year and one firm) the department expanded this program to include three large firms in 2006-07. For 2007–08, four architecture firms have committed to participate in the Professional Studio Program. The department is continuing to expand the number of architecture firms that will participate in this program. For the 2008 – 09 the number of firms participating will remain the same.

• The mix of faculty teaching in fourth year has been changed to include visiting professionals along with recently hired and tenured faculty, so students will have an opportunity to experience a variety of approaches and building types in their design studios.

• The fourth year faculty developed a white paper June 2006 to define the overall education goals for the fourth year. The recommendations of this white paper will continue to be discussed with the entire faculty during 2007-2008. Implementation priorities will be established from these discussions.

• The draft fourth year assessment rubric developed in 2007-09, mentioned in the response to 12.29 Comprehensive Design will provide the strategy for assessing the learning outcomes for the range of new fourth year activities.

PART 4 — NAAB Visiting Team Report - "Changes To The Accredited Program"

Response:
Updated 2010 Response
• There are no changes to the accredited program or reports on any other topic the program wants to bring to the attention of the NAAB that may affect its adherence to the Conditions.

Updated 2009 Response
• The department has hired an additional staff person to assist in the office. This additional staff person, Front Desk Assistant hired in September 2008, has improved the efficiency of the department. Her duties include assisting the Department Head with correspondence, meeting arrangements, scheduling of appointments, maintaining calendar. Special projects for Department Head and Associate Department Head include developing surveys, spreadsheets, assisting with the accreditation visit preparation, etc. She also provides receptionist duties for the department, maintains architecture@calpoly.edu email, produces weekly online “student digest” and maintains other pages on Architecture web site, mail distribution, distributes and tracks key cards for all student, issued keys for design studios, initiates and follows up with student evaluation paperwork, and filing and documents distribution.

• There are no other changes to the accredited program or reports on any other topic the program wants to bring to the attention of the NAAB that may affect its adherence to the Conditions.

2008 Response
• There are no changes to the accredited program or reports on any other topic the program wants to bring to the attention of the NAAB that may affect its adherence to the Conditions.

2007 Response
• The department has hired a permanent department head, Henri de Hahn, who started August 2006.

• There are no other changes to the accredited program or reports on any other topic the program wants to bring.
3.2 Summary of Responses to Changes in the NAAB Conditions

Program responses are broken down into the categories of “revised” and “new” conditions.

Revised Conditions:

1. Learning Culture and Social Equity – Expanded studio culture to include all learning environments in the program.

2. Five Perspectives - Updated all perspectives to reflect on current issues of the program and connect to the collateral organizations that we interact with.

3. Self-Assessment Procedures – Connected the program’s procedures for self-assessment to mission and long-range plan.

4. Human Resources & Human Resource Development - The reporting of program’s staff, faculty and students resources with the program’s activities in one section has helped to show the Department’s efforts and the range of successful events and achievements over the last six years.

5. Financial Resources – In these difficult economic times, developing financial projections and identifying the financial resource issues enabled the program to reflect on the accomplishments over the last 6 years and to begin to adjust priorities for the future.

6. Student Performance Criteria – The introduced education realms and expanded Student Performance Criteria (SPC) along with the requirement to indicate the 1-2 courses that show “the greatest evidence of student achievement” has helped to streamline this process of connecting required courses to the SPC.

7. Required Text for Catalogs and Promotional Materials - Publishing the required accreditation narrative and terms of accreditation and date of next visit has helped to improve the understanding of the cycle of this process.

8. List of Documents to be Available in the Team Room – Providing a range of supplemental documents for visiting team to review during the visit, has helped to streamline the APR writing process.

New Conditions:

8. Long-Range Planning – Identifying multi-year objectives for continuous improvement that have been met and not met has provided an opportunity for the program to reflect on how well things are going in regards to the mission and goals of the department.

9. Statistical Reports - The development of statistics about students and faculty in ways not required as part of the annual report has helped the department to reflect on areas that need to be improved.

10. Faculty Credentials – The program does connect faculty expertise to the teaching of required and electives courses. Given the required format, it is difficult to reflect how the faculty’s research aligns with their teaching responsibilities.

For the last seven areas (#s 11-17), it has been helpful for the program to describe the processes for evaluation (Evaluation of Preparatory Education) and how modifications are identified, developed, approved, and implemented (Curriculum Development). In addition, the Department has used the web page, Facebook, and appropriate public workshops and meetings to communicate with students about changes in the licensure process and the IDP 2.0. This information is regularly updated and communicated to prospective students, current students, faculty, alumni and parents.

11. Curriculum Review and Development
12. Evaluation of Preparatory Education
13. Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees
14. Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
15. Access to Career Development Information
16. Public Access to APRs and VTRs
17. Publicizing ARE Pass Rates
4.0 Supplemental Information

4.1 Student Performance Matrix

The SPC matrix is completed for the accredited degree requirements of the professional degree program.

4.1a The SPC matrix includes the criteria that are demonstrated in the accredited degree program.

4.1b The SPC Transfer matrix indicates those "core" SPCs that are been met in preparatory education prior to admission to the NAAB-accredited program.

Note #1: The program highlights where it can what NAAB requires; 1-2 cells that correlate to a required course on the matrix that point to “the greatest evidence of student achievement”. There are a few exceptions to this where more than 2 courses need to be highlighted to show evidence given the nature of what is being for. Some examples of this include (but not limited to) the following SPCs: communication and visual communication skills.
Note #1: SPC Criterion: Courses are marked for the "Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed".
Note #2: ARCH 105-Architecture Practice 1 (Shop Safety Course). Content integrated into ARCH 131/2/3 Courses, but course required to be taken by transfer students per portfolio review.
Note #3: ARCH 131/2/3 has replaced 121/2/3. Core course content is the same.

Cal Poly:
SPC: Student Performance Criteria
A: Ability-level skill
U: Understanding-level skill

ULO: University Learning Objective
ECS: Environmental Control Systems
H+T: History Theory
D+S: Design + Seminar
BP: Building Practice
Lect: Lecture
Act: Activity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPC Realm</th>
<th>SPC Number</th>
<th>SPC Criterion</th>
<th>SPCL</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Arch 101</th>
<th>Arch 131</th>
<th>Arch 132</th>
<th>Arch 133</th>
<th>Arch 207</th>
<th>Arch 217</th>
<th>Arch 218</th>
<th>Arch 241</th>
<th>Arch 242</th>
<th>Arch 251</th>
<th>Arch 252</th>
<th>Arch 253</th>
<th>Arch 307</th>
<th>Arch 341</th>
<th>Arch 342</th>
<th>Arch 351</th>
<th>Arch 352</th>
<th>Arch 353</th>
<th>Arch 420</th>
<th>Arch 443</th>
<th>Arch 451</th>
<th>Arch 452</th>
<th>Arch 453</th>
<th>Arch 481</th>
<th>Arch 492</th>
<th>ArcE 211</th>
<th>ArcE 212</th>
<th>ArcE 226</th>
<th>ArcE 315</th>
<th>ArcE 316</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Critical Thinking and Representation</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Design Thinking Skills</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Visual Communication Skills</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Technical Documentation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Investigative Skills</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Fundamental Design Skills</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Use of Precedents</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Ordering Systems Skills</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Historical Traditions and Global Culture</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Pre-Design</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Site Design</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Life Safety</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Comprehensive Design</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Financial Considerations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Environmental Systems</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>Structural Systems</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Building/Emergent Systems</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B11</td>
<td>Building Service Systems</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B12</td>
<td>Building/Materials and Assemblies</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Leadership and Practice</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Human Behavior</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Client Role in Architecture</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Practice Management</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Ethics and Professional Judgment</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Community and Social Responsibility</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note #1: SPC Criterion: Courses are marked for the "Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed".
Note #2: ARCH 105-Architecture Practice 1 (Shop Safety Course). Content integrated into ARCH 131/2/3 Courses, but course required to be taken by transfer students per portfolio review.
Note #3: ARCH 131/2/3 has replaced 121/2/3. Core course content is the same.

SPC: Student Performance Criteria
A: Ability-level skill
U: Understanding-level skill
Cal Poly:
ULO: University Learning Objective
ECS: Environmental Control Systems
H+T: History Theory
D+S: Design + Seminar
Bp: Building Practice
Lect: Lecture
Act: Activity
4.2 Course Descriptions

Each single page course syllabus lists the "Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed".

See Part Four, Section 4.1 Student Performance Criteria Matrix, to see how all required courses satisfy the Student Performance Criteria (SPC).
Number and Title of Course: EDES 101 Introduction to Architecture and Environmental Design.

Course Description: Familiarization with the professional fields of architecture, landscape architecture, structural engineering, construction management, and city planning. Introduction to the college’s programs as they relate to individual aptitudes. The design process. Visiting speakers. Credit/No Credit grading. 2 lectures.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
2. Communicate effectively (ULO 2).
   a. Ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively (A1).
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).
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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
C6 Leadership
C9 Community and Social Responsibility

Topical Outline
Course introduction (5%)
Our inheritance / our prospects (10%)
Student clubs (5%)
Universal tools and process (10%)
Global and international perspectives (10%)
Sustainable design and construction (5%)
Innovative technology (5%)
Interdisciplinary collaboration and student work (10%)
Livable community components (5%)
Guests (25%)
Civic inspirations (10%)
Focus on the future (5%)

Prerequisites: NA.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: variable selection of online resources including videos, articles, and white papers.

Offered: Fall annually.

Faculty Assigned: Thomas Jones (Dean).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 101 Survey of Architectural Education and Practice.

Course Description: Exploration of the major paradigms that have guided the development of architectural education and the profession. Survey of the roles of the architects and an introduction to curricula and programs designed to prepare students for careers in architecture. Credit/No Credit grading only. NB: This is a one-unit course taken three times during the student’s first year in the program.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
2. Communicate effectively (ULO 2).
   a. Ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively (A1).
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).
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).
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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A1 Communication Skills
A10 Cultural Diversity

Topical Outline
Introduction to architecture: trends, methods, and approaches (33%)
Design of projects at various scales (33%)
Transhistorical approaches to habitation and dwelling (33%)

Prerequisites: NA. Concurrent: ARCH 131, 132, or 133.

Textbooks/Learning Resources:

Offered: Fall, Winter, and Spring annually.

Faculty Assigned: Brent Freeby (Lecturer), Michael Lucas (Professor), and Keith Wiley (Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 1051 ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE 1
[Note #1: This content of this course has been incorporated into the ARCH 131, 132, 133 Design and Visual Communication Sequence of Courses. At this time, course is still taught to transfer students, as determined by the portfolio review.]

Course Description: Shop safety, machine and tool operation and small-scale design and construction. 1 Lab

Program Goals and Course Outcomes

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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A3 Visual Communication Skills

Topical Outline
Course introduction (5%)
Shop Safety and Equipment Operation Demonstrations (50%)
Joinery Assignments of Small-Scale Projects that Demonstrate Understanding of Safety and Equipment Usage (45%)

Prerequisites: NA.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: Support Shop Safety Manuel

Offered: Fall annually.

Faculty Assigned:
Brent Freeby, L. Joann Grover, Ansgar Killing, Kent MacDonald, Alice Mueller, Eric Nulman, Richard Schmidt, Keith Wiley, Gregory Wynn, Magarida Yin,
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 131 Design and Visual Communication 1.1
[Note #1: This course is replacing ARCH 121 Design and Visual Communication 1.1]

Course Description: An introduction to the issues, concepts, processes and skills pertaining to two-and three-dimensional design and the freehand, constructed and digital representation and visual communication of ideas, objects and environments. Shop safety, machine and tool operation, and small-scale design and construction.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
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).
   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).
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).
7. Work productively in groups (ULO 4).
   d. Ability to work in multidisciplinary teams (C1).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A3 Visual Communication Skills
A6 Fundamental Design Skills

Topical Outline
Site and program analysis (10%)
Design concept (40%)
Visual communication (40%)
Architectural theory (10%)

Prerequisites: NA. concurrent: EDES 101.

Textbooks/Learning Resources

Offered: Fall annually.

Faculty Assigned: Jim Bagnall (Emeritus), Brent Freeby (Lecturer), JoAnn Grover (Lecturer), Michael Lucas (Professor), and Keith Wiley (Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 132 Design and Visual Communication 1.2

[Note #2: This course is replacing ARCH 122 Design and Visual Communication 1.2]

Course Description: Continuation of ARCH 131 plus the issues, concepts, processes and skills pertaining to color theory and the design and visual communication of architectural space. Shop safety, machine and tool operation, and small-scale design and construction. 4 laboratories.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
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).
   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).
   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).
3. Work productively in groups (ULO 4).
   d. Ability to work in multidisciplinary teams (C1).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A3 Visual Communication Skills
A6 Fundamental Design Skills

Topical Outline
Site and program analysis (10%)
Design concept (40%)
Visual communication (40%)
Architectural theory (10%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 131.

Textbooks/Learning Resources

Offered: Winter annually.

Faculty Assigned: Jim Bagnall (Emeritus), Brent Freeby (Lecturer), JoAnn Grover (Lecturer), Michael Lucas (Professor), and Keith Wiley (Lecturer).
**Number and Title of Course:** ARCH 133 Design and Visual Communication 1.3

[Note #3: This course is replacing ARCH 123 Design and Visual Communication 1.3]

**Course Description:** Continuation of ARCH 132 plus the issues, concepts, processes and skills pertaining to the analysis and design of architectural form, space and organizations. Shop safety, machine and tool operation, and small-scale design and construction. 4 laboratories.

**Program Goals and Course Outcomes**

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).
   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).
   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).

3. Work productively in groups (ULO 4).
   d. Ability to work in multidisciplinary teams (C1).

**Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed**

A3 Visual Communication Skills
A6 Fundamental Design Skills
C1 Collaboration

**Topical Outline**

Site and program analysis (10%)
Precedent studies (10%)
Design concept (35%)
Visual communication (35%)
Architectural theory (10%)

**Prerequisites:** ARCH 132

**Textbooks/Learning Resources:**

**Offered:** Spring annually.

**Faculty Assigned:** Brent Freeby (Lecturer), JoAnn Grover (Lecturer), Michael Lucas (Professor), and Keith Wiley (Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems 1 (lecture component).

Course Description: Theory of climate, energy use and human comfort as applied to the design of small-scale buildings. Emphasis on energy conservation and methods of ventilating, cooling, heating, and lighting for envelope-load-dominated buildings. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
   b. Understanding the basic principles of environmental systems' design including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools (B8).
   e. Understanding the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies (B10).
   g. Understanding the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse (B12).

5. Demonstrate expertise in the maintenance of an architectural practice (ULO 3).
   d. Understanding the architect's legal responsibility to the public and the client (C7).

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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B8 Environmental Systems
C2 Human Behavior
B10 Building Envelope Systems

Topical Outline
Climate (12.5%)
Heat transfer (12.5%)
 Thermal comfort (12.5%)
Solar geometry and control (18.5%)
Passive heating (12.5%)
Passive cooling (12.5%)
Daylighting (18.5%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 242. Concurrent: ARCH 253 linked to Arch 207 activity.

Textbooks/Learning Resources:

Offered: Spring annually.

Faculty Assigned: Troy Peters (Assistant Professor).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems 1 (activity component).

Course Description: Theory of climate, energy use and human comfort as applied to the design of small-scale buildings. Emphasis on energy conservation and methods of ventilating, cooling, heating, and lighting for envelope-load-dominated buildings. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
   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).
   e. Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
   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).
   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).
   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).
7. Work productively in groups (ULO 4).
   d. Ability to work in multidisciplinary teams (C1).
9. Make reasonable decisions informed by shared values (ULO 6).
   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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B3 Sustainability

Topical Outline: see lecture component.

Prerequisites: see lecture component.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: see lecture component.

Offered: Spring annually.

Faculty assigned: Richard Beller (Lecturer), JoAnn Grover (Lecturer), Chandrika Jaggia (Lecturer), Troy Peters (Assistant Professor), Richard Schmidt (Lecturer), Sandy Stannard (Associate Professor), and Keith Wiley (Lecturer)
Number and Title of Course: ARCE 211 Structures I.

Course Description: Introduction to the role of structures in the making of buildings. Introduction to statics and creation of simple three-dimensional structures. Development of skills to analyze structures composed of axial force (truss) members. 2 lectures, 1 activity.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
   c. Understanding the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces (B9).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B9 Structural Systems

Topical Outline
History of structures (10%)
Creation of simple, stable arrangements of points, lines, planes and solids (10%)
Forces, displacements, and equilibrium (20%)
Internal forces and load flow in 2D and 3D truss structures (40%)
Stress and strain (20%)

Prerequisites: PHYS 121/131, MATH 142/182.

Textbooks/Learning Resources

Offered: Fall, Winter, and Spring annually; Summer occasionally.

Number and Title of Course: ARCE 212 Structures II.

Course Description: Introduction to the role of structures in the making of buildings. Introduction to shear and moment diagrams using the principles of statics and the application of the diagrams to simple three-dimensional structures. Development of skills, particularly free body diagrams, to analyze structures composed of bending (beams) members. 2 lectures, 1 activity.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
   c. Understanding the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces (B9).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B9 Structural Systems

Topical Outline
Introduction and review (10%)
Multi-force members and free-body diagrams for complex structures (10%)
Internal forces in beams and shear/moment diagrams (10%)
Relationship between transverse loading and shear/moment diagrams (5%)
Internal forces in determinate frames (5%)
Load flow (10%)
Moments of inertia (5%)
Parallel axis theorem (5%)
Bending stress and allowable stress in compression/tension (10%)
Beam design (5%)
Combined stress (5%)
States of stress (5%)
Shear flow (5%)
Shear stress (10%)

Prerequisites: ARCE 211

Textbooks/Learning Resources

Offered: Fall, Winter, and Spring annually; Summer occasionally.

Number and Title of Course: ARCH 217 History of World Architecture: Prehistory – Middle Ages.

Course Description: Architecture and urbanism in the ancient world, from prehistory to the Middle Ages. Social, cultural and physical conditions that influenced the built environment of the Mediterranean basin, plus Europe, Asia, Africa and Pre-Columbian America. 4 lectures. Fulfills GE C3.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
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).
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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture
A10 Cultural Diversity
C2 Human Behavior

Topical Outline
Introduction (5%)
Stone Age (5%)
Mesopotamia (5%)
Ancient Egypt (5%)
Bronze Age cities and ancient Gree (15%)
Ancient Rome and Byzantium (15%)
Ancient Americas (10%)
Asia (20%)
Islam (10%)
Medieval European landscape (10%)

Prerequisites: NA.

Textbooks

Websites
Ancient Greece (http://www.ancientgreece.com/s/Main_Page/)
Ancient Theater Archive (http://www.whitman.edu/theatre/theatretour/home.htm)
Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History (http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/)
British Museum (http://www.britishmuseum.org/)
Rome Reborn (http://www.romereborn.virginia.edu/)
Teotihuacan (http://archaeology.asu.edu/teo/)
Poverty Point Earthworks (http://www.lpb.org/programs/povertypoint/index.htm)
Stone Age (http://history-world.org/stone_age.htm)
Sacred Destinations (http://www.sacred-destinations.com/)

Offered: Fall annually.

Faculty Assigned: Don Choi (Associate Professor) and Christopher Yip (Professor).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 218 History of World Architecture: Middle Ages – 18th Century.

Course Description: World architecture and urbanism from the Middle Ages until the end of the 18th century Baroque. Social, cultural and physical conditions which influenced the built environment of Europe, Asia, and the Pre-Columbian and Colonial Americas. 4 lectures. Fulfills GE C3.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
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).
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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture
A10 Cultural Diversity

Topical Outline
Introduction (5%)
Romanesque church (5%)
Gothic cathedral (5%)
Urbanization of Europe (5%)
Italian Renaissance (15%)
Islamic World (10%)
Southeast Asia, China, and Japan (10%)
Roman Renaissance and Baroque (10%)
English Renaissance and Baroque (5%)
Native and colonial Americas (5%)
French Renaissance and Baroque (10%)

Prerequisites: NA.

Textbooks/Learning Resources

Offered: Winter annually.

Faculty assigned: Don Choi (Associate Professor), Marc Neveu (Assistant Professor), and Christopher Yip (Professor).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 219 History of World Architecture: 18th Century – Present.

Course Description: Architecture and urbanism of the modern world, from the 18th century to the present. Social, cultural and physical conditions influencing the built environment of Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas. 4 lectures. Fulfills GE C3.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
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).

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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture
A10 Cultural Diversity

Topical Outline
Neoclassicism (5%)
The question of style in the 19th century (5%)
The architectural impact of industrialization (5%)
Paris and Vienna in the 19th century (5%)
Colonial India and China (5%)
The United States in the 19th century (5%)
The Arts and Crafts and Garden City Movements (5%)
The Art Nouveau (5%)
The Modern Movement (15%)
Capitalist and Fascist alternatives to Modernism (5%)
Postwar modernism (15%)
Postmodernism (5%)
Contemporary trends (5%)

Prerequisites: NA.

Textbooks/Learning Resources

In addition, Blackboard provides links to a large number of Web sites for each lecture.

Offered: Spring annually.

Faculty Assigned: Don Choi (Associate Professor), Marc Neveu (Assistant Professor), and Christopher Yip (Professor)
Number and Title of Course: ARCE 226 Structural Systems for Architects.

Course Description: Description, behavior and comparison of structural building systems. Concepts of structural stability, load flow, framing schemes and building configuration related to vertical and lateral loads. For architecture and construction management students. 3 lectures.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
   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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B9 Structural Systems

Topical Outline
Introduction (11%)
Geometric stability (11%)
Gravity loads and dynamic forces (11%)
Vertical load systems (11%)
Lateral load systems (11%)
Flexible diaphragms (11%)
Rigid diaphragms (11%)
Framing schemes and structural grids (11%)
Building configuration (11%)

Prerequisites: ARCE 212 or ARCE 222


Offered: Fall, Winter, and Spring annually; Summer occasionally.

Faculty assigned: Jacob Feldman, Michael Hubley, Jennifer Lynn, Ansgar Neuenhofer, Gordan Nuttall, and Kelsey Parolini.
**Number and Title of Course:** ARCH 241 Architectural Practice 2.1 (lecture component).

**Course Description:** The language, principles and materials of construction with an emphasis on the origin, history, and application of traditional and emergent materials. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

**Program Goals and Course Outcomes**
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
   g. Understanding the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies (B12).
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).

**Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed**
B12 Building Materials and Assemblies

**Topical Outline**
Drawing conventions (10%)
Structural and thermal properties of materials (10%)
Air leakage and water control (5%)
Case study (5%)
Wood (10%)
Stone (5%)
Ceramics (10%)
Concrete and cementitious materials (10%)
Metals (10%)
Glass, synthetics, and coatings (10%)

**Prerequisites:** NA. Concurrent: ARCH 251.

**Textbooks/Learning Resources**

**Offered:** Fall annually.

**Faculty Assigned:** Robert Arens (Professor).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 241 Architectural Practice 2.1 (activity component).

Course Description: The language, principles and materials of construction with an emphasis on the origin, history, and application of traditional and emergent materials. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
   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).
2. Communicate effectively (ULO 2).
   b. Ability to use appropriate representational media to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the design process (A3).
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
   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).
9. Make reasonable decisions informed by shared values (ULO 6).
   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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B3 Sustainability

Topical Outline: see lecture component.

Prerequisites: NA. Concurrent: ARCH 251.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: see lecture component.

Offered: Fall annually.

Faculty Assigned: Robert Arens (Professor), JoAnn Grover (Lecturer), Kent Macdonald (Lecturer), Richard Schmidt (Lecturer), Howard Weisenthal (Professor), and Greg Wynn (Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 242 Architectural Practice 2.2 (lecture component).

Course Description: A continuation of ARCH 241 with an emphasis on the fundamental aspects of construction systems and the basics of construction documentation. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
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).
   e. Understanding the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies (B10).
   g. Understanding the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies (B12).
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).
5. Demonstrate expertise in the maintenance of an architectural practice (ULO 3).
   d. Understanding the architect's legal responsibility to the public and the client (C7).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B12 Building Materials and Assemblies

Topical Outline
Working and schematic drawings (15%)
Building codes (10%)
Compressive vs. tensile structures (10%)
Bearing elements (15%)
Spanning elements (10%)
Cladding principles (15%)
Case studies (15%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 241. Concurrent: ARCH 252.

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Recommended.
Supplemental readings on Blackboard.

Offered: Winter annually.

Faculty Assigned: Robert Arens (Professor).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 242 Architectural Practice 2.2 (activity component).

Course Description: A continuation of ARCH 241 with an emphasis on the fundamental aspects of construction systems and the basics of construction documentation. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
   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).
2. Communicate effectively (ULO 2).
   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).
   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).
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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B12 Building Materials and Assemblies

Topical Outline: see lecture component.

Prerequisites: see lecture component.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: see lecture component.

Offered: Winter annually.

Faculty Assigned: Robert Arens (Professor), Dennis Combrink (Lecturer), Charles Crotser (Lecturer), Chandrika Jaggia (Lecturer), Kent Macdonald (Lecturer), Alice Mueller (Lecturer), and Richard Schmidt (Lecturer), and Greg Wynn (Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 251 Architectural Design 2.1.

Course Description: Continuation of ARCH 133 in terms of materiality and the theories, concepts, processes and skills pertaining to the analysis and design of architectural form, space and organizations to communicate intended concepts and meanings. 5 laboratories.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
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).
   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).
   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).
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
   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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A3 Visual Communication Skills
A8 Ordering Systems Skills

Topical Outline
Site and program analysis (10%)
Precedent studies (10%)
Design concept (45%)
Systems integration (10%)
Visual communication (20%)
Architectural theory (5%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 133. Concurrent: ARCH 241 activity linked to ARCH 251.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: NA.

Offered: Fall annually.

Faculty Assigned: Robert Arens (Professor), Art Chapman (Emeritus), Donna Duerk (Emeritus), Chandrika Jaggia (Lecturer), Troy Peters (Assistant Professor), Richard Schmidt (Lecturer), Howard Weisenthal (Professor), and Greg Wynn (Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 252 Architectural Design 2.2.

Course Description: Continuation of ARCH 251 plus the theories, concepts, processes and skills pertaining to light, construction and function as determinants that shape the built environment and support the communication of intended concepts and meanings. 5 laboratories.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
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).
   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).
   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).
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
   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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A3 Visual Communication Skills
A8 Ordering Systems Skills

Topical Outline
Site and program analysis (15%)
Precedent studies (5%)
Design concept (40%)
Systems integration (15%)
Visual communication (20%)
Architectural theory (5%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 251. Concurrent: ARCH 242 activity linked to ARCH 252.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: NA.

Offered: Winter annually.

Faculty Assigned: Robert Arens (Professor), Art Chapman (Emeritus), Donna Duerk (Emeritus), Chandrika Jaggia (Lecturer), Kent Macdonald (Lecturer), Troy Peters (Assistant Professor), Richard Schmidt (Lecturer), Howard Weisenthal Professor), and Greg Wynn (Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 253 Architectural Design 2.3.

Course Description: Continuation of ARCH 252 plus the theories, concepts, processes and skills pertaining to context, structure and climate as determinants that shape the built environment-and support the communication of intended concepts and meanings. 5 laboratories.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
   e. Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
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).
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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A3 Visual Communication Skills
A8 Ordering Systems Skills

Topical Outline
Site and program analysis (15%)
Precedent studies (5%)
Design concept (35%)
Systems integration (20%)
Visual communication and technical documentation (20%)
Architectural theory (5%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 252 Concurrent: ARCH 207 activity linked to ARCH 253.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: NA.

Offered: Spring annually.

Faculty Assigned: Richard Beller (Lecturer), Art Chapman (Emeritus), Chuck Crotser (Lecturer), Chandrika Jaggia (Lecturer), Kent Macdonald (Lecturer), Alice Mueller (Lecturer), Bryan Ridley (Lecturer), Richard Schmidt (Lecturer), Howard Weisenthal (Professor), and Greg Wynn (Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 307 Environmental Control Systems 2 (lecture component).

Course Description: Theory of climate, energy use and human comfort as applied to the design of large-scale buildings. Emphasis on energy conservation, methods of ventilating, cooling, heating, and lighting, and acoustics, water and waste systems for internal-load-dominated buildings. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3)
   b. Understanding the basic principles of environmental systems' design including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools (B8).
   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, including their environmental impact and reuse (B12).

5. Demonstrate expertise in the maintenance of an architectural practice (ULO 3).
   d. Understanding the architect's legal responsibility to the public and the client (C7).

6. Understand architecture in relation to the larger world of knowledge (ULO 3).
   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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B8 Environmental Systems
B10 Building Envelope Systems
B11 Building Service Systems
C2 Human Behavior

Topical Outline
Lighting (34%)
HVAC (22%)
Acoustics (22%)
Water and waste (22%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 341. Concurrent: ARCH 352 linked to Arch 307 activity.

Textbooks/Learning Resources

Offered: Winter only; annually.

Faculty assigned: Troy Peters (Assistant Professor).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 307 Environmental Control Systems 2 (activity component).

Course Description: Theory of climate, energy use and human comfort as applied to the design of large-scale buildings. Emphasis on energy conservation, methods of ventilating, cooling, heating, and lighting, and acoustics, water and waste systems for internal-load-dominated buildings. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
   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).
   e. Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
   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 make technically clear drawings and models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design (A4).

9. Make reasonable decisions informed by shared values (ULO 6).
   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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B3 Sustainability

Topical Outline: see lecture component.

Prerequisites: see lecture component.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: see lecture component.

Offered: Winter only; annually.

Faculty assigned: Richard Beller (P/T Lecturer), Mark Cabrinha (Assistant Professor), Chuck Crotser (P/T Lecturer), Randy Dettmer (P/T Lecturer), James Doerfler (Professor), Thomas Fowler (Professor), Terry Hargrave (Professor Emeritus), Curtis Illingworth (P/T Lecturer), Chandrika Jaggia (P/T Lecturer), Ansgar Killing (P/T Lecturer), John Lange (Professor), Marc Neveu (Assistant Professor), Daniel Panetta (Professor), Troy Peters (Assistant Professor), Barry Williams (P/T Lecturer), and Margarida Yin (P/T Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCE 315 Small Scale Structures.

Course Description: Introduction to structures that use timber and steel as the primary construction material. Introduction to gravity load carrying systems and lateral load resisting systems using steel and timber elements. Development of skills to analyze structures using free body diagrams and the concept of load flow. 4 lectures.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
   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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B9 Structural Systems

Topical Outline
Gravity elements: floor systems, beams, girders, and columns (20%).
Materials: timber products, steel grades, and welds (20%)
Lateral-load-resisting elements (20%)
Nailed, bolted, and welded connections (20%)
Construction issues (20%)

Prerequisites: ARCE 226.

Textbooks/Learning Resources:

Offered: Fall, Winter, and Spring annually; Summer occasionally.

Faculty assigned: Craig Baltimore, Pamalee Brady, Thomas Hawkins, Michael Parolini, and Greg Wilhelm.
Number and Title of Course: ARCE 316 Large Scale Structures.

Course Description: Introduction to structures that use steel and concrete as the primary construction material. Introduction to gravity-load-carrying systems and lateral-load-resisting systems using steel and concrete elements. Development of skills to analyze structures using free-body diagrams and the concept of load flow. 4 lectures

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
3. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
   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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B9 Structural Systems

Topical Outline
Introduction (5%)
Steel framing systems (10%)
Truss framing systems (5%)
MRF systems (5%)
Framing systems for lateral loads (5%)
Braced frame systems (5%)
Exam (5%)
Reinforced concrete framing systems (5%)
T-beams and continuous one-way slabs (5%)
Detailing reinforcement of reinforced concrete structural systems (5%)
Design of columns and foundations systems (5%)
Concrete structural systems for lateral loads (5%)
Long-span structural systems (10%)
Cladding systems (10%)
Case studies (5%)
Project review (10%)

Prerequisites: ARCE 315.

Textbooks/Learning Resources:

Offered: Fall, Winter, and Spring annually; Summer occasionally.

Faculty assigned: Kevin Dong, Jacob Feldman, James Guthrie, Melissa Hazlett, Rebecca Jansen, Satwant Rihal, and Edmond Saliklis.
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 341 Architectural Practice 3.1 (lecture component).

Course Description: Continuation of Arch 242 content. Building systems that inform the design and development of large-scale buildings. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
1. Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3)
   o Understanding the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems (B9).
   o Understanding the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies (B10).
   o 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).
   o Understanding the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse (B12).
3. Demonstrate expertise in the maintenance of an architectural practice (ULO 3).
   o Understanding the architect’s legal responsibility to the public and the client (C7).
3. Understand architecture in relation to the larger world of knowledge (ULO 3).
   o 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).
4. Work productively in groups (ULO 4).
   o Understanding the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process (C6).
   o Understanding the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities (C6).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture
B10 Building Envelope Systems
B11 Building Service Systems
B12 Building Materials and Assemblies
C6 Leadership

Topical Outline
History and theory of building technology (40%)
Building systems (40%)
Zoning, codes and legal Issues (20%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 207. Concurrent: ARCH 351 linked to ARCH 341 activity.

Textbooks/Learning Resources

Offered: Fall only; annually.

Faculty Assigned: James Doerfler (Professor).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 341 Architectural Practice 3.1 (activity component).

Course Description: Continuation of Arch 242 content. Building systems that inform the design and development of large-scale buildings. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
• Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
  o 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).
  o e. Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
• Communicate effectively (ULO 2).
  o Ability to make technically clear drawings and models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design (A4).
  o Ability to write outline specifications (A.4).
• Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
  o Ability to apply the basic principles of building systems in the development of a project design (B5 only relates to life-safety systems).
• Work productively in groups (ULO 4).
  o Ability to work in collaboration with others (C1).
• Make reasonable decisions informed by shared values (ULO 6).
  o 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).
• Engage in lifelong learning (ULO 7).
  o Ability to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes (A5).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B10 Building Envelope Systems
B12 Building Materials and Assemblies

Topical Outline: see lecture component.

Prerequisites: see lecture component.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: see lecture component.

Offered: Fall only; annually.

Faculty Assigned: Richard Beller (P/T Lecturer), Mark Cabrinha (Assistant Professor), (Chuck Crotser (P/T Lecturer), Randy Dettmer (P/T Lecturer), James Doerfler (Professor), Thomas Fowler (Professor), Terry Hargrave (Professor Emeritus), Curtis Illingworth (F/T Lecturer), Chandrika Jaggia (P/T Lecturer), Ansgar Killing (P/T Lecturer), John Lange (Professor), Marc Neveu (Assistant Professor), Daniel Panetta (Professor), Troy Peters (Professor), Barry Williams (P/T Lecturer) and Margarida Yin (P/T Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 342 Architectural Practice 3.2 (lecture component).

Course Description: Continuation of ARCH 341 content. Building systems, especially building envelope systems, that inform the design and development of large-scale buildings. The role of fabrication and construction in this process. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes

- Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
  - Understanding the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress (B5).
  - Understanding the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems (B9).
  - Understanding the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies (B10).
  - Understanding the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse (B12).
- Demonstrate expertise in the maintenance of an architectural practice (ULO 3).
- Understanding the fundamentals of building costs (B7).
  - Understanding the architect's legal responsibility to the public and the client (C7).
- Understand architecture in relation to the larger world of knowledge (ULO 3).
- 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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed

B10 Building Envelope Systems
B12 Building Materials and Assemblies
B5 Life Safety

Topical Outline
Architectural materials research (10%)
Specifications (10%)
Building envelopes including roofs (70%)
Egress and people-moving systems (10%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 307. Concurrent: ARCH 353 linked to ARCH 342 activity.

Textbooks/Learning Resources

Specific articles from *Architectural Record* and *PRAXIS* provided in PDF format on Blackboard.

Offered: Spring only; annually.

Faculty Assigned: James Doerfler (Professor).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 342 Architectural Practice 3.2 (activity component).

Course Description: Continuation of ARCH 341 content. Building systems, especially building envelope systems, that inform the design and development of large-scale buildings. The role of fabrication and construction in this process. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
- Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
  - 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).
  - Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
  - Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical, sensory, and cognitive disabilities (B2).
- Communicate effectively (ULO 2).
  - Ability to make technically clear drawings and models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design (A4).
- Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
  - Ability to apply the basic principles of building systems in the development of a project design (B5 only relates to life safety).
- Demonstrate expertise in the maintenance of an architectural practice (ULO 3).
  - Ability to write outline specifications (A.4).
- Make reasonable decisions informed by shared values (ULO 6).
  - 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).
- Engage in lifelong learning (ULO 7).
  - Ability to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes (A5).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A4 Technical Documentation
B5 Life Safety

Topical Outline: see lecture component.

Prerequisites: see lecture component.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: see lecture component.

Offered: Fall only; annually.

Faculty Assigned: Richard Beller (P/T Lecturer), Mark Cabrinha (Assistant Professor), Chuck Crotser (P/T Lecturer), Randy Dettmer (P/T Lecturer), James Doerfler (Professor), Thomas Fowler (Professor), Terry Hargrave (Professor Emeritus), Curtis Illingworth (F/T Lecturer), Chandrika Jaggia (P/T Lecturer), Ansgar Killing (P/T Lecturer), John Lange (Professor), Marc Neveu (Assistant Professor), Daniel Panetta (Professor), Troy Peters (Assistant Professor), Barry Williams (P/T Lecturer), and Margarida Yin (P/T Lecturer).
**Number and Title of Course:** ARCH 351 Architectural Design 3.1

**Course Description:** Continuation of ARCH 253. Development and exploration of architectural theories, building systems, and design processes involved in creating appropriate architecture with an emphasis on site issues. 5 laboratories.

**Program Goals and Course Outcomes**
1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
   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).
   e. Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
   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).
   d. Understanding the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems (B9).
   h. Ability to apply the basic principles of building systems in the development of a project design.

**Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed**
A1 Communication Skills
A3 Visual Communication Skills
B2 Accessibility
B4 Site Design

**Topical Outline**
Site and program analysis (10%)
Precedent studies (5%)
Design concept (30%)
Systems integration (30%)
Visual communication and technical documentation (20%)
Architectural theory (5%)

**Prerequisite:** ARCE 212 and ARCH 253. Concurrent: EDES 101, ARCH 341; ARCH 351 linked to ARCH 341 activity.

**Textbooks/Learning Resources:** varies by instructor.

**Offered:** Fall only; annually.

**Faculty assigned:** Richard Beller (P/T Lecturer), Mark Cabrinha (Assistant Professor), Chuck Crotser (P/T Lecturer), Randy Dettmer (P/T Lecturer), James Doerfler (Professor), Thomas Fowler (Professor), Terry Hargrave (Professor Emeritus), Curtis Illingworth (F/T Lecturer), Chandrika Jaggia (P/T Lecturer), Ansgar Killing (P/T Lecturer), John Lange (Professor), Marc Neveu (Assistant Professor), Daniel Panetta (Professor), Troy Peters (Professor), Barry Williams (P/T Lecturer), and Margarida Yin (P/T Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 352 Architectural Design 3.2

Course Description: Continuation of ARCH 351. Development and exploration of architectural theories, building systems, and design processes involved in creating appropriate architecture with an emphasis on sustainability issues. 5 laboratories.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
   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).
   e. Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
   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).
   d. Understanding the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems (B9).
   h. Ability to apply the basic principles of building systems in the development of a project design.
9. Make reasonable decisions informed by shared values (ULO 6).
   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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A1 Communication Skills
A3 Visual Communication Skills
B4 Site Design
B3 Sustainability

Topical Outline
Site and program analysis (10%)
Precedent studies (5%)
Design concept (30%)
Systems integration (30%)
Visual communication and technical documentation (20%)
Architectural theory (5%)

Prerequisite: ARCH 351. Concurrent: ARCH 307; ARCH 352 linked to ARCH 307 activity.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: varies by instructor.

Offered: Winter only; annually.

Faculty assigned: Richard Beller (P/T Lecturer), Mark Cabrinha (Assistant Professor), Chuck Crotser (P/T Lecturer), Randy Detther (P/T Lecturer), James Doerfler (Professor), Thomas Fowler (Professor), Terry Hargrave (Professor Emeritus), Curtis Illingworth (F/T Lecturer), Chandrika Jaggia (P/T Lecturer), Ansgar Killing (P/T Lecturer), John Lange (Professor), Marc Neveu (Assistant Professor), Daniel Panetta (Professor), Troy Peters (Professor), Barry Williams (P/T Lecturer), and Margarida Yin (P/T Lecturer).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 353 Architectural Design 3.3

Course Description: Continuation of ARCH 352. Development and exploration of architectural theories, building systems, and design processes involved in creating appropriate architecture with an emphasis on program issues. 5 laboratories.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
   e. Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
   g. Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical, sensory, and cognitive disabilities (B2).
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).
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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A1 Communication Skills
A3 Visual Communication Skills

Topical Outline
Site and program analysis (10%)
Precedent studies (5%)
Design concept (30%)
Systems integration (30%)
Visual communication and technical documentation (20%)
Architectural theory (5%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 352. Concurrent: ARCH 342; ARCH 353 linked to ARCH 342 activity.

Textbooks/Learning Resources: varies by instructor.

Offered: Spring only; annually.

Faculty assigned: Richard Beller (P/T Lecturer), Mark Cabrinha (Assistant Professor), Chuck Crotser (P/T Lecturer), Randy Dettmer (P/T Lecturer), James Doerfler (Professor), Thomas Fowler (Professor), Terry Hargrave (Professor Emeritus), Curtis Illingworth (F/T Lecturer), Chandrika Jaggia (P/T Lecturer), Ansgar Killing (P/T Lecturer), John Lange (Professor), Marc Neveu (Assistant Professor), Daniel Panetta (Professor), Troy Peters (Professor), Barry Williams (P/T Lecturer), and Margarida Yin (P/T Lecturer).
**Number and Title of Course:** ARCH 420 Seminar in Architectural History, Theory and Criticism (4).

**Course Description:** Special topics based on the exploration of specific approaches, periods of time, and cultural or geographic areas. The Schedule of Classes will list the topic selected. 4 seminars.

**Program Goals and Course Outcomes**
- Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
  - 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).
- Communicate effectively (ULO 2).
  - Ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively (A1).
- Understand architecture in relation to the larger world of knowledge (ULO 3).
  - Historical traditions and global culture: understanding parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors (A9).
- Work productively in groups (ULO 4).
  - Ability to work in collaboration with others (C1).
- Engage in lifelong learning (ULO 7).
  - Ability to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes (A5).

**Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed**
A1 Communication Skills
A2 Design Thinking Skills
A5 Investigative Skills
A9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture

**Topical Outline:** varies by subtopic; see syllabi.

**Prerequisites:** ARCH 217, ARCH 218, and ARCH 219

**Textbooks/Learning Resources:** varies by subtopic; see syllabi.

**Offered:** Fall, Winter and Spring annually.

**Faculty Assigned:** Don Choi (Associate Professor), Marc Neveu (Assistant Professor), Eric Nulman (Lecturer), Stephen Phillips (Associate Professor), and Chris Yip (Professor).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 443 Professional Practice (lecture component).

Course Description: The roles and responsibilities of the architect in providing professional services. Topics include firm and organizational structures, types of project delivery systems, marketing and project acquisition, contracts and fee structures, design phases and services, project management, insurance and liability, and internships and licensure. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
   a. 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).
2. Demonstrate expertise in the maintenance of an architectural practice (ULO 2).
   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).
3. 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).
4. 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).
5. Make reasonable decisions informed by shared values (ULO 6).
   a. Understanding the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment (C8).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
B7 Financial Considerations
C3 Client Role in Architecture
C4 Project Management
C5 Practice Management
C6 Leadership
C7 Legal Responsibilities
C8 Ethics and Professional Judgment
C9 Community and Social Responsibility

Topical Outline
Ethics, legal responsibilities, internships and licensure (10%)
Firm and organizational structures (10%)
Marketing and project acquisition (10%)
Types of project delivery (20%)
Contract and fees (20%)
Phases of design and contract administration (20%)
Insurance and liability (5%)
Instruments of service (5%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 342


Offered: Winter annually.

Faculty assigned: Curt Illingworth (Lecturer).
**Number and Title of Course:** ARCH 443 Professional Practice (activity component).

**Course Description:** A critical analysis of the roles and responsibilities of the architect in providing comprehensive services to the client from project acquisition and inception to project delivery and closeout; the process and requirements for internship development and attaining registration. 2 lectures, 2 activities.

**Program Goals and Course Outcomes**
2. Communicate effectively (ULO 2).
   a. Ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively (A1).
5. Demonstrate expertise in the maintenance of an architectural practice (ULO 3).
   e. Ability to write outline specifications (A4).
7. Work productively in groups (ULO 4).
   c. Ability to work in collaboration with others (C1).

**Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed**
A1 Communication Skills
C1 Collaboration

**Topical Outline:** see lecture component.

**Prerequisites:** see lecture component.

**Textbooks/Learning Resources:** see lecture component.

**Offered:** Winter annually.

**Faculty Assigned:** Richard Beller (Lecturer), Randy Dettmer (Lecturer), Martin Harms (Emeritus), Curt Illingworth (Lecturer), Hulett Jones (Lecturer), Sandy Miller (Emeritus), and Don Swearingen (Emeritus).
**Number and Title of Course:** ARCH 451 Architectural Design 4.1 (5).

**Course Description:** Problems of increasing architectural complexity involving the integration of architectural theory, design processes, and building systems with emphasis placed on multifunction singular buildings. 5 laboratories.

**Program Goals and Course Outcomes**
- **Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).**
  - 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).
  - Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
  - Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design (B4).
- **Communicate effectively (ULO 2).**
  - Ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively (A1).
  - Ability to use appropriate representational media to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the design process (A3).
  - Ability to make technically clear drawings and models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design (A4).
- **Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).**
  - 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).

**Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed**
- A1 Communication Skills
- A3 Visual Communication Skills
- B4 Site Design

**Topical Outline**
- Architectural theory (5%)
- Precedent studies (5%)
- Site and program analysis (10%)
- Design concept (30%)
- Systems integration (30%)
- Visual communication and technical documentation (20%)

**Prerequisites:** ARCE 316, ARCH 101 (3 units), ARCH 342, ARCH 353

**Textbooks/Learning Resources:** NA.

**Offered:** Fall annually.

**Faculty Assigned:** Richard Beller (Lecturer), Martin Harms (Emeritus), Ansgar Killing (Lecturer), Margot McDonald (Professor), Sandy Miller (Emeritus), Eric Nulman (Lecturer), Jonathan Reich (Professor), and Don Swearingen (Emeritus).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 452 Architectural Design 4.2 (5).

Course Description: Problems of increasing architectural complexity involving the integration of architectural theory, design processes, and building systems with emphasis placed on multi-building, multifunctional projects. 5 laboratories.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
• Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
  o 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).
  o Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
  o Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design (B4).
• Communicate effectively (ULO 2).
  o Ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively (A1).
  o Ability to use appropriate representational media to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the design process (A3).
  o Ability to make technically clear drawings and models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design (A4).
• Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).
  o 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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A1 Communication Skills
A3 Visual Communication Skills
B4 Site Design

Topical Outline
Architectural theory (5%)
Precedent studies (5%)
Site and program analysis (10%)
Design concept (30%)
Systems integration (30%)
Visual communication and technical documentation (20%)

Prerequisites: ARCE 316, ARCH 101 (3 units), ARCH 342, ARCH 353

Textbooks/Learning Resources: NA.

Offered: Winter annually.

Faculty Assigned: Mark Cabrinha (Assistant Professor), Chuck Crotser (Lecturer), Randy Dettmer (Lecturer), James Doerfler (Professor), Thomas Fowler (Professor), Martin Harms (Emeritus), Ansgar Killing (Lecturer), Margot McDonald (Professor), Eric Nulman (Lecturer), Jonathan Reich (Professor), Bryan Ridley (Lecturer), and Don Swearingen (Emeritus).
**Number and Title of Course:** ARCH 453 Architectural Design 4.3 (5).

**Course Description:** Problems of increasing architectural complexity involving the integration of architectural theory, design processes, and building systems with emphasis placed on multifunctional projects in an urban context. Total credit limited to 10 units and may substitute for ARCH 451 or ARCH 452. 5 laboratories.

**Program Goals and Course Outcomes**
- **Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).**
  - 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).
  - Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
  - Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design (B4).
- **Communicate effectively (ULO 2).**
  - Ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively (A1).
  - Ability to use appropriate representational media to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the design process (A3).
  - Ability to make technically clear drawings and models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design (A4).
- **Demonstrate expertise in the integration of building systems (ULO 3).**
  - 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).

**Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed**
- A1 Communication Skills
- A3 Visual Communication Skills
- B4 Site Design

**Topical Outline**
- Architectural theory (5%)
- Precedent studies (5%)
- Site and program analysis (10%)
- Design concept (30%)
- Systems integration (30%)
- Visual communication and technical documentation (20%)

**Prerequisites:** ARCE 316, ARCH 101 (3 units), ARCH 342, ARCH 353

**Textbooks/Learning Resources:** NA.

**Offered:** Spring annually; Summer occasionally.

**Faculty Assigned:** Mark Cabrinha (Assistant Professor), Don Choi (Professor), Randy Dettmer (Lecturer), James Doerfler (Professor), Thomas Fowler (Professor), Martin Harms (Emeritus), Margotp McDonald (Professor), Sandy Miller (Emeritus), Eric Nulman (Lecturer), Stephen Phillips (Associate Professor), Jonathan Reich (Professor), Bryan Ridley (Lecturer), Don Swearingen (Emeritus), and Chris Yip (Professor).
Number and Title of Course: ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project (15).

Course Description: Comprehensive building design and research project in an architectural concentration area. Demonstration of professional competency in integration of architectural theory, principles and practice with creative, organizational and technical abilities in architectural programming, design and design research. Total credit limited to 15 units. 5 laboratories.

Program Goals and Course Outcomes
1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
   e. Ability to examine, comprehend, and apply the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents (A7).
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).
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).

Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed
A3 Visual Communication Skills
B6 Comprehensive Design

Topical Outline
Site and program analysis (10%)
Precedent studies (5%)
Design concept (30%)
Systems integration (30%)
Visual communication and technical documentation (20%)
Architectural theory (5%)

Prerequisites: ARCH 451, 452 and 453

Textbooks/Learning Resources: NA.

Offered: Fall, Winter and Spring annually.

Faculty Assigned: Mark Cabrinha (Assistant Professor), Charles Crotser (Lecturer), Tom Di Santo (Professor), Doug Jackson (Assistant Professor), Laura Joines-Novotny (Professor), Karen Lange (Professor), Michael Lucas (Professor), Eric Nulman (Lecturer), Stephen Phillips (Associate Professor), Sandy Stannard (Professor), and Barry Williams (Lecturer).
**Number and Title of Course:** ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis (4).

**Course Description:** Development of the framework and format of a thesis project proposal related to the specific design option. Work to include: research topic, intent, scope, methodology, assumptions, outline of work program and documentation. To be taken concurrently with first quarter of ARCH 481. 3 seminars.

**Program Goals and Course Outcomes**
1. Think critically and creatively (ULO 1).
   - 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).
   - 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)
2. Communicate effectively (ULO 2).
   - a. Ability to read, write, speak, and listen effectively (A1).
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).

**Greatest Evidence of Student Performance Criteria Addressed**
A1 Communication Skills
A2 Design Thinking Skills
A5 Investigative Skills
A7 Use of Precedents
A11 Applied Research
B1 Pre-Design

**Topical Outline**
20% Site selection, documentation, and analysis
20% Programming
20% Precedent studies
20% Problem statement development
20% Graphic design

**Prerequisites:** ARCH 451, 452 and 453

**Textbooks/Learning Resources:** NA.

**Offered:** Fall annually.

**Faculty Assigned:** Mark Cabrinha (Assistant Professor), Charles Crotser (Lecturer), Tom Di Santo (Professor), Doug Jackson (Assistant Professor), Laura Joines-Novotny (Professor), Karen Lange (Professor), Michael Lucas (Professor), Eric Nulman (Lecturer), Stephen Phillips (Associate Professor), Sandy Stannard (Professor), and Barry Williams (Lecturer).
4.5 Faculty Resumes
JOSEPH C. AMANZIO, EMERITUS PROFESSOR (RETIRED 6/09)

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 342 Architectural Practice
ARCH 353 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
M.Arch and Urban Design, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 1974
B.Arch, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 1967

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1971-2009
Instructor, Department of Urban Affairs, College of Continuing Education, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 1972
Design Studio Teaching Assistant, School of Architecture, Washington University, St. Louis 1971-1972
Lecturer, Architecture Department, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland 1968
Visiting Foreign Lecturer, Architecture Program, Regional College of Art, Kingston-Upon-Hull, England 1967

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Principal, Amanzio and Cooper, AIA, Associated Architects, San Luis Obispo 1983-1986
Designer, Greenleaf & Telesca, Engineers & Architects, Miami, Florida 1967
Designer- Draftsman, Watson, Deutschman, Kruse and Lyons, Architects & Engineers, Miami, Florida 1960-1966
Draftsman, Office of Campus Architect, University of Florida: Campus and University Facility Planning 1967

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of California

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

Activities:
Conducted class office visit field trips every quarter to architects in LA area and San Francisco areas of California and to visit with architect acting as mentors for students in the Professional Mentorship Studio
Since 2005 have traveled annually to Europe to 3 – 4 weeks to visit and photograph major works of architecture, and conduct photographic studies of public open spaces and plazas.
Developed slide lectures: Typology of Architectural Form; Typology of Urban Space; The Zen of Design Process.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Association of Computer Aided Design in Architecture (ACADIA)
CCAIA Member
ROBERT ARENS, AIA - PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 241 (Act, Lec) Architectural Practice
ARCH 251, 252 Architectural Design
ARCH X424 Design of Museum Displays on Science, Engineering and Technology

Educational Credentials:
M Arch, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 1984
BS Arch, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 1981

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2009 -present
Associate Professor, Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2005-09
Associate Professor, Architecture, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 1999-2005
Assistant Professor, Architecture, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 1992-99
Visiting Assistant Professor, Architecture, University of Colorado, Denver, CO 1997
Assistant Professor, Architecture, The University of Detroit-Mercy, Detroit, MI 1988-92

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Design Consultant, Robert M. Arens Architecture, San Luis Obispo, CA 1988-present
Project Architect, Studio Daniel Libeskind, New York, NY and Berlin, Germany 2003-4
Design Coordinator and Project Designer, Studio Daniel Libeskind with The Davis Partnership, Berlin and Denver, CO 2001-02
Project Designer, The Davis Partnership, Denver, CO 2000-01
Project Director, The Etruscan Foundation; Province of Siena, Italy and Grosse Pointe, MI 1989-94
Project Designer, William Kessler and Associates, Inc., Detroit, MI 1984-88

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Licensed architect in the State of Michigan since 1985 (license #1301031741)

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

Grants/Research:
PDCI SEED Grant, 2010, $4,418
“Research and Development to Support Technology in the Classroom”, (Co-PI with James Doerfler), Information Technology Services Grant, 2008, $15,000
“A Materials Library to Enhance Active Learning in ARCH 241”, Center for Teaching and Learning Grant Program, 2005-06, $5695
“Japan Study Tour of the Work of Hiroshi Hara”, Kansas State University Faculty Development Award, 2005, $1000

Awards:
Paul and Verla Neel Faculty Scholarship, 2007 and 2008

Activities:
Faculty Councilor to the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture since 2007-2009
Faculty advisor to the Student Chapter of the American Institute of Architects since 2007

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Active member of the American Institute of Architects since 1985
Active member of Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture since 1988
Member of the Building Technology Educators’ Society since 2006
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 207 Environmental Control System
ARCH 221 Architectural Design Fundamentals
ARCH 253 Architectural Design
ARCH 307 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 341 Architectural Practice
ARCH 351 Architectural Design
ARCH 443 Architectural Practice
ARCH 451, 452, 453 Architectural Design
ARCH 466 Topics in Architectural History and Theory

Educational Credentials:
B.S. Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1976
M.S. Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1994

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1994 - present
Faculty Member in Residence, Washington Alexandria Architectural Center 2007-2008
Construction manager and instructor for student built project for non-profit organization 2005
Construction Manager and faculty advisor for Cal Poly’s 3rd place 2005 Solar Decathlon project 2005

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Architect, General Contractor and Builder, Richard Beller Architect 1970 - Present

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
New York State Registration
NCARB Certification
LEED AP Building Design & Construction

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

Awards:

Activities:

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects
Green Build of San Luis Obispo County
US Green Building Council
WILLIAM R. BENEDICT, EMERITUS ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (RETIRED 6/10)

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 451, 452, 453 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
M. Arch, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 1989
B. Arch, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 1967

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Emeritus Associate Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly 2007- present
Interim Head, Architecture Department, Cal Poly 2004- 2006
Associate Director, Architecture Department, Cal Poly 2002- 2004
Associate Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly 2000- 2007
Assistant Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly 1991- 2000
Lecturer, Architecture Department, Cal Poly 1990- 1991
Visiting Assistant Professor, College of Architecture, Texas A&M University 1989- 1990
Instructor in Art, Department of Art, University of Tennessee 1986- 1987
Assistant Professor, School of Architecture, University of Tennessee 1974- 1980

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Research Assistant, School of Architecture, University of Texas, Austin, TX 1987-1989
Interior, Product & Graphic Design, Special Instruments Laboratory, Knoxville, TN 1978-1983
Architectural, Interior & Graphic Design, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, TN 1967-1974

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

Activities:
Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, CAED Representative: 1998 to 2004
Architecture Dept. Articulation Coordinator: Fall 1994 to 2007
Website designer for CAED and all CAED Departments

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Design Communication Association, President (2004-2007)
Design Communication Association, President Elect & Conference Chair (2002- 2004)
MARK N. CABRINHA, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 122 Design and Drawing
ARCH 341, 342 Architectural Practice
ARCH 351, 352, 353 Architectural Design
ARCH 452, 453 Architectural Design
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project

Educational Credentials:
Ph.D. candidate, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute 2004 - present
M. Arch, University of Illinois at Chicago 2001
B. Arch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1995

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Assistant Professor, Architecture Department, CAED, Cal Poly SLO 2007-Present
Lecturer, Architecture Department, CAED, Cal Poly SLO 2002-2004, 2007
Visiting Assistant Professor, Architecture Department, University of Oregon 2006
Doctoral Teaching Fellow, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute 2004-2006
Teaching Assistant, University of Illinois at Chicago 2000-2001

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Associate, Project Architect, OWP/P Architects, Chicago, IL 1997-2001

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of Illinois

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Activities:
Installing a Studio-Based Collective Intelligence” and “Moveable Feast” Proceedings of the ACSA West Central Conference, Champaign, Illinois (2008).
Board of Directors, ACADIA 2010-2012
Co-Chair, ACADIA Conference 2006, Synthetic Landscapes, Louisville, Kentucky
Competition Juror for 2005 Biennale Miami + Beach

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Association for Computer Aided Design in Architecture (ACADIA)
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 251 Architectural Design
ARCH 252 Architectural Design
ARCH 253 Architectural Design
ARCH 457 Computer Graphics in Architecture

Educational Credentials:
MS, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, IL 1971
BS Mathematics, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1970
B Arch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1970

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Emeritus Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 2009-present
Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1972-2009
Director of Relations, CAD Research Center, Cal Poly 1985-present
Director of the Computer-Aided Productivity Center, Cal Poly 1987-1993
Director of Instructional Computing and Operations, Cal Poly 1992-1993
Director of the Cal State University Academic Mainframe Specialty Center, Cal Poly 1988-1993

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
President and Founder, CDM Technologies, Inc., San Luis Obispo, CA 1994-Present
Director, Collaborative Agent Design Research Center (CADRC), Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1986-Present

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:

Grants/Research:
Founding member of the CAD Research Center, Cal Poly, 1985-present
During the period 1998 to the present, my research associate, Professor Jens Pohl and I have served as principal investigators for approximately $10,900,000 in research funding in the areas of facility management, funded by the U.S. Department of Defense.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Associate Member, AIA
DON CHOI, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 217, 218, 219 History of World Architecture
ARCH 320 Topics in Architectural History
ARCH 363 Off-Campus Orientation Seminar
ARCH 420 Seminar in Architectural History, Theory and Criticism
ARCH 453 Architectural Design
ARCH 480 Special Studies in Architecture

Educational Credentials:
Ph.D., University of California Berkeley 2003
M.Arch, Rice University 1993
A.B., Princeton University 1988

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Associate Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 2009 - present
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 2003 - 2009
Lecturer, San Francisco State University Spring, 2002

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Visiting Collaborative Researcher, Institute of Industrial Science, Tokyo University 1998-2000

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
n/a

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:

Publications:

Grants/Research:
Center for Teaching and Learning Grant Program, Cal Poly (shared with Marc Neveu); 2009-10 ($5,744)

Activities:
Conference papers and/or panels: ACSA Annual Meeting (2006, 2007)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Society of Architectural Historians
College Art Association
Association of Asian Studies
Vernacular Architecture Forum
WOODY COMBRINK—LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 123 Design and Drawing
ARCH 242 Architectural Practice
ARCH 341 Architectural Practice
ARCH 351 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
BArch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo (5th year Architecture-Danish Academy of Fine Art and Design – Denmark) 1974
Sacramento Community College- Assoc. Arts Degree February 1966-June 1968
Sacramento State University September 1968-June 1969

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Architecture Department, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, CA 1996-present
Lecturer, Construction Management Department, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, CA 2006-2007
Lecturer, City and Regional Planning Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1996, 2006-2008

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Architect / Artist, Combrink Studio, San Luis Obispo, CA June 1976-Present
Plans Examiner III, County of San Luis Obispo (6 months) 1991
Associate Designer – Architect, J.M Brady & Assoc., San Luis Obispo, CA June 1984-June 1987

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Awards:
Obispo Beautiful Awards – Obispo Beautiful Association
Award of Recognition – Residential New Construction – 1232 Iris St., 2008
Award of Recognition – Residential New Construction – 1329 Peach St., 2004
Award of Recognition – Residential Remodel – 670 Grove St., 2002

Activities:
Past Chair and member, Architectural Review Commission, City of San Luis Obispo (since April, 1991) - Retired - (8 years)
Member - Arch. Tech. Advisory Committee - Cuesta College, 1997-1999
Member - Tree Committee - City of San Luis Obispo (June, 1991 - 1994).
Past Member - Sustainable Building Council,(1997-1999)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
SLO Green Build (2010-present)
ALLAN COOPER, EMERITUS PROFESSOR

Courses taught (two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 342 Architectural Practice
ARCH 352, 353 Architectural Design
ARCH 443 Professional Practice

Educational Credentials:
Master of Architecture in Urban Design, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 1971
Bachelor of Architecture, Rice University, Houston, TX 1968
Bachelor of Arts, Rice University, Houston, TX 1967

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Emeritus Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 2004-2009
Interim Director, Architecture Department 2004
Interim Assoc. Dean, College of Architecture & Environmental Design 2002-2003
Interim Director, Architecture Department 2001-2002
Assoc. Director, Architecture Department 1998-2001
Interim Assoc. Dean, College of Architecture & Environmental Design 1997
Assoc. Director, Architecture Department 1995-1997
Director, Architecture Department 1993-1995
Assoc. Department Head, Architecture Department 1992-1993
Professor, Architecture Department 1975-1992
Director, Executive Masters Program 1996 to 2001
Lecturer, Summer Architectural Career Workshop On-going

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Project Designer, Beckett Point Residence, Port Townsend, WA 1999-2003
Principal, Amanzio and Cooper A.I.A., Architects, San Luis Obispo, CA 1982-1990
Design Consultant, Morro Group (Formerly M.R. Enterprises), Environmental Research Management, Los Osos, CA 1983-1985

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of California

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Awards:
AIA Central Coast Chapter Design Award, Cooper Residence, 2008
Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award from The California Architecture Board, 2007

Activities
Faculty Advisor: APX, CSI, Design Village, COOP, Architectural Management Track
Cal Poly IDP (Intern-Architect Development Program) Coordinator
Art Juror for Art in Public Places, City of SLO
Chair, Mission Orchard Neighborhood Association
President, Obispo Beautiful
Chair, Save Our Downtown
Design review committee for City SLO

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
AIA (American Institute of Architects)
CSI (Construction Specifications Institute)
CPI (Collaborative Process Institute)
Commissioner, City of San Luis Obispo (SLO) Planning Commission
Member, 1998-Present; SLO Arts Council
Past Chairman, Architectural Review Commission, City of San Luis Obispo, 1984 to 1990
CHARLES CROTSER, LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 242 Architectural Practice
ARCH 253 Architectural Design
ARCH 307 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 341, 342 Architectural Practice
ARCH 351, 352, 353 Architectural Design
ARCH 452 Architectural Design
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
B Arch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1971
Diploma of Architecture, Ecole D'art Americaine, Fontainbleau, France 1970
Associate Arts, Cerritos College, Norwalk, CA 1966

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1975 - Present
Associate Professor, Washington/Alexandria Architectural Consortium 1999 - 2000
Lecturer, Cuesta College, San Luis Obispo, CA 1996
Instructor, “The Drawing Room”, San Miguel de Allende, Mexico, summer 2003

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Charles Crotser, Architect, A.I.A. San Luis Obispo, CA 1984 - present
Project Architect, Steven D. Pulits AIA Architects, San Luis Obispo, CA 2000 - 2001
Principal (Illustrator), Architectural Ideation, San Luis Obispo, CA 1988 - 1990
Building Abatement Officer, County of San Luis Obispo - Building Abatement Officer 1973 - 1974
Junior Draftsman, Ethan Jennings Jr., Architect AIA 1971 - 1973

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of California, C-8622 (1976)

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Activities:
Member of Planning Team for San Luis Obispo Homeless Services Center (2008 – present)
Design Consultant – Varian Ranch, Arroyo Grande, CA (1990 – present)
Design Consultant – The Bluffs, Shell Beach, CA (2002 – present)
Juror – “Art in Public Places” – San Luis Obispo, CA

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Member, American Institute of Architects (A.I.A.)
Member, International Conference of Building Officials (I.C.B.O.)
Member, National Trust for Historic Preservation
Member, American Planning Association
Member, SLO Green Build
Commissioner for Board of Architectural Examiners, California Architectural Licensing Supplemental Exam
Member, San Luis Obispo Cultural Heritage Committee (April 2002 – present)
Member, San Luis Obispo “Downtown Physical Concept Plan Committee” (1990 – present)
Board Member, San Luis Obispo Non-profit Housing Corporation (2003 – present)
Board Member, Friends of Prado Day Center (2000 – present)
Board Member, San Luis Obispo Historical Society (2009 – present)
HENRI DE HAHN - DEPARTMENT HEAD, PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
NONE, yet participates in most quarterly reviews of the Department

Educational Credentials:
Master of Architecture - Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, ETH-Lausanne, Switzerland 1985
Bachelor of Science - College Saint-Michel, Fribourg, Switzerland 1979

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Department Head, Architecture dept. Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2006-present
Professor, Architecture dept. Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2006-present
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, University of Kentucky 1997-1998
Associate Professor, University of Kentucky 1993-2006
Assistant Professor, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, ETH- Zürich. Switzerland 1993-1996
Visiting Seminar Instructor, Art Center College of Design (Europe) 1993-1996
Assistant Dean for Alumni and Development 1989-1991
Assistant Professor, University of Kentucky 1987-1993

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Principal Architect, Atelier de Hahn, 417 West Third Street, Lexington, KY 1987-2006
Architect, Atelier Cube, Lausanne, Switzerland 2001 (intermittent)
Architect, Atelier Audergon, Vionnet and Perakis, Lausanne, Switzerland 2000 (intermittent)
Architect, Musy et Vallotton, Lausanne, Switzerland 1987-1996 (intermittent)

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect - Architect EPF-L/SIA, REG A, State of Vaud/Zurich, Switzerland 1985

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:
None since 2005

Grants/Research:
Blue Grass Trust (BGT), (Spring 2005) $ 7,000. Project –Kentucky Turnpikes

Awards:
None since 2005

Activities:
Attend annual ACSA and AIA Meeting and various conferences
Guest critic at national and international universities
Research projects currently in progress: article on innovative advancement strategies for the Chronicle in Higher Education; and essays on the cover of Le Corbusier’s 1947 book: When the Cathedrals Were White,” Architecture as a project of society; The Charta of Athens (1931) to the Charta of Venice (1964); Le Corbusier and Gustavo Giovannoni: A spatial horizon in Giorgio Morandi’s paintings; Silence versus Discourse in architectural education; Study on contemporary patios and courtyards; Sustainability: what about cultural sustainability; Rem Koolhaas’ use of typology; from New York’s 1926 Downtown Athletic Club to Berlin’s 2004 Dutch Embassy; Sustainability: And what about cultural sustainability?; and On the notion of fundamental design principles.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects, International Associate AIA (2010)
A3-EPFL, member (1985-present)
California Architectural Foundation (CAF), board member (2007-present)
Lexington Fayette Urban County Government, Preservation Commission, Lexington, KY (2003-06)
Journal of Architectural Education (JAE), Board and Design Committee, Member (2006-07)
African Cemetery No. 2, Lexington, KY, Board Member (2001-06)
Vernacular Architectural Forum (VAF), Member (2000-present)
Lexington Community College Advisory Committee, Lexington, KY, Member (2000-06)
RANDY DETTMER – LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
- ARCH 242 Architectural Practice
- ARCH 351 Architectural Design
- ARCH 443 Professional Practice
- ARCH 452, 453 Architecture Design

Educational Credentials:
- B ARCH, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1973
- Professional Development Studies, Harvard Graduate School of Design 1998

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
- Lecturer, Department of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1979 - present
- Lecturer, Department of Architecture, Cuesta College, San Luis Obispo, CA 2007

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
- Principal, Dettmer Architecture, San Luis Obispo, CA 1983 – present
- San Luis Obispo County Division of Architectural Service 1974-1977

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
- Licensed Architect, California, Washington, Idaho, Colorado, & Hawaii

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
- Activities:
  - “Gateway Building”, 3 story mixed use residential and commercial condominium project in downtown San Luis Obispo, featured in the Tribune, January 2008
  - “Villa Pacifica”, 4 unite residential condominium project in Avila Beach featured in the Tribune, January 2009
  - Personal and professional profile featured in The Journal Plus Magazine, November 2009
  - Work featured in Central Coast Home & Outdoor Magazine, 2007
  - Commissioner, California Architects Board, Supplemental Exams
  - Member, Architectural Technology Advisory Council, Cuesta Community College, SLO
  - Member, Board of Directors, American Institute of Architects California Council
  - President, American Institute of Architects, Central Coast Chapter
  - Chairman, San Luis Obispo City Planning Commission
  - Chairman, San Luis Obispo City Architectural Review Commission
  - Chairman, San Luis Obispo City Construction Appeals Board
  - Alternate Member, San Luis Obispo County Airport Land Use Commission

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
- American Institute of Architects
- Certified by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB)
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 313 Advanced Delineation
ARCH 470 Selected Advanced Topics
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis
EDES 408 Implementing Sustainable Principles

Educational Credentials:
B Arch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, SLO, CA, One Term Exchange: University of Stuttgart, Stuttgart, GERMANY, One Year Exchange: CSU Firenze, ITALIA 1989

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Associate Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2009 – present
Assistant Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2003 – 2009
Lecturer, Architecture Dept., Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, A 1999- 2003
Guest Lecturer and Assistant to the Professor, Ecole d’ Architecture de Paris - La Defense, Paris, FRANCE October ’95 - July ’96
Guest Lecturer, Arhitektonski fakultet Beograd, School of Architecture Belgrade, YUGOSLAVIA April 1996

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Principal Architect + Furniture + Web Designer, M:OME Modern Sustainable Housing, San Luis Obispo, CA 2000–present
Project Manager, Treffinger, Walz, and MacLeod, Architects, San Rafael, CA 1990-1991
Architectural Delineator 7th Street Historical District – Los Angeles, State Of California, San Luis Obispo, CA 1987
Designer, Landor Associates, Strategic Designers, San Francisco, CA 1986
Draftsman, Landor Associates, Strategic Designers, San Francisco, CA 1985

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of California: C25464

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:
Sustainable Technology Park at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, Published: Water Harvesting Site/Landscape, Skin Ventilation, Natural Daylighting and Water Harvesting Building, 2005

Awards:
AIA, C Awards 2006-2009 (M:OME and ga+d); CMU Award – Concrete Masonry Association of California and Nevada (ga+d) – 2006; Recipient “Distinguished Teaching Award” University Level - Cal Poly 2005

Activities:
2007 Eco Wave International Green Architecture Conference co-sponsored by the San Francisco Institute of Architecture Berkeley, CA
2007 HIC on Social Science co-sponsored by University of Louisville Center for Sustainable Neighborhoods
“M:OME: Bridge Street Neighborhood”, Proceedings of the 2005 International ACSA Conference, Mexico City, DF encounters ENCUENTROS rencontre
Co-Organizer, Pecha Kucha Night, San Luis Obispo, Volumes 1-11, 2007-2010, Summer High School Workshop Watercolor Workshop, 2001-2010
Committees: Academic Senator, Cal Poly, 2007-2009; CAED + Architecture Department Scholarship Committee, 2008-2010
Faculty Advisor: Alpha Rho Chi, 2003-2010, CLA – Student Chapter of the ACLU, 2007-2010
Coordinator/Director: Hearst Lecture Series Committee Member (Director Three Years) 2002-2010, Paris Exchange Coordinator with L’Ecole d’ Architecture de Paris – Val de Seine, 2003-2010, Switzerland Summer Exchange Program Coordinator – STUDIO TICINO, 2010, Vellum Furniture Competition Director, Volumes 1-6, 2004-2010

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Central Coast Watercolor Society
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 341, 342 Architectural Practice
ARCH 352, 353 Architectural Design
ARCH 452, 453 Architectural Design
ARCH 462 Topics in Architectural Practice
ARCH X410 Integrated Building Envelopes

Educational Credentials:
Master of Architecture I - Syracuse University, School of Architecture, 1985
Bachelor of the Arts - University of Hartford, Art History, honors, 1981

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Architecture, Architecture dept. Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA, 2009-present
Founding Director, d[fab]lab, Digital Fabrication Laboratory, 2008 – present
Associate Professor, Architecture Dept., Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA, 2005-2009
Interim Department Head, University of Technology, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 2004
Lecturer, Construction and Design, University of technology, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 1998-2005

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect - New South Wales, Australia, 2000; State of New York, USA, 1989

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

Grants/Research:
Information Technology Services Research Grant, “Research and Development to Support Technology in the Classroom,” research to enhance learning in the large lecture class, 2008; Center for Teaching and Learning Grant: “Using Digital Tools to Enhance Learning in the Interdisciplinary Classroom,” 2007

Awards:
Autodesk Sponsorship Award for Fourth Year Interdisciplinary Studio, 2009; Autodesk BIM Experience Award, international award program, 2009

Activities:

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects
DONNA P. DUERK, PROFESSOR EMERITA

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 251 Architectural Design
ARCH 252 Architectural Design
ARCH 533 Architectural Programming

Educational Credentials:
M Arch, Advanced Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 1980
B Arts, Psychology, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 1972
B Arch, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 1971

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1981- present
Teaching Assistant, MIT, Cambridge, MA 1980-1981
Teaching Assistant, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 1971

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Facilities Programmer, Caudill Rowlett Scott (CRS), Houston, TX 1972-1975
Facilities Programmer, University of Houston, TX 1975-1979

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of Texas, 1972

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Activities:
Cal Poly Foundation Board of Directors, 1999 to present
Review papers and abstracts for Space Architecture Technical Committee of the AIAA, 2003-Present
Budget and Long Range Planning Committee of the University for 2004-2006
American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics Conference, Reno, NV, January, 2004

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
AIAA, Space Architecture Technical Committee, Education Sub-Committee Chair, 2003-Present
Environmental Design Research Association (EDRA) Board of Directors for three years and two years as Secretary/Treasure and Member, 1970-Present
Master Gardener (University of California Cooperative Extension Master Gardener Program), 2007-Present
CA Rare Fruit Growers, 2007-Present
Central Coast Cactus and Succulent Society, 2006-Present
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Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 453 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
Ph.D. (ABD) Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Alexandria, VA 2010
M.Arch, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 2001
Bachelor of Arts, History, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 1998

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Director of Workshops, Washington-Alexandria Architecture Center, Virginia Tech, Alexandria, VA 2004-present
Ph.D Teaching Assistant Fall 2007-Fall 2009

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Studio 3 Architects, P.C., McLean, VA 2001-2005
Victoria Kiechel, Architect AIA, Washington, DC 2005
Urban Workshop, Alexandria, VA 2002-present

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB)

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

Activities:
"Ethos Logos Pathos: Architects and their Chairs", paper accepted for the AHRA international conference of Scale, University of Kent, UK (forthcoming)
"Proximate distance : Tactile musings on digital production", paper accepted for the international conference, Architecture and Phenomenology (Kyoto, Japan) (2009)
Invited Jury Member, Best Architecture Diploma/Thesis project, Bauhaus-Universität Weimar (2009);
Invited Presenter, 90th anniversary of the founding the Bauhaus in Weimar, Bauhaus-Universität Weimar (2009)
Presenter, Design DC convention of practitioners and vendors (2008)
Guest Lecturer, Morgan State University, Baltimore (2008)
Guest Lecturer, DC AIA Theory in Architecture Series (2007)
Invited Critic, Catholic University of America (2007)
WAAC ambassador and Guest Lecturer, CalPoly (San Luis Obispo, CA) and LSU (Baton Rouge, LA) (2006)
Presenter, CAUS Research Symposium, Blacksburg, VA (2006)
Visiting Critic and Lecturer, Arquiforo IV, Universidad de San Martin de Porres, Lima, Peru (2005)
"Camera Obscura", brick masonry installation, Masonry Institute of America, Sterling, VA (2010)
"Rotino", finalist, toy competition sponsored by Naef (2010)
"Ad ungeum", stainless steel and glass sculpture installed at the Bauhaus-Universität Weimar, in commemoration of its 90th anniversary (2009)
"Presidential Helicopter Maintenance Facility -- Reception Desk", Design/build project undertaken with WAAC students, published online: Virginia Tech’s homepage (www.vt.edu); National Capitol Region homepage, Virginia Tech (www.ncr.vt.edu); published in ASCA News (October 2006); Building Design + Construction magazine (December 2006)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 341, 342 Architectural Practice
ARCH 351, 352, 353 Architectural Design
ARCH 452, 453 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
M. Arch, Cornell, Ithaca, NY 1994
B. Arch, New York Institute of Technology / old Westbury Campus, Westbury, NY 1984

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2007 - present
Assistant Head, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2007 - present
Associate Head, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2002 - 2007
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1998 - 2007
Full-time lecturer, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1995 - 1996
Part-time Lecturer, University of California at Berkeley, Architecture Department, Berkeley, CA 1991-1993
Teaching Assistant, Cornell University, Dept. of Architecture, Introduction Program Sum. ’87, ’88
Director of Minority Educational Affairs, Cornell University, College of Architecture, Art and Planning 1985 - 1989

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Founder and Director, Collaborative Integrative-Interactive Digital Design Studio (CIDS) 1998 - present
Co-Founder and Coordinator, Interdisciplinary Projects Group (IPG) 2006 - present
Design Development Team Member, Davis Brody Bond Associates, Architects, New York City, NY 1994
Design Development Team Member, Hartman • Cox Architects, Washington, DC 1989-1990
Designer/Project Manager, Garrison McNeil Architects and Planners, New York City, NY 1978-1984

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect New York State License Number: 323233; National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) Certification Number: 38053

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

“Light Motion Machines”, 2007 FormZ Auto-des-sys, Inc Annual Publication
“Intimate Production of Space”, 2007 FormZ Auto-des-sys, Inc Annual Publication

Grants/Research:
Design Collaboratory, Interdisciplinary Collaboration with Professors Cabriniha, Doerfler and Dong (Arce), AutoDesk 2009 – 2010
ARUP Foundation Grant for the “Collaborative Design Studio” with Professors Cabriniha, Doerfler and Dong (PI), 2009 – 2010, $10,000
Interdisciplinary Design Studio Grant, 2008 - 2013 (This is the first studio in the department funded under this program) ($10,000 a year x 5 years) $50,000
Lydia Humphries Student Assistant Scholarship Work Study Funds ($2,500 per student w/ an average of 2 students a year), 2000 to present
“Collaborative Integrative-Interdisciplinary Digital-Design Studio” (CIDS) computer studio, Cal Poly State University Cal Poly Plan Funds I, 1996, $113,000

Awards:
2009-2010 Creative Achievement Award, ASCA; 2010 NCARB Prize ($7,500) for “Design Collaboratory 2007-2010, with Pros. Cabriniha, Doerfler, and Dong
Creative Achievement Award, ACSA 2009-2010; American Institute of Architects (AIA) Education Honor Award for Integrated Project Studio (IPG) taught in collaboration
with Full Time Lecturer Barry Williams, AIA in 2009; Selected for American Institute of Architects Doer’s Profile (Face of the AIA), The News of the America’s Community of Architects, Volume 15, April 25, 2008; American Institute of Architects Education Award 2008 for Collaborative Integrative-Interdisciplinary Digital-Design Studio (CIDS) - Faculty Commencement Speaker, for the College of Architecture and Environmental Design and the College of Liberal Arts Graduation Ceremony, December 2007
“Wesley Ward Teaching Award”, College of Architecture and Environmental Design Foundation, 2007, $1,000 provided for classroom use
“Faculty Teaching Award”, Department of Architecture, 2005

Activities:
Association of Computer Aided Design in Architecture (ACADIA); ACSA Secretary (2003 – ’04); NAAB 2005-’09; NAAB Secretary (‘07-’08); NAAB Visitation Teams — 17 visitations (8 chaired)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Association of Computer Aided Design in Architecture (ACADIA); NAAB Visitations — 15 visitations (4 chaired)
BRENT FREEBY – LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 101 Survey of Architectural Education and Practice
ARCH 105 Architectural Practice
ARCH 121, 122, 123 Design and Drawing
ARCH 131, 132, 133 Design and Visual Communication
ARCH 160 Digital Tools for Architecture
ARCH 252 Architectural Design
ARCH 460 Act Advanced Computer Graphics in Architecture
ARCH 460 Lec Advanced Computer Graphics in Architecture

BArch, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, CA 2000

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo 2002 - present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Architect, brent freeby design, Pismo Beach 2004-present
MW Architecture, San Luis Obispo 2003-2005
Intern, Models and Visualization, Arcanum Architecture, San Francisco 1999

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, California

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Awards:
Cal Poly SLO Disability Resource Center Faculty Member of the Year Award, 2006
San Luis Obispo Beautification Award, 2005
San Luis Obispo Beautification Award, 2004
San Luis Obispo Beautification Award, 2003
San Luis Obispo Beautification Award, 2002

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
BRUNO GIBERTI, A.I.A., PH.D. PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
(see Associate Department Head, Special Assistant to Provost and Academic Senate Chair under Teaching Experience below)

Educational Credentials:
PhD, Architecture, UC Berkeley, CA, 1994
MArch, UC Berkeley, CA, 1989
BA Arch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA, 1980

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Special Assistant to the Provost and Faculty Director of WASC Self-Study, 2007-present
Associate Director, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, 2002-present
Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, 2001-06
Associate Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, 1997-99
Assistant Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, 1995-2001
Lecturer, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, 1994-95

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Project Designer, Madison Park Development, Oakland, CA, 1985-1986
Associate Editor, Arts and Architecture, Los Angeles, CA, 1981-1985
Managing Editor and Advertising Manager, LA Architect, Los Angeles, CA, 1981-1985

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
State of California, #C 31683, 2008-present

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:

Publications:
Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 64, no. 3 (September 2005): 381-383.

Grants/Research:
$5000 grant from Graham Foundation, with $3495 in matching funds from Cal Poly, CAED, and Architecture Department, to survey work of Wilson Brothers & Co., 2002;
two-quarter sabbatical to study Wilson Brothers & Co, 2001-2002; $5000 State Faculty Support Grant to complete Designing the Centennial, 1999;
$2000 grant from Cal Poly, Interactive Learning Group, to create web pages for architectural history survey course, with Prof. Serim Denel, 1995.

Awards:
Material Culture Award for manuscript of Designing the Centennial from University Press of Kentucky, 1999

Activities:
Co-Chair, University Assessment Council, 2009-present
Chair, Academic Senate, 2006-2008
Access to Excellence (CSU strategic plan) Steering Committee, 2006-2008
Chair, Academic Senate Research and Professional Development Committee, 2004-2006
Chair, Tenured Faculty, 2002-2004

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects
Society of Architectural Historians
L. JOANN GROVER – LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 121, 122, 123 Design and Drawing
131, 132, 133 Design and Visual Communication
ARCH 105 Architectural Practice
ARCH 207, 307 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 241, 341 Architectural Practice

Educational Credentials:
B Arch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1998
A.S. Geology, Santa Barbara Community College 1979

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2002 – Present
Part-Time Faculty, Cuesta College, San Luis Obispo, CA 2002 – Present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Designer, Habitat Studio, San Luis Obispo 1998 - 2002
Principal/Owner/Designer, Grover Design Studios, Los Osos, CA 1998 - Present
Co-founding Partner/Designer, StudioB - Virtual Reality Design, Los Osos, CA 2005 - Present

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
New York State Registration
NCARB Certification

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Activities:
Architecture Student Advisor, 2009-present
Faculty Advisor, Student Chapter of the American Institute of Architects Cuesta 2008-2009
Actively completing Architecture Registration Examination
Architecture First Year Coordinator, 2008-09
Architecture Curriculum Committee, 2008-2009
Faculty Mentor, Sophomore Success Program, 2007 - present
Watercolor Workshops, Student Development Program, 2007 and 2008
Arts Obispo, Open Studios Artist 2008
Drawing Room, San Miguel de Allende, Mexico – 2005
Sustainable Design Training, San Luis Obispo County Planning & Building, Co-Presenter

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
National Trust for Historic Preservation
SLO Green Build
Arts Obispo
San Luis Art Center – Acrylic Painting
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 302 Theories of Architectural Design
ARCH 341 Architectural Practice
ARCH 351 Architectural Design
ARCH 451 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
M Arch, MIT 1978
Bachelor of Arch Eng. Washington State University 1965

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1978-2007
Lecturer, University of Idaho 1975-1976
Lecturer, Washington State University 1974-1975

Professional Experience:
Project designer and manager, Donham and Sweeney, Boston, MA 1977-1978
Project manager, designer, production, Brooks, Hensley, Cresser, Spokane, WA 1969-1972
Design Coordinator, Trogdon, Smith, Grossman, Spokane, WA 1968-1969
Project manager et al, A.McClure, Seattle, WA 1965-1968
Terry Hargrave, Architect, Spokane, WA, and Atascadero, CA. (42 projects) 1973-current

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Licensed Architect, since 1968

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Activities:
Collaborative Exhibitions:
California Museum of Photography  http://www.cmp.ucr
Cornell University, http://ctheorymultimedia.cornell.edu
http://www.boringart.com
http://www.hiveprojects.com
http://www.a-virtual-memorial.org
http://www.chairetmetal.com

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Curt Illingworth, Lecturer

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 341, 342 Architectural Practice
ARCH 351, 352, 353 Architectural Design
ARCH 443 Professional Practice
ARCH 451, 452, 453 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
MArch, University of California, Berkeley, CA 1985
BS Arch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1978
M. Divinity, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, PA 1970
B.A. History, Grove City College, Grove City, PA 1967

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Department of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1989-Present
Teaching Assistant, University of California, Berkeley, CA 1983-1984

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Principal, Curtis Illingworth Architecture, San Luis Obispo, CA 1985-2009

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Licensed Architect, State of California

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Activities:
Academic Advising Committee Chairman, Cal Poly Architecture Department
Student Advisor
Coordinator of 4th Year Architecture Practice Curriculum
City of San Luis Obispo – Architecture Review Commission
Lucia Mar School District – K-12 Volunteer Speaker
Obispo Beautiful Committee – San Luis Obispo

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
DOUGLAS JACKSON – ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 470 Selected Advanced Topics
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
M Arch, Princeton University School of Architecture, Princeton, NJ 2000
B Arch, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 1993

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Assistant Professor, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2008–Present
Hyde Chair of Excellence - Endowed Visiting Professor, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NB 2007–2008
Studio Instructor, Otis College of Art and Design, Los Angeles, CA 2003

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Principal, Doug Jackson Design Office 2007–Present
Principal, Jones, Partners: Architecture 2003–2007

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
CA Licensed Architect (C-31242), 2007–present

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:
“Wormhole House”, GA Houses 109 (March 2009)
“100x Architecture of the Americas” (Braun, 2008)
Champaign School of Architecture (2008)
White House Redux: 123 Ideas for a New White House (Storefront for Art and Architecture, 2008)
“DRAPE Artist Residence and Gallery”, GA Houses 103 (March 2008)
Future City: Experiment and Utopia in Architecture, Marie-Ange Brayer, Jane Alison, Frederic Migayrou, and Neil Spiller (Thames and Hudson, 2007)
Groundscapes, Ika & Andreas Ruby (GG, 2006)
“F2”, GA Houses 92 (March 2006)
“Yucca Valley House”, GA Houses 86 (March 2005)
“PROcon Rooftop Dwelling Unit”, GA Houses 80 (March 2004)
UME, no. 18 (2004)

Activities:

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, 2007–present
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 207, 307 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 221 Architectural Design Fundamentals
ARCH 241, 242 Architectural Practice
ARCH 251, 252, 253 Architectural Design
ARCH 342 Architectural Practice
ARCH 352 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
MArch and MS Construction Management, Iowa State University, IA  Aug 1988-Dec 1990
BArch, College of Architecture, Chandigarh, India  Sept. 1981-May 1986

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo  Sept. 2008-June 2009
Adjunct Professor – Cal Poly State University, San Luis Obispo  Sept. 2007-June 2008

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Senior Architect - Goody Clancy & Associates, Boston  July 2001-June 2005

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
New York State Registration
NCARB Certification

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Grants/Research:
Course Design with Technology in Mind (CDTM) by the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), Cal Poly State University, Fall 2009.

Awards:
R&D magazine’s 2004 Renovated Lab of the Year Award for the re-design of MIT’s Chemistry Building under Goody Clancy Associates
‘Premium for Academic Excellence’ (PACE) award at Iowa State University, 1988-89

Activities:
AIA and SLO Green Build continuing education seminars

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Member, AIA
LAURA JOINES, AIA, PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 242 Architectural Practice
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
M. Arch, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 1987
A.B. Geography/Anthropology Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York 1981
M.S. Historic Preservation Program Columbia University, New York, NY 1982

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Architecture Dept., Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1989- present
Director/Founder, Prague Summer Studio, Prague Czech Republic 1991-1996
Studio Teacher, Boston Architectural Center, Boston, MA 1988

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
DOMU architecture + design 2010-present
MOMEarchitects 2002-2010

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of California #C-25173, 1993

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Grants/Research:
“Full-Size Cladding System Mockup”, Interdisciplinary Collaboration with Construction Management (with Bill Epstein and Paul Weber) and Architecture Students and Faculty, 2003 – 2004, $4,000
“Designing Housing Solutions for Higher Density in Downtown San Luis Obispo” (with Brook Muller) Community Development Grant, College of Business, Cal Poly State University, Winter 2004, $4,200
“Modular Display Units (MDU)”, Design and Construction of Student Work Storage Display System for Department Archive Room, 2003 – 2004, $13,100

Awards:
Architectural Record 2009 Advertising Excellence Award for Teixeira House and La Cantina Doors
AIA CCC Honor Award, 2008, Teixeira House, San Luis Obispo
AIA CCC, American Institute of Architects Central Coast Chapter Merit Award, 2006 Bridge Street Neighborhood
AIA CCC, American Institute of Architects Central Coast Chapter Merit Award, 2003 Ehlers House, San Luis Obispo
AIAS CCC, Student Chapter Awards, Honor Award, 2003 Ehlers House, San Luis Obispo
Vellum Furniture Prize, Aluminum Chair, Annual Vellum-Cal Poly Faculty/Student Show, San Luis Obispo, 2006
Serbian Products and Furniture Show, Best of Show, MOME wall table, December, 2008

Activities:
Contributed articles/editorials/quotes on the Bridge St. Project to the San Luis Obispo Tribune, Jan/Feb 2004
Personal Profile appeared in Durham Academy Alumni Journal, June 2004

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
AIA, American Institute of Architects, 2004
Vice-President, Bridge Street Corporation, Non-Profit Housing Group, 2004
San Luis Obispo Green Build Coalition, San Luis Obispo, CA
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 451 Urban Design Studio Fall 2007
ARCH 443 Professional Practice Case Study Method F2007, S&F2009

Educational Credentials:
B Arch, University of Texas, Austin, TX 1993

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Part-Time Lecturer, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo (San Francisco Program) Fall 2007 – present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Owner and Principal, jones | haydu, San Francisco, CA, Aug 2006 – Present
Associate, Britt Medford, Architect, Austin, TX March 1993–July 1996
Intern, Beran and Shelimire Architects, Dallas, TX 1984–1990, Summers & Winters

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, California 1993
Registered Residential Designer, Nevada, 2007
LEED ® Accredited Professional, USGBC, 2006

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Activities:
Featured in the AIA SF “Architecture and the City” Festival, Dining by Design, 2009

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects Member
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
EDES 101 Introduction to Architecture and Environmental Design
Housing Concepts Architecture 472
Guest lectures in a variety of classes

Educational Credentials:
B. Arch, Cornell University 1969

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Environmental Design 101 2003-present
Graduate Teaching Assistant/Part Time Lecturer, Department of Architecture, University of Oregon 1975-1977
Part Time Faculty, Department of Architecture, University of California at Berkeley 1982-1984

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Dean, College of Architecture and Environmental Design, Cal Poly State University, San Luis Obispo 2001-2003
Executive Director, California Futures Network 1998-2001
Director of Community Planning and Development, Asian Neighborhood Design, San Francisco 1989-1992
Special Projects Director, Mayor's Office of Housing, San Francisco 1983-1988
Project Designer, Rosecrans and Broder, San Francisco 1971-1974

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of California

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications (selected):
“Smart Growth Housing Models for California”, Annual Housing California Conference, Sacramento, 2003
“Mixed Housing Models for Sacramento County”, Sacramento County Planning Commission, 2002
“Reporters Resource and Media Guide to Growth in California”, a joint project of CFN and Environmental Media Center West, San Francisco, 2002
“MARIN COUNTY SMART GROWTH HOUSING MODELS” FOR CFN, SAN FRANCISCO, 2002

Awards:
Obispo Beautiful, Award for Housing Renovation Design, 2010
San Luis Obispo Green Building Tour, Sustainable Residence Design, 2008
Design Intelligence “Top 30 Educators” award, 2005

Activities:
Architecture+Construction Alliance, (coalition of 13 Universities with Architecture and Construction programs) Founding Member, 2006—present, elected Board Vice President 2009
San Luis Obispo County Housing Trust Fund, Board member and President, 2008-2010:
Cal Poly Campus Sustainability Committee Chair, appointed by President, 2006-present
Cal Poly Strategic Plan Writing Committee, Deans Council Representative, 2008 – present
San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce, Strategic Plan Committee Member, 2008
Paso Robles Chamber of Commerce Strategic Plan Committee Member, 2007
California State University Energy Advisory Task Force, Member 2006-2007
San Luis Obispo Workforce Housing Coalition, Public Presenter, 2006 – present

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects, Central Coast Chapter Board of Directors, 2003 to present; San Luis Obispo County Housing Trust Fund, Board member and President, 2008-2010: Cal Poly Campus Sustainability Committee Chair, appointed by President, 2006-present
BRIAN KESNER, EMERTIUS PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 241 Architectural Practice
ARCH 251, 252 Architectural Design
ARCH 451, 452 Architectural Design
ARCH 472 Housing Design Concepts

Educational Credentials:
M Arch, College of Environmental Design, University of California, Berkeley 1968
B Arch, College of Environmental Design, University of California, Berkeley 1967

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, CA 1980 to present
Assistant Professor, Department of Architecture, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign 1970 - 1975

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Principal, Brian B. Kesner, Architect, Durango, CO 1975-1980
Research Assistant, Clare Cooper Marcus, Berkeley, & KMD Architects, San Francisco, CA 1965 – 1970
3 years varied office experience in architectural offices + 2 years housing & public facilities research 1965-1970

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Awards:
American Institute of Architect’s COTE Environmental Literacy Award, for The Sustainable Environments Courses and Minor at Cal Poly’s College of Architecture & Environmental Design, 2005

Activities:
Principal investigator/commentator for the 1er Coloquio de Investigacion en Disenno Arquitectonico Y Tecnologias de la Arquitectura (1st Colloquium of Research in Architectural Design & Technologies), at Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Mexico, June 16-19th, 2004
“Collaborative Teaching As International Educational Exchange” / “Estrategias Y Acciones de Cooperacion en la Educacion Superiorante Los Procesos de Globalizacion”, B. Kesner & B. Amaro Sanchez, workshop presentations at Congresso Internacional de Urbanismo Y Medio Ambiente, Puebla, Puebla, Mexico, March 24-26, 2004
Winter 2005 and 2007: 10-week Extended Fieldtrip Study with 18 students/yr. throughout pre-Hispanic, Colonial, & modern Mexico. Focus on courtyard based building typology - small urban space. Charrettes with students of FABUAP/Mexico.
4th year Design Studio Coordinator, Architecture Department, 2003-2004
Coordinator for Exchange activities with FABUAP for CAED Departments, 2003-2008
Coordinator for Mexico Extended Fieldtrip off-campus program 2005-07
Media Resources Center: Advisory Committee 2005-2007

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
US Green Building Council, Local Government Commission
ANSGAR KILLING - LECTURER

Courses (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 105 Materials of Construction
ARCH 221 Architectural Design Fundamentals
ARCH 241, 242 Architectural Practice
ARCH 253 Architectural Design
ARCH 307 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 353 Architectural Design
ARCH 443 Professional Practice
ARCH 451, 452 Architectural Design
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
MS Arch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1998 – 2000
Diplom Ingeieur Architektur, Polytechnic University Biberach, Germany 1990 – 1995
Journey-man’s certificate, Guild of Craftsmen, Hamburg, Germany 1986 – 1989

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2007 – present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Partner/CTP, K+H Architects, Stuttgart, Germany 2000 – 2007

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect in Germany

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:
“Knowledge Management and Organizational Memory in CAS-Environments” (J. Pohl, ed.), Advances in Computer based and Web based Collaborative Systems, focus Symposia: International Conference on Systems Research, Informatics and Cybernetics, Baden-Baden, Germany, 2004 (pp.119-124)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Chamber of German Architects, Stuttgart, Germany, 2000-present
JOHN LANGE, PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 341, 342 Architectural Practice
ARCH 351, 352, 353 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania 1975
Master of Architecture, Stanford University 1971
Bachelor of Architecture, University of Cincinnati 1968

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Architecture Dept., Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1976 - Present
Lecturer, Pratt Institute of Technology, New York, NY 1982
Lecturer, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 1973 - 1975

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Architect, Castro-Blanco-Feder, Architects, New York, New York, transit station remodel; #103, #125 1981-1982
Designer, Spencer, Lee, & Busse, Palo Alto, California, wastewater treatment facilities, El Portal, CA 1971-1972
Draftsman, Skidmore, Owings, & Merrill, Chicago, Illinois, interiors; World Bank, New York, New York, elevated transit; Chicago, IL 1967-1968

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, California (1970 – Present), ACSA

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:
The Polemic Drawings of John Lange, gallery installation, Terry Green, Curator, Blue Line Gallery, Roseville, CA, July 2009.

Activities:
CAED PRT Committee 2009-10
CAED Curriculum Committee, 2005-06
Department Head Search and Screen Committee 2004, 2006
Search and Screen Committee 2005, 2006

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
KAREN LANGE, PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 462 Topics in Architectural Practice
ARCH 470 Selected Advanced Topics
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
Bachelor of Architecture, Honors, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo 1980

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Architecture Dept., Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1993 – Present
Assistant Professor, Interior Design, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, CA 1989 – 1993

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Owner/Architect, Karen Lange 2000 – 2010
Project Architect, bfgc architects, San Luis Obispo, CA 1990
Assorted Designer and Intern Architect Positions, New York/Los Angeles 1979 – 1984

LICENSES/REGISTRATIONS:
Registered Architect, California (1985 – Present), ACSA

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

Awards:
Architecture Department Faculty Merit Award, June 2008.

Activities:
“Spatial Constructs: Ten Years of Thesis.” Publication in Finishing School, the proceedings of ACSA Southeast Regional Meeting, Tampa, Florida, November 2004.
Chair, Subcommittee, Faculty Search 2008, 2009.
Chair, Subcommittee, Department Head Search 2006
Chair, Peer Review Committee, 2009-10
Reader, ACSA West Central Meeting, 2004
Hearst Lecture Committee, 2006-07

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 101 Survey of Architecture Education and Practice
ARCH 131, 132, 133 Design and Visual Communication
ARCH 326 Native American Architecture and Place
ARCH 401 Toward a Barrier-Free Environment
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
M. Arch, Morgan State University, Baltimore, MD 1995
B. Arch, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 1979

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2008- present
Associate Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2003- 2008
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1997- 2003
London Studies Program/International Studies, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2009
Director, Summer Career Workshop (High School Program), Cal Poly, SLO 2001- 2008
Institute for Architecture and Planning, Morgan State University (long term sub) Fall, 1992

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Planning Commissioner, City of Morro Bay, CA 2007- present
Sole Proprietor, Pro-bono Architectural/Planning Consultation, 3 Dog Studio, Morro Bay, CA 1997- present
Sole Proprietor, Bush River Studio, Baltimore, MD and Abingdon, MD 1983-1997
Senior Associate/ Studio Leader/ Project Architect, Murphy and Dittenhafer Architects, Baltimore, MD and York, PA
Project Architect/Manager, Probst-Mason Architects, Baltimore, MD; Senior Associate 1992-1994
Project Architect/Manager, Cooke and Assoc., Baltimore, MD; Senior Associate 1989-1991
Project Architect/Manager, Richter, Combrooks and Gribble, Baltimore, MD 1980-1986
Project Architect/Manager, Marks, Thomas and Assoc., Baltimore, MD; Senior Associate 1978-1980

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of Maryland

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

Awards:
Recipient, Cal Poly Distinguished Teaching Award (08); Recipient, CAED Service Award (05, 06, 08)

Activities:
Sounding the Depths of Morro Bay: An Eco-phenomenological Reconciliation, Proceedings of the ACSA Southwest Meeting, Univ. of Texas at Austin, 2007
EcoMetro, Proceedings of the ACSA West Regional Meeting, Woodbury University / Pasadena, CA, 2006
Seeing Brown/Projecting Green: An Eco-phenomenological Reconciliation? Proceedings of the ACSA Central Regional Meeting, Univ. of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 2006
Sustainable Sediment: Empowering A Sustainable Morro Bay, Proceedings of the ACSA Central Regional Meeting, Univ. of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, 2006
Interrogating the Real in Design (with T. DiSanto and K Lange) 12th Ca State Univ. Symposium on University Teaching, Cal Poly, 2009
Look Before You Leap: the Architecture Summer Career Workshop (with M. Cabrinha) 12th Ca State Univ. Symposium on University Teaching, Cal Poly, 2009
Forbidden Morro Bay, Forbidden Place: International Assn for the Study of Environment, Space and Place, Towson University, Towson, Maryland, 2009
Architecture as Eco-poiesis, Thinking Through Nature: Philosophy for an Endangered World; Intl Assn for Environmental Philosophy, University of Oregon, 2008
Safeguarding Suspected Sacred Urban Sites, Pecos Conference on Southwest Archeology, Pecos National Monument, NM, 2007
Stirring the Sediments: Locating a Post-Industrial Morro Bay, Meeting of the Northwest Society of Architectural Historians, University of Idaho, 2006
Constructing Remembrance: Death and Thesis in Architecture, Mid-Atlantic Popular/American Culture Assoc Annual Conference, New Brunswick, N.J, 2005
Northeast Waterfront Futures Task Force, City of Morro Bay, 2006-07;

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Member, American Society for Phenomenology, Fine Arts, and Aesthetics; Member, Intl Assn for Environmental Philosophy; Member, Intl Assn for the Study of Environment, Space and Place; Member, Northwest Society of Architectural Historians
KENT MACDONALD, LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 105 Architectural Practice
ARCH 123 Design and Drawing
ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 241, 242 Architectural Practice
ARCH 251, 252, 253 Architectural Design
ARCH 352 Architectural Design
ARCH 443 Professional Practice
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
M. Arch, UC Berkeley, CA 1983
B. Arts, UC Berkeley, CA 1975

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Architecture Dept., Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2002 – present
Lecturer, Architecture Dept., Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1994 – 1997
Lecturer, Architecture Dept., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 1991
Lecturer, Architecture Dept., University of California, Berkeley, CA 1980

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Principal, Private Practice in San Francisco and New York 1986 – 1994

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of California, No. 22776

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:
*Not previously listed

Activities:
Advisor, CARE Net, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (2009)
San Francisco Housing Competition, San Francisco (2005)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 363 Off-Campus Orientation Seminar
ARCH 451, 452, 453 Architectural Design
EDES 420 Historic Preservation and Adaptive Reuse in the Built Environment

Educational Credentials:
Ph.D. candidate (A.B.D.), Geography, University of California, Santa Barbara current
M.A.R.C.H. University of Oregon, Eugene, OR March 1987
B.S. Math. University of California, Santa Barbara June 1980
B.A. French. University of California, Santa Barbara June 1980

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1992-present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Architect and Intern, Thallon & Edrington Architects, Eugene, Oregon 1987-89; 90-91
Intern Architect, Robertson Sherwood Architects LLC 1989-90
GIS Programmer, Henningson, Durham and Richardson (HDR), Santa Barbara, CA 1980-81

LICENSES/REGISTRATIONS:

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Grants/Research:
Historic Structures Report, Mission San Miguel. Contributor to Getty Foundation Grant to the California Missions Foundation. Winter Quarter 2008 (4 WTU)
Educating Global Engineers (edGE), Collaborator on National Science Foundation Grant, College of Engineering, Cal Poly-SLO. Jan-June 2007 (2 WTU)
Sustainable Environmental Design Curriculum (SEDE). Principal Investigator. California Integrated Waste Management Board, Sacramento, CA ($50,000), 2004

Awards:
Cal Poly Architecture Dept. Faculty Merit Award, 2009; Cal Poly EmPOWER Poly Coalition– Faculty Appreciation Award, June 2006; Cal Poly CAED Paul and Verla Neel Faculty Award, 2006; AIA/COTE Eco-literacy Award in Architectural Education (for Sustainable Environments Minor & Courses), 2005

Activities:
Presentation materials for climate workshop at Sustainable By Design, Denmark’s International Studies (DIS), Copenhagen, Denmark, November 2005.
Board Member and Chair, Board of Directors, American Solar Energy Society, 2006-2013 (Chair 2010-12); Chair, US Green Building Council Formal Education (K-20+ Committee, 2006-2009; Steering Committee Member and Conference Chair, UC/CSU/CCC Sustainability Conference, 2006-2010 (Chair 2008); Conference Chair, SOLAR 2004 Passive Solar Conference/SOLAR 2008, National Solar Conference, 2004/2008; Associate Guest Editor

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
AIA Committee on the Environment (COTE) and Historic Resources Committee (HRC); ASES (American Solar Energy Society); IALD (International Association of Lighting Designers); SBSE (Society of Building Science Educators); USGBC (US Green Building Council)
SANDY D. MILLER, AIA, PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 443 Professional Practice
ARCH 451, 453 Architectural Design
ARCH 480 Special Studies in Architecture

Educational Credentials:
M. Arch, University of California - Berkeley 1978
Architecture Course, Cooper Union, New York, New York 1967
B. Arts, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio 1963

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Department of Architecture, Cal Poly, SLO 1984- present
Faculty Early Retirement Program, 50% Teaching Load June 2007-2012
Founder and Director, San Francisco Urban Design Internship Program 1988- present
Founder, Preceptorship Program, augmenting San Francisco Urban Design Internship 1995- 2004
Assistant Professor, Architecture Dept., Cogswell College, San Francisco 1982- 1984

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Consultant, Medical Planning Consultant, Ratcliff Architects, VA Hospital, Berkeley, CA 1988
Principal, Friedman, Sagar, McCarthy & Miller, Architects, San Francisco, CA 1979-82
Associate, Howard Friedman & Associates, San Francisco, CA 1976-79
Sandra Miller & Associates, San Francisco, CA 1972-76

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of California

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Grants/Research:
Grant - in - kind, classroom space for San Francisco Urban Design Internship Program funded by San Francisco City Planning Department
Urban Design Collaborative Practice & Research with San Francisco Department of City Planning
10th & Howard, Western SoMa Task Force, Large Parcel + Historic Bldg. Site Prototype/Guidelines Testing, 2008
8th & Harrison, Western SoMa Task Force, Large Parcel Site Prototype, 2007
Sabbatical Research on Case Study Method for the Professional Practice Sequence, Architecture 441 and Architecture 442, Jan - June 2004

Activities:
Presenter, Internship Seminar, AIA National Convention, San Francisco 2009
Case Study Curriculum initiated in San Francisco Program Arch 441, Arch 443 Fall 2003 - present; over 40 firms and projects recruited to date
San Francisco Architectural Internship, Arch 480, initiated course, recruited over 45 firms, over 500 student participants, 1988 – 2008
San Francisco Urban Program Model adopted for the Metro Program Proposed Expansion, 2008 – present
SARA National Convention, Exhibit of San Francisco Program Design Projects, 2007
Arch 461 2 units (now Arch 462 3 units) initiated course for Internship Resume/Portfolio Presentation, 1994 – 2006
ACSA/AIA Teachers’ Seminar at Cranbook - Case Studies July 2004
Prototype Case Study Class in Architecture 442 on-campus practice class, initiator/organizer March 2004, 5 faculty, 25 firms, 105 fourth year students
Visiting Practitioners -- Course Enhancement for fourth-year on-campus design, initiator 2003-04
PG&E Energy Center, San Francisco - over 24 classes & lectures -- sustainability, energy conservation 2004 - 2010

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects -- National, California, and San Francisco Chapters
Organization of Women Architects
San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association
ALICE ALISON MUELLER, LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 105 Architectural Practice
ARCH 121, 122, 123 Design and Drawing
ARCH 242 Architectural Practice
ARCH 253 Architectural Design
ARCH 351, 352 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
M Arch, The Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, Columbia University, New York, NY 1983
Master of Arts, Art Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 1976
Bachelor of Arts, History, Caldwell College, Caldwell, NJ 1970

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. 2001-Present
Lecturer, City Regional Planning Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. 2005

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Principal, Office of Sheckman + Mueller 1985- present
Principal, OSM Design-Build Firm. 1999- present
Principal, Alice Mueller and Associates, Owner's Representative. 1975-1979

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:
'AIA Recognizes Teaching Faculty for Innovative Courses,' ACSA News, October 2005.
'Opinion of the Tribune: Housing Ideas Outside the Box,' Tribune Editorial, April 20, 2005.

Grants/Research:
'Cal Poly Downtown Studio,' Orfnea Bank of America Community Development Initiative Grant, Fall 2003 - Spring 2005.

Awards:
American Institute of Architects RFP Award, 'European Green Sustainable Communities,' 2006.
American Institute of Architects Education Honor Award, Cal Poly Downtown Studio, Interdisciplinary Community-based Service Learning, 2005.
Verla and Paul Neel Faculty Scholarship, College of Architecture + Environmental Design, California Polytechnic State University, 2004-2005. Faculty Field Trip Award, College of Architecture + Environmental Design, California Polytechnic State University, 2004-2005.

Activities:
Academic Senate General Education Task Force, 2009 - Present.
Planning Commissioner, City of Pismo Beach, California, 2009-present

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects.
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 216 History of World Architecture: Middle Ages-18th Century
ARCH 219 History of World Architecture: 18th Century-Present
ARCH 302 Theories of Architectural Design
ARCH 351, 352 Architectural Design
ARCH 420 Seminar in Architectural History, Theory and Criticism

Educational Credentials:
Ph.D., Honors and Theory of Architecture, McGill University, Montréal, PQ, Canada 2006
M.Arch., History and Theory of Architecture, McGill University, Montréal, PQ, Canada 2000
B.Arch., professional, Wentworth Institute of Technology, Boston, MA 1995

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Assistant Professor, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA 2007-present
Visiting Faculty (Cultural Studies), SCI-Arc, Los Angeles, CA. 2008
Assistant Professor, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada 2005-2007
Adjunct Faculty, Wentworth Institute of Technology, Boston, MA 2000, 2005

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

Grants/Research:
Center for Teaching and Learning Grant, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA ($6,000) – 2008; Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba Grant ($4,600) – 2007; University of Manitoba Research Grant ($6,500) – 2006; Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba Research Grant ($2,500) – 2005, 2006

Activities:
H(omage) d’eau, Seventy Architects. L’Université du Québec à Montréal.
"Between Pedagogy and Practice: the work of Myron Goldsmith." Paper presented at the 2010 International Conference on Structures and Architecture, Guimarães, Portugal. (with Prof. Edmond Saliklis)
"Educating the Ethical Practitioner." Reconciling Poetics and Ethics Conference, Canadian Center for Architecture, Montréal, PQ, Canada.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Terreform 1
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 105 Architectural Practice
ARCH 121 Design and Drawing
ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 242 Architectural Practice
ARCH 351, 352, 353 Architectural Design
ARCH 420 Seminar in Architectural History, Theory and Criticism
ARCH 451, 452, 453 Architectural Design
ARCH 470 Selected Advanced Topics
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
M Arch, Harvard University Graduate School of Design, Cambridge, MA 2004
B Arch, Minor in Philosophy, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1999

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2007-Present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Architect, END Eric Nulman Design, Venice, CA 2008-Present
Architect, Morphosis Architects, Santa Monica, CA 1999-2002

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of New York, 2005-Present

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRAINS/Awards/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

Activities:
Towards an Affective Architecture, Presentation, 2010 ACSA National Conference, New Orleans, LA, March 2010
the Object, the Image, & the Activity, Lecture, Hearst Lecture Series, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA, April 2008
A New Library for the Information Age, Lecture, San Luis Obispo County Library Summit, Atascadero, CA, November 2007
ETN: Seven Projects, Lecture, University of California, Berkeley, CA, November 2006

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Member of the American Institute of Architects, 2005-Present
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 351, 352, 353 Architectural Design
ARCH 452, 453 Architectural Design
ARCH 472 Housing Design Concepts
ARCH 480 Special Studies in Architecture

Educational Credentials:
PhD, Texas A&M (on leave 2003 – 2006) 2003 - present
M. Arch, UC Berkeley, CA 1986
B. Larch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1976

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1986 - present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Architectural Job Captain/Production, Design & Site Planning, William Pierce Coburn, & Haviland Associates Architects, Berkeley/Oakland, CA 1980 – 83
Associate: Design, Planning, Production & Studies, Bridgers-Troller Associates, Burbank, CA 1977 - 80

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Licensed Landscape Architect, California
Licensed Architect, California

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Grants/Research:
2009-10: $10,000 Instructionally Related Activities fund award. The IRA funds enable the faculty to recruit and assemble a multi-disciplinary student team to compete in the Bank of America sponsored “Low-Income Housing Challenge” held in San Francisco. The competition includes the selection, site development, design proposal, and financial feasibility studies for an affordable housing project with in California.
2008-09: $9,730 Instructionally Related Activities fund award. The IRA funds enable the faculty to recruit and assemble a multi-disciplinary student team to compete in the Bank of America sponsored “Low-Income Housing Challenge” held in San Francisco.
2007-08: $4,800 Instructionally Related Activities fund award. The IRA funds enable the faculty to recruit and assemble a multi-disciplinary student team to compete in the Bank of America sponsored “Low-Income Housing Challenge” held in San Francisco.

Awards:
2006 Elected to membership in the Tau Sigma Delta Honor Society
2006 Elected to membership in the Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society
2005 Finalist: The Urban Land Institute’s Kenneth Good Graduate Student Fellowship: The Fellowship awards 8 scholarships, no strings attached other than to finish the year of study, to graduate students studying real estate, real estate development, or related subjects
2004 Wolfgang Roeseler Scholarship: a small scholarship awarded to outstanding students in the Urban & Regional Sciences Program.

Activities:
PhD Program in Urban and Regional Sciences at Texas A&M University,
Completed draft dissertation.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
ANDREA PEASE, LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 307 Environmental Control Systems

Educational Credentials:
BS Arch, Building Technology Program, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Cambridge, MA 1985-1990

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2005-2009

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Principal, In Balance Green Consulting, San Luis Obispo, CA, 2004-Present
Project Manager, Program Architect, RRM Design Group, San Luis Obispo, CA 1997-2004
Principal, Andrea R. Pease, Architectural Services, Dominica, West Indies 1996
Project Manager, A Z Architecture Studio, Venice, CA 1995
Assistant Planner, Community Redevelopment Agency, Los Angeles, CA 1994
Project Manager, Caldwell Architects, Marina del Rey, CA 1991-1994

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
California Licensed Architect, C28231
LEED Accredited Professional, Version 2.0, April 2002; Version 2.2, November 2007

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Activities:
Featured in Building a Green Revolution, Tribune, January 7, 2007, Ermina Karim
Basich/Pease Kitchen Remodel, Tribune Home Section, August 18, 2006
Featured in Think Green When Designing New Home, Tribune, April 2, 2005, Rebecca Juretic
LEED for Homes workshop, September 2008
Facilitated a LEED Charette, August 2008
GreenBuild: Denver November 2006, Atlanta, 2005
Sustainable Products Council, January 2005

Presentations:
Green Building in SLO County, SLO Green Build government liaisons, October 2008
Green Remodeling and Renovation for Residential Projects, SLO Green Build, January 2008
Energy, Buildings and the 2030 Challenge, AIA CCC Chapter, October 2007
Solutions to Global Climate Change, Panel, Cuesta College, October 2007
2030 Challenge, San Luis Obispo Energy Summit for local governments, August 2007
Green Building on the Central Coast, Osher course, August 2007

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
AIA – Member since 2000, Board Member 2005
SLO Green Build – Board Member, Past President, Founding Member, 2005-Present
2030 Challenge Joint Task Force, 2008-Present
US Green Building Council, 2004-Present
SLO Chamber of Commerce, 2005 – Present, Sustainability Committee, 2009-Present
LEED Resource Group founder
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 207, 307 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 241 Architectural Practice
ARCH 251, 252, 253 Architectural Design
ARCH 407 Environmental Control Systems

Educational Credentials:
M ARCH, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 2003
Graduate Certificate-Teaching Technical Subjects in Architecture, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 2003
B.A., Physics, University of Illinois, Chicago 1989

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Assistant Professor, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2008 - present
Lecturer, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2007-2008
Assistant Professor of Architecture, Ball State University, Muncie IN 2003-2004

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Project Manager, Designbridge, LTD., Chicago, IL 2005-2006

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect – Illinois, Wisconsin

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:

Awards:
PDCI SEED Grant, 2010, $ 6,318
Awarded Lifetime membership to American Solar Energy Society by confidential donor, 2009, $1200
Innovation Quest Contest Finalist for FreeRunner Software, 2009, $100
Agents of Change Tool Kit Loan, 2007, $5,800

Activities:
National Secretary/Treasurer Elect, Society of Building Science Educators 2010
Society of Building Science Educators, Scholarship Committee, 2008-2009

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects (AIA), member, 2007-2008
U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), member, 2006-2008
American Solar Energy Society (ASES), Life member, 2001-2009
Society of Building Science Educators (SBSE), member, 2001-2009
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 342 Architectural Practice
ARCH 353 Architectural Design
ARCH 420 Seminar in Architectural History, Theory and Criticism
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
PhD, Princeton University School of Architecture, Princeton, NJ June 2008
B.A. Yale University, Architecture Major, New Haven, CT June 1991

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Assistant Professor, Architecture Dept., California Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA Fall 2005 – present
Visiting Assistant Professor, History/Theory, Architecture Dept., University of California, Los Angeles, CA Fall 2007
Lecturer, Architecture Dept., University of California, Berkeley, CA Summer/Fall 2004
Lecturer, Architecture Dept., California College of the Arts, San Francisco, CA Fall 2004
Lecturer, History/Theory, Architecture Dept., Southern California Institute of Architecture, Los Angeles, CA Spring 2004
Teaching Assistant, School of Architecture, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 2000-2003

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Principal, Stephen Phillips Architects (SPARCHS) - San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Luis Obispo, CA June 1999-Present
Junior Designer, Charles Moore, Moore Ruble Yudell (MRY), Santa Monica, CA July 1994 - Feb 1997

LICENSES/REGISTRATIONS:
California Architects Board License, CA, 1998-present

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:
Linden Street Apartments (SPARCHS), Small Firms Great Projects 2008/2009, SF/AIA, September 2008
“Powerful, and Contemporary: Picturing Education in LA,” Thi3ty Fou4 Magazine 11 (October 2007): 160-165
“Art Exhibit,” Longwell Remodel (SPARCHS), Sunset Magazine, April 2005

Grants/Research:
J. Paul Getty Foundation, Residential Postdoctoral Fellowship, 2009-2010; Smithsonian American Art Museum, Residential Postdoctoral Fellowship, Summers 2009, 2010; Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, Research Grant, 2009; Canadian Center for Architecture, Collection Research Grant, 2006; MuseumsQuartier Artist-in-Residence Grant, Research Fellowship, 2005

Awards:
AIA Merit Award, Longwell Seadrift Residence (SPARCHS), Central Coast Chapter, 2009; New Faculty Teaching Award, ACSA/AIAS National Education Award, 2009;

Activities:
Lectures, Conferences, and Symposia: Getty Research Institute, Smithsonian American Art Museum, Cal Poly; Bauhaus University; McGill/CCA, Cornell, Princeton, Alvar Aalto Research Institute, Akademie Der Bildenden Kunste Wien, UC Berkeley, SAH, AHRB Research Center Manchester/Tate Museum
Visiting Critic: Harvard, Cooper Union, SCI-Arc, University of Applied Arts Vienna, USC, Princeton, UCLA, UCB, CCA

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects (AIA), SF, CC, and LA Chapters, 1996-present; Society of Architectural Historians (SAH), Washington D.C., 2003-present
Cal Poly State University, NAAB APR, September 7, 2010, Part Four, Section 4.3 Faculty Resumes, page 44

JENS POHL, GRADUATE COORDINATOR AND PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 461 Advanced Computer-Aided Design in Architecture
ARCH 480 Special Studies in Architecture
ARCH 551 Architectural Design
ARCH 561 Advanced Design
ARCH 580 Seminar in Theory of Architecture
ARCH 598 Master’s Design Project

Educational Credentials:
Ph.D Arch Science, University of Sydney, Australia 1970
M. Bld. Sc., University of Sydney Australia 1967
B. Arch, University of Melbourne, Australia 1965

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1973 to present
Graduate Coordinator, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1983 to present
Graduate Coordinator, College of Architecture and Environmental Design, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1988 to 1991
Senior Lecturer, School of Building, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia 1970 to 1972

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
President, EDUCOL Inc., Computer software and consulting services for the Architecture, Engineering and Construction (AEC) industry. 1981 to 1991

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
New York State Registration
Licensed Architect, Victoria, Australia (1965 to present)
Licensed Architect New South Wales, Australia (1968 to present).
NCARB Certification

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Grants/Research:

Activities:
Executive Director, Collaborative Agent Design Research Center (CADRC), Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo (1986- present)
Principal Organizer, Special Focus Symposium: Collaborative Decision-Support Systems, InterSymp Conference, annual series, Baden-Baden, Germany, (1989 to present)
“The Emergence of Building Science: Historical Roots, Concepts, and Application” CADRC Center, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, California (2007), (pp. 328).

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
JONATHAN REICH, AIA, PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 363 Off-Campus Orientation Seminar
ARCH 451, 452, 453 Architectural Design
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis
EDES 406 Sustainable Environments
EDES 408 Implementing Sustainable Principles
EDES 410 Advanced Implementation of Sustainable Principles

Educational Credentials:
M Arch, University of California, Berkeley, CA 1983
Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Design (B.A.E.D.), University of Washington, Seattle 1979
Bachelor of Arts in Modern History (B.A.), University of Washington, Seattle 1979

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Architecture Dept., Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2005 - present
Associate Professor, Architecture Dept., Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo CA 2000 -2005
Visiting Associate Professor, Pennsylvania State University Program in Rome, Italy 2000 -2003
Visiting Associate Professor, University Studies Abroad Consortium (USAC); Turin, Italy (Teach Seminar on Hilltown Morphology) 2000 - 2001
Associate Professor, (w / tenure) Dept. of Architecture, University of Idaho 1999 - 2000
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Architecture, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 1993 - 1998
Lecturer, Department of Architecture, University of California, Berkeley 1983 - 1988

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Owner/Architect, Jonathan Reich Architects 1987-present
Architect, Pfister & Muller, Zurich 2001

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:

Awards:
2009 Finalist in Fulbright Scholar Award competition. (Final notification of status pending…due May 2010)
2005 AIA/COTE Eco-Literacy in Architectural Education Award
2004 University of Maryland/EPA “Low Impact Development” Design Competition. Multiple Awards

Activities:
“Coast2Coast5”: Design workshop critic at International conference on coastal development, Ascoli Piceno, Italy, 2008
Design Consultant & Participant, “City of Ventura Freeway Cap Urban Design Workshop.” 14 acre freeway cap over 101 freeway re-connect city w/ sea, 2008
Sponsored by National Trust for Historic Preservation & Preservation Idaho, 2008
“Coast2Coast4”: Design workshop Comitato scientifico, critic & presenter at International conference on coastal development, Ascoli Piceno, Italy, 2007
“Coast2Coast3”: Design workshop Comitato scientifico, critic & presenter at International conference on coastal development, Ascoli Piceno, Italy, 2006
“Coast2Coast2”: Design workshop critic at International conference on coastal development, Ascoli Piceno, Italy, 2005
“Coast2Coast”: Design workshop Comitato scientifico, critic & presenter at International conference on coastal development, Ascoli Piceno, Italy, 2004
“Education for Sustainability in Architecture”; Speaker at EFS Conference at University of Portland (OR), 2004

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Board of Directors, Cal Poly Housing Corporation, developer of 69 units of affordable housing for faculty in San Luis Obispo, Ca.
American Institute of Architects (A.I.A.); Registered Architect in California & Washington
Board of Directors of Mercy Housing Inc. of Idaho (A very large national non-profit housing developer) 1994 - 2005
San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce Affordable Housing Task Force
Society of Building Science Educators (SBSE); American Assoc. of Housing Educators (AAHE); Society History of Technology (SHOT)
BRYAN RIDLEY – LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 132 Design and Visual Communication
ARCH 253 Architectural Design
ARCH 452 Architectural Design
ARCH 351, 352 Architectural Design
ARCH 341 Architectural Practice

Educational Credentials:
BArch, Cum Laude: Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2001

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer 2007-present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Project Manager, garcia architecture + design October 2007-present
Independent Design Consultant July 2006-present
Project Designer, Thomas P. Cox Architects, Inc. October 2005-July 2006

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:
Portfolio Design 3rd Edition, Harold Linton (January 2004) - Portfolio design work features on cover and internally

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
LEED Accredited Professional
RALPH ROESLING, LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 452 Architectural Design
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
BArch, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 1971-1976
Graduate Studies, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 1976

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Visiting Lecturer/Critic, Kansas State Architecture Program, Castiglion Fiorentino, Italy 2009
Lecturer, Architecture Dept., Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2004-Present
Adjunct Professor, Woodbury University, San Diego, CA 2001-Present
Adjunct Faculty, Woodbury University, San Diego, CA 1999-2004
Professor, Newschool of Architecture, San Diego, CA 1993-1998
Visiting Lecturer, School of Architecture, Kansas State University 1997-1998
Department Chair, Architectural Design, Newschool of Architecture, San Diego CA 1990-1993
Associate Professor, Newschool of Architecture, San Diego, CA 1990-1998
Instructor, Newschool of Architecture, San Diego, CA 1983-1988

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Principal, RNT Roesling Nakamora Terada Architect, Inc., San Diego, CA 1980-Present
Associate, Innis-Tennebaum Architects, Inc., San Diego, CA 1978-1980
Porcell & Rule Architects, San Diego, CA 1977-1978
Summer Research Assistant in Solar Technology, Arizona State University Summer 1976

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
California, C-10987, 1980

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:

Publications:
“Carlsbad High School”, 4th Year Professional Design Studio, lulu.com, 2008; Currently working on recent RNT monograph

Awards:
AIACC Award of Merit, Nix Nature Center, 2009
AIA Ventura County, Award of Merit, Oxnard Branch Library, 2009; AIA Ventura County, Award of honor, Oxnard Civic Center, 2009
ACI Innovation Award, Nix Nature Center, 2009
AIA San Diego Honor Award, Nix Nature Center, 2008
AIA Orange County Award of Excellence, Nix Nature Center, 2008
AIA San Diego Energy Award, DMV San Ysidor Office, 2008
AIA Santa Barbara merit Award, Isla Vista Elementary School, 2007
Home of the Year, San Diego Home and Garden, Bardsley Residence, 2006
AIA San Diego Citation Award, Imperial Avenue Master Plan and San Diego Mid-City Bus Rapid Transit Station, 2006
Save our heritage Organization, “Step in the Right Direction” Award NTC, Promenade, Rehabilitation of Building 177, 2006
APA Award for Focused Planning, Lemon Grove Specific Plan, 2006
AIA Orange County Award of Merit, 2005
Bolsa Chico State Beach Redevelopment, 2005

Activities:
Professional Studios at RNT in San Diego (community based design projects) with CalPoly students, Spring Quarters: 2008, 2009, and 2010
“Experiencing Architecture”, Lecture at Musashino Art University, Tokyo, Japan, 2006

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Fellow, American Institute of Architects, 1998-Present; Member, American Institute of Architects, 1980-Present; Member, Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, 1984-Present; Board Member, San Diego Chapter American Institute of Architects Foundation, 1991-Present
RICHARD SCHMIDT—LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 105 Architectural Practice
ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 241, 242 Architectural Practice
ARCH 251, 252, 253 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
BA Haverford College, MA Washington University,
BArch California Polytechnic State University

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Architecture and City and Regional Planning Departments, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1986-present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Architect, San Luis Obispo

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Licensed Architect, California

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:
Four research bibliographies in the Vance Architecture Series; subjects include, Alvar Aalto, Irving Gill, mimetic architecture, and hand built homes (in progress)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 207, 307 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
M. Arch, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 1992
Copenhagen, Denmark Valle Scholar 1989
B. A. Arch, UC Berkeley, CA 1987
Firenze, Italia Study Abroad (through Syracuse University) 1985

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Associate Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2001-present
Assistant Professor, Summer Session at Sede di Roma in Rome, Italy 2000-2000
Visiting Assistant Professor, Dept. of Architecture, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 2000
Visiting critic, University of California, Berkeley, CA 2000
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Architecture, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 1996-2000

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Sandy Stanndard, Architect (in collaboration with Jonathan Reich) 1991–present
Consultant, Researcher, Program Coordinator, Pacific Energy Center, San Francisco, CA 2000

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect [California, Idaho]; LEED AP

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Publications:
Carbon Neutral Design (CND) Summit. As part of the AIA funded CND project (Milwaukee, WI), 2008
Numerous articles written about Solar CalPoly’s entry into the Solar Decathlon (CNN, Reuters, USA Today, San Jose Mercury News, etc.), 2005

Grants/Research:
Extramural Funding Initiative (EFI) in support of “Carbon Neutral/Zero Energy Design Education: Preparing the Next Generation;” 2008, American Institute of Architects (AA) supported Carbon Neutral Design (CND) Project, a Society of Building Science Educators collaborative project (Jim Wasley, UW-Milwaukee, Principal Investigator), 2008; Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) University Incentive Program Grant, 2005; State Faculty Support Grant. In support of Solar Decathlon activities, 2005; “Agents of Change Training Session Fellowship.” At Will Bruder’s Phoenix Library (funding via a University of Oregon FIPSE grant)

Awards:

Activities:
“How Long Can You Tread Water?,” paper session proposed, organized, and moderated at the ACSA Annual Meeting, Portland, OR, 2009
GreenBuild 2008. Served as one of the representatives of the Carbon Neutral Design (CND) project team, Boston, MA, 2008
“Focus the Nation” panelist, San Luis Obispo, CA. National teach-in about global warming, 2008
“Global Climate Change Teach-In: The 2010 Imperative.” Organized Cal Poly’s participation in this global webcast by Architecture 2030, 2007
American Solar Energy Society (ASES) Annual Conference, Solar Decathlon panel (with Prof. Peña, and students), 2006
Allen Residence; Warren Residence. Consultation for a passive solar house and alternation/expansion, 2009
USBGC local chapter [emerging green builders]; Solar Decathlon, Co-PI with Rob Pena (ARCH), Jesse Maddren (ME), and other CAED faculty;

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Soc. of Bldg. Science Educators (SBSE); USGBC (local); Int. Assoc. of Lighting Designers (IALD).
Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 121 Design and Drawing
ARCH 122 Design and Drawing
ARCH 123 Design and Drawing
ARCH 363 Off-Campus Orientation Seminar
ARCH 443 Professional Practice
ARCH 451 Architectural Design
ARCH 452 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
M. Arch, University of Illinois 1972
B. Arch, Oklahoma State University 1968

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, California 1974- present
Professor, Engineering and Technology, Architecture Division, Cuesta College, San Luis Obispo, California 1996- 2008
Professor, Dept. of Architecture, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 1985
Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 1984

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Swearingen Assoc., Private practice, San Luis Obispo, California 1984- present
Environmental Specialist, County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building 1988- 2006

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of Arizona

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Awards:
International Programs Teacher of the Year Award, Office of the Chancellor, Long Beach, California

Activities:
Faculty Advisor, International Programs for Denmark and Italy
Coordinator of Off-Campus Programs 1974 – present; Environmental Specialist, County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building 1988-2006

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
HOWARD WEISENTHAL, PROFESSOR

Courses Taught [Course Numbers and Titles] (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 241 Architectural Practice 2.1
ARCH 251 Architectural Design 2.1
ARCH 252 Architectural Design 2.2
ARCH 253 Architectural Design 2.3

Educational Credentials:
M Arch, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 1974
B Arch, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 1972

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1983- present
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Architecture, Louisiana State University 1978- 1983

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Varied office and design experience.

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered Architect, State of Florida

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES (SINCE 2004):
Research:
18th century and early 19th century building construction and technology, including the design, fabrication and integration of ornamental brick masonry, cast iron and terracotta (in progress)
“An Annotated Bibliography of Architectural Ornament” and research leading to a paper titled “Man, Ornament and Architecture” (in progress)

Awards:
Design students received top honors, second place and a merit citation in 2008 Leading Edge Competition / Design student received honors in The Waterfront Design Competition 2009

Activities:
Off-campus program Coordinator – Washington Alexandria Architectural Consortium
Coordinator 2nd Year Design Fieldtrips to San Francisco, San Diego, Sacramento, Los Angeles, Las Vegas
Materials Demonstration Laboratory – “The Simpson Building” Design Committee
Curriculum Committee – College
Peer Panel for Lecturer Grievance – University
Employment Equity Facilitators – Department

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
KEITH WILEY, LECTURER

COURSES TAUGHT [COURSES NUMBERS AND TITLES] (TWO ACADEMIC YEARS PRIOR TO CURRENT VISIT):
ARCH 101 Introduction to Architecture and Environmental Design
ARCH 105 Architectural Practice
ARCH 121, 122, 123 Design and Drawing
ARCH 131, 132, 133 Design and Visual Communication
ARCH 160 Digital Tools for Architecture
ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems

Educational Credentials:
M Arch, Southern California Institute of Architecture, Los Angeles, CA 2001
BS Landscape Architecture, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1991

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 2001- present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Design Staff, Studio G Design. Santa Barbara, California. 1998-2000
Design Staff, Franklin D. Israel Design Associates. Los Angeles 1993 (Summer)

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Activities:
"The Instrumental Model: Repositioning the Three-Dimensional Presentation." Design Communications Association Biennial Conference. San Luis Obispo, California, January 2004
Architecture Summer Career Workshop. 2003 - present

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
BARRY L. WILLIAMS, LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 207 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 307 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Project
ARCH 492 Senior Design Thesis

Educational Credentials:
M Arch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 2001
B Arch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1975

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Architecture Dept., Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1980 - Present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Managing Principal, Westberg + White Architects 1998 - present
Principal and Owner, BLWA- Architects, San Luis Obispo, CA 1980 - 1998

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
New York State Registration
NCARB Certification
LEED certification

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Research:

Awards:
ACSA and the AIA Education honor Award (in collaboration with Thomas Fowler IV), 2009
Architecture Department Faculty Merit Award, 2006 -2007 academic year
Outstanding Faculty Award, Student Affairs, Cal Poly, 2004 -2005

Activities:
Board of Directors of the Santa Maria Cultural Group, 1999 - present

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects, 2004-Present
San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce, 2003 - present
GREGORY WYNN—LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 105 Architectural Practice
ARCH 241, 242 Architectural Practice
ARCH 251, 252, 253 Architectural Design
ARCH 341, 342 Architectural Practice

Educational Credentials:
B Arch, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA
June 1988

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Part-time Lecturer, Architecture Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo
2000-present

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Owner, Greg Wynn, Architect, San Luis Obispo, CA
1994-present

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
California Architect #C24917, issued March 28, 1994
NCARB Certificate # 66897

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Awards:
Award of Recognition, Obispo Beautiful Association, June 2007

Activities:
Master Commissioner, California Board of Architectural Examiners, California Supplemental Exam
Founding Member, Cuesta College Architecture Advisory Board
City of San Luis Obispo Architectural Review Commission member

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
GUILLERMO YÁNGUEZ BERGANTINO, LECTURER

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior to current visit):
- Arch 481 Senior Thesis
- Arch 251, 252, 253 Architecture Design
- Arch 241, 242 Professional Practice

Educational Credentials:
- BArch cum Laude, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 1985-91

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
- Architecture Section Coordinator, The Animation Workshop, Viborg University, Viborg, Denmark 2008-present
- Guest Critic, Architecture, The International Neukloster Fall Academy, Neukloster, Germany 2007
- Lecturer, California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo, CA 2004-08
- Teaching Assistant, The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 1989-91

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
- Principal & CEO, yanguez architekten, Berlin 2007-present
- Lead Designer, Ravatt Albrecht Architects, San Luis Obispo, CA 2004-07
- Lead Designer, Omni Design Group, San Luis Obispo, CA 2004-07
- Lead Designer, Competitions, Baumschlager & Eberle, Lochau, Austria 2003
- Lead Designer, Renzo Piano Kohlbecker, Berlin 2000-03
- Lead Designer, HOK Heilmuth, Obata + Kassabaum, Berlin 1998-00
- Lead Designer, Bartels & Wittwer Architekten + Ingenieure, Berlin 1994-96
- Architect, OMA Office for Metropolitan Architecture, Rotterdam 1993-94
- Architect, Büro Johner−Helipi, Stuttgart 1993
- Intern, Office of the Chief Pilot, Panama Canal Commission, Panama 1986

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
- Architektenkammer Niedersachsen EL 14813 Chamber of Architects, Lower Saxony

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:
Awards:
- 2007 AIACCC Honor Award, Excellence in Design and Execution, Good Samaritan Dining Hall/Kitchen, Santa Maria, CA
- Citation, Riconfigurazione della Cattedrale di Ischia, 2009
- Citation, Torre del Golf, Lima, Perú, 2008
- Citation, Zentrum Prenzlau, Prenzlau, 2004

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
- Architektenkammer Niedersachsen EL 14813, Chamber of Architects, Lower Saxony
- SPIA, Sociedad Panameña de Ingenieros y Arquitectos
MARGARIDA YIN – LECTURER

Courses Taught [Course Numbers and Titles] (Two academic years prior to current visit):
ARCH 105 Architectural Practice
ARCH 307 Environmental Control Systems
ARCH 341, 342 Architectural Practice
ARCH 351, 352, 353 Architectural Design

Educational Credentials:
B. Arch., University of Mackenzie, Sao Paulo, Brazil 1995
M. Arch., University of California, Berkeley 1979

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Lecturer, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 1989-1995 & 1997-present
Assisted in Design Courses, Cuesta College, San Luis Obispo, CA 2003-2009
Lecturer, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 1983-1986
Assisted in Design Courses, University of California, Berkeley, CA 1979

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Owner and Architect, residential projects, SLO, CA, Oahu, HI, Seattle, WA, Berkeley, CA, Sao Paulo, Brazil 1975-present
Architect, BFGC Architects and Planners, Inc. SLO, CA 2000-2002
Architect, International Design Center-University of HI. Taipei, Taiwan. 1996
Architect, TSL/Merchant design group 1995
Architectural Designer, Shen/Glass architects, Berkeley, CA 1987
Architectural Designer, Dewitt & Architects, Boulder, CO 1984
Architectural Designer, Rosall Remmen & Cares Architects and Planners, Boulder, CO 1983
Architectural Designer, YRM International. Hong Kong 1982
Architectural designer, Design Logic Inc., Oakland, CA 1981-82
Architect, G. D. Architect. Sao Paulo, Brazil 1977-78
Architect, Hayes Bosworth Ltda. Sao Paulo, Brazil 1975-77

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:
Registered architect in Brazil, California and Hawaii.

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:

Publications:
“Children's Play Environment in the urban setting”, co-authored with Prof. Christopher Yip. Journal of Livable Cities
“New Architectural language that bridges the East and West”, in progress. Publisher in progress.

Grants/Research:
3rd year Design Travel Fellowship, took Design Studio to China, 2008

Activities:
Speak, read and write two foreign languages, Chinese and Portuguese

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
American Institute of Architects
Chinese Professional Association
CHRISTOPHER LEE YIP, PHD, PROFESSOR

COURSES TAUGHT [COURSE NUMBERS AND TITLES] (TWO ACADEMIC YEARS PRIOR TO CURRENT VISIT):
ARCH 217, 218, 219 History of World Architecture
ARCH 420 Seminar in Architectural History, Theory and Criticism
ARCH 453 Architectural Design
ARCH 480 Special Studies in Architecture

EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS:
Ph.D., Architectural History, University of California, Berkeley 1985
M Arch., Architecture, University of California, Berkeley 1977
B.A., Environmental Design, University of California, Berkeley 1971

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
Professor, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1994 – Present
Associate Professor, University of Hawaii, Manoa 1994-1996
Associate Professor, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo 1988-1994
Assistant Professor, University of Colorado 1982-1988
Associate, University of California, Berkeley 1976-1978

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

LICENSES/REGISTRATION:

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS/ RECENT RESEARCH/GRANTS/AWARDS/ACTIVITIES:

Publications:

Grants/Research:
Freeman Foundation Grant, $1,630, 2008
National Endowment for the Humanities Grant, $3,600, 2007

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:
Association for Asian American Studies
Society of Architectural Historians
Vernacular Architecture Forum
4.4 Faculty Credentials Matrix
| Faculty Member | ARCH 105 | ARCH 121/2/3 | ARCH 160 | ARCH 207 | ARCH 217/18/19 | ARCH 221 | ARCH 241/2/3 | ARCH 251/2/3 | ARCH 302 | ARCH 307 | ARCH 313 | ARCH 320 | ARCH 326 | ARCH 337 | ARCH 341/2/3 | ARCH 351/2/3 | ARCH 400 | ARCH 401 | ARCH 407 | ARCH 420 | ARCH 437 | ARCH 443 | ARCH 451/2/3 | ARCH 464 | ARCH 462 | ARCH 465 | ARCH 466 | ARCH 467 | ARCH 469 | ARCH 472 | ARCH 480 | ARCH 481 | ARCH 485 | ARCH 492 | ARCH 495 | ARCH 532 | ARCH 533 | ARCH 551 | ARCH 561 | ARCH 580 | ARCH 598 | ARCH X410 | EDES 406 | EDES 408 | EDES 410 |
|----------------|----------|--------------|----------|----------|----------------|----------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|--------------|----------|----------|
## Matrix for Faculty Credentials

**Fall 2009, Winter 2010, Spring 2010**

<p>| Faculty Member | ARCH 101 | ARCH 105 | ARCH 131/2/3 | ARCH 207 | ARCH 217/18/19 | ARCH 221 | ARCH 231/2/3 | ARCH 307 | ARCH 313 | ARCH 331 | ARCH 337 | ARCH 341/2/3 | ARCH 351/2/3 | ARCH 361 | ARCH 381 | ARCH 400 | ARCH 407 | ARCH 417 | ARCH 427 | ARCH 441/2/3 | ARCH 451/2/3 | ARCH 461 | ARCH 467 | ARCH 470 | ARCH 472 | ARCH 477 | ARCH 480 | ARCH 487 | ARCH 492 | ARCH 500 | ARCH 517 | ARCH 532 | ARCH 533 | ARCH 551 | ARCH 561 | ARCH 580 | ARCH 598 | EDGES 406 | EDGES 408 |
|----------------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|---------|----------|---------|--------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Expertise/Research/Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanzio</td>
<td>Programming and Design for Child Care and Development Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arens</td>
<td>Materials Database Development; Rapidly Assembled Emergency Shelters; Architecture and Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagnall</td>
<td>Architecture integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beller</td>
<td>Design-Build &amp; Green Building Expertise; Local Award Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict</td>
<td>Initiated &amp; Coordinated Professional Studios Model; Beginning Design; Website Designer for CAED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; all CAED Depts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict</td>
<td>Beginning Design Education; Formal Design Concepts; Perspective Drawing Theory and Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrinha</td>
<td>Digital Fabrication; Gridshell Design/Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>Computer Graphics; Collaborative Decision Making (Director, Collaborative Agent Design Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center (CADRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choi</td>
<td>Architectural History; Modern Japanese History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combrink</td>
<td>Local Award-Winning Residential Design; Local Review Commissions/Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Local Review Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crotser</td>
<td>Local Historical Preservation; Low Income/Homeless Housing; Local Review Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dettmer</td>
<td>Local Review Commissions; Local Residential Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Santo</td>
<td>Modern Affordable/Sustainable Housing; Passive and Active Solar Prototype Housing; Digital and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analog Representations (i.e., watercolor, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doerfler</td>
<td>Building Systems; Building Cladding Systems; Interdisciplinary Design Studios; Digital Fabrication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duerk</td>
<td>Aerospace Architecture; Architectural Programming; Educational Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foote</td>
<td>4th Year Design; Fabrication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>Design Methods: Design Studio Analog and Digital Representation; Building Systems Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies; Interdisciplinary Collaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeby</td>
<td>First Year Design; Computer Modeling; Local Award Winning Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giberti</td>
<td>American Architecture; Modern Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grover</td>
<td>Sustainable Design; Historic Preservation; First Year Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hargrave</td>
<td>Design and Architectural Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harms</td>
<td>4th Year Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illingworth</td>
<td>Design and Practice; IDP; Student Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Contemporary Design; Competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagga</td>
<td>Sustainable Design; Construction Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joines</td>
<td>Ecological Design; Medieval Town Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Practice and Urban Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasperovich</td>
<td>Architectural Photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Planning; Laboratory Buildings; Passive Solar Design; Professional Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lange, J</td>
<td>Visual Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lange, K</td>
<td>Pedagogy of Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Phenomenomenological Methodology in Design; Cultural Construction of Architecture and Space in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Americas; Developmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td>Community Planning and Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Sustainable Design; Renewable Energy; Sustainable Environmental Design Curriculum; Urban Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Microclimate; Past Occupancy Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Community Engagement Through Collaborative Practice; Practice Case Study Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueller</td>
<td>Community-Based Service Learning Studios; Workforce Housing; Relationship of Cultural Iconography to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation of Architectural Form; Emergent Materials; Innovation Construction Systems; New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technologies for Design and Professional Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neveu</td>
<td>Architectural History and Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nulman</td>
<td>Advanced Design Studios; Contemporary Architectural Practice; Building Envelopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panetta</td>
<td>Market Based, Sustainable Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease</td>
<td>Sustainable Design; Renewable Energy; Sustainable Environmental Design Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Passive Solar Design; Daylighting; Environmental Control Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Urban Design; Contemporary Digital Design and Fabrication; 20th &amp; 21st Century Art and Architecture Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory and Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohl</td>
<td>Collaborative Decision-Support Computer Systems in Distributed Artificial Intelligence Environments; Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods; Building Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reich</td>
<td>Factors affecting the development of urban infill housing in the American west; Urban infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development over freeways; History of Technology and Materials Development; Design and Construction of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridley</td>
<td>Local Practitioner; Beginning and Advanced Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>2nd Year Design and Practice; ECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannard</td>
<td>Architectural Lighting Design; Environmentally Sensitive Design; Housing &amp; Community Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearingen</td>
<td>Beginning Design; Off-Campus Programs; Local City Planning and Building Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weisenthal</td>
<td>Developing Informative Construction Details; The Nature of Contemporary Building Tectonics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>Craft and Making; Architectural Models; Process-Oriented Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Mathematical Progressions and Proportions of Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynn</td>
<td>Local Award-Winning Residential Design; Local Review Commissions/Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin</td>
<td>Studio-Based Community Design Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yip</td>
<td>Patterns in the History of Asian Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beller</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>341/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>351/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chol</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>451/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combrink</td>
<td>241/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>341/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>351/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croser</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>341/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>351/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dettmer</td>
<td>351/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Santo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doerfler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeby</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grover</td>
<td>121/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>341/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaggia</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lange K</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueller</td>
<td>121/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nulman</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>451/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannard</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearingen</td>
<td>121/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynn</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>341/2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yip</td>
<td>451/2/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Faculty Teaching Credentials Comparison List Between for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Architecture Department

Visiting Team Report

Bachelor of Architecture (5 years)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
2 March 2005

*The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1940, is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture. Because most state registration boards in the United States require any applicant for licensure to have graduated from an NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.*
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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments

The visiting team observed the following strengths of the architecture program of California Polytechnic State University:

- **Quality of students.** The intelligence, commitment, and maturity of the students are reflected in the craft and sophistication of their work.

- **A faculty dedicated to teaching.** A hallmark of this program is a faculty dedicated to teaching as evidenced by their excellent performance under the constraints of limited resources.

- **New administrative leadership.** The arrival of a new dean has reinvigorated the faculty, staff, and students through his activities in pursuing private funding, promising the realignment of university resources and connection to the community and profession.

- **Off-campus experiences.** The provision of national and international study programs provides the opportunity for students to acquire a range of cultural and professional experiences. A variety of locations available leverages a whole new dynamic on the campus and is enthusiastically embraced by the students.

- **University support for the program.** The team was impressed with the recent recognition by the university administration of the proportionately higher cost of the architecture program to other university programs.

- **Commitment to making things.** From the design details developed in studio to the student projects in Poly-Canyon and the annual Design Village, the care and artisanry reflect a continued commitment to the tradition of making, thus reaffirming the mission statement of the institution.

2. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

All conditions were marked “met” in the 1999 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo Visiting Team Report (VTR).

3. Conditions Well Met

   12.20 Building Envelope
   12.27 Detailed Design Development

4. Conditions Not Met

   12.29 Comprehensive Design
5. Causes of Concern

- 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.

- 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.

- While advising services are available, they are inadequate in supporting the needs of the majority of the students.

- 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

1. Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

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

1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context

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

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

1.2 Architecture Education and Students

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

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

1.3 Architecture Education and Registration

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

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

1.4 Architecture Education and the Profession

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

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

1.5 Architecture Education and Society

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Program Self-Assessment**

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

   Met [X]  Not Met [ ]

3. **Public Information**

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

   Met [X]  Not Met [ ]

4. **Social Equity**

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

   Met [X]  Not Met [ ]

5. **Human Resources**

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

   Met [X]  Not Met [ ]

   Limited staffing impedes access and/or use of the photo lab, the shop, and the Media Resource Center (MRC). The university administration indicates that these issues are in the process of being resolved.

6. **Human Resource Development**

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

   Met [X]  Not Met [ ]
7. Physical Resources

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

Current studios are filled to capacity with 18 students per section. These studios do not currently accommodate space for in-class reviews. This is a hardship. Due to the lack of gallery space, final project reviews are difficult.

8. Information Resources

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

9. Financial Resources

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

10. Administrative Structure

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

11. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]
12. Student Performance Criteria

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

12.1 Verbal and Writing Skills

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

12.2 Graphic Skills

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

12.3 Research Skills

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

12.4 Critical Thinking Skills

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

12.5 Fundamental Design Skills

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

12.6 Collaborative Skills

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]
12.7 Human Behavior

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

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

12.8 Human Diversity

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

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

12.9 Use of Precedents

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

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

12.10 Western Traditions

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

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

12.11 Non-Western Traditions

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

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

12.12 National and Regional Traditions

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

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

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

Met Not Met
[ ] [ ]

12.14 Accessibility

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

Met Not Met
[ ] [ ]

12.15 Site Conditions

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

Met Not Met
[ ] [ ]

12.16 Formal Ordering Systems

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

Met Not Met
[ ] [ ]

12.17 Structural Systems

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

Met Not Met
[ ] [ ]

12.18 Environmental Systems

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

Met Not Met
[ ] [ ]
12.19 Life-Safety Systems

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

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

12.20 Building Envelope Systems

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

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

12.21 Building Service Systems

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

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

12.22 Building Systems Integration

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

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

While there was overall evidence of the ability to integrate various building systems, there was only general evidence of the ability to integrate mechanical systems. The team found this criterion minimally met.

12.23 Legal Responsibilities

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

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

12.24 Building Code Compliance

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

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

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.26 Building Economics and Cost Control

Understanding of building economics, and construction cost control within the framework of a design project

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.27 Detailed Design Development

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.28 Technical Documentation

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

12.29 Comprehensive Design

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

Met Not Met
[ ] [X]

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.
12.30 Program Preparation

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

12.31 The Legal Context of Architectural Practice

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

12.32 Practice Organization and Management

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

12.33 Contracts and Documentation

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

12.34 Professional Internship

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

12.35 Architects’ Leadership Roles

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]
12.36 The Context of Architecture

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

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

12.37 Ethics and Professional Judgment

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

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

1. History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2004 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Architecture Program Report.

Overview

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, Cal Poly 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 40 years from 1963 to 2004, the University grew to its current size of 17,257 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.

Background

Today’s University, with its emphasis on 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/ae, 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 intercollegiate athletics program that transitioned to Division I status, and a vital student government with responsibility for running a multimillion dollar student corporation, more than 400 student clubs, the annual Poly Royal (briefly suspended, then reintroduced as Open House).

Faculty, student and alumni/ae achievements brought growing recognition to Cal Poly, culminating in annual selection as the best public comprehensive university in the Western United States in the “America’s Best Colleges” issue of U.S. News & World Report, from 1993 forward. The 1999 rankings declared Cal Poly’s College of Engineering the best public largely undergraduate engineering school in the country. In fall 2000 the Computer Science Department was proclaimed best in the nation among its peers.

Over 20 major capital projects transformed the campus during the University Years. Individual, foundation and corporate gifts played a growing role in capital and program development. Among important examples: the industry-supported Dairy Products Technology Center; alumnus Al Smith’s bequest of the Swanton Pacific Ranch; the partnership among the University, City of San Luis Obispo and private donors to establish the Performing Arts Center’s Christopher Cohan Center; the foundation and corporate-funded Advanced Technology Laboratories; and the $16 million gift from Kinko’s founder Paul J. Orfalea and his family to benefit and name the College of Business and the campus Children’s Center.

The composition of Cal Poly’s student population changed to reflect the growing diversity of the state’s population. By fall 1999, nearly 30 percent of Cal Poly’s students were from non-white groups and Cal Poly had become among the nation’s leading educators of Hispanic baccalaureate graduates in architecture, agriculture and engineering.

At century’s end, a new campus master plan provided a comprehensive vision of the University’s future. Cal Poly, while growing, would preserve its polytechnic, undergraduate, residential character and learn-by-doing educational philosophy. It would expand access for California’s diverse students to opportunities in the new global, technological economy. Reflecting proudly on its first century, it would advance confidently into the new millennium, with A Tradition for the Future.
University Recognition

For the 12th year in a row, Cal Poly has been rated the best public largely undergraduate university in the West by *U.S. News & World Report*, in its 2005 *America's Best Colleges* guidebook. Cal Poly retained its No. 5 position overall in the magazine's list of the West's best universities, including private institutions, that "provide a full range of undergraduate and master's-level programs but few, if any, doctoral programs." (*U.S. News* ranks colleges which grant doctoral degrees, such as those in the University of California system, in a separate category.)

2. Institutional Mission

The following text is taken from the 2004 *California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo Architecture Program Report*.

As a predominantly undergraduate, comprehensive, polytechnic university serving California, the mission of Cal Poly is to discover, integrate, articulate, and apply knowledge. This is done by emphasizing teaching; engaging in research; participating in the various communities—local, state, national, and international with which it pursues common interests; and where appropriate, providing students with the unique experience of direct involvement with the actual challenges of their disciplines in the United States and abroad.

Cal Poly is dedicated to complete respect for human rights and the development of the full potential of each of its individual members. Cal Poly is committed to providing an environment where all share in the common responsibility to safeguard each other's rights, encourage a mutual concern for individual growth and appreciate the benefits of a diverse campus community.

3. Program History

The following text is taken from the 2004 *California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo Architecture Program Report*.

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 5-year B. Arch. curriculum appeared for the first time in a catalog. There were 6 first graduates from the B. Arch. program in 1964–65. The first two years of B. Arch. and B.S. ArcE are the same. The B.S. 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. 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.

Program Recognition

For two years in a row, Cal Poly's architecture program has ranked very high nationally, by *Design Intelligence*, published by the Design Futures Council, a Washington, D.C.–based think tank dealing with architecture, engineering and building technology. In 2003 the program was ranked as one of three top programs offering a B. Arch. degree in the country, and in 2002 as one of two top programs (second to Harvard).
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. 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 first-year students every Fall, students often work on a project in the “Canyon” in need of repair.

4. Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2004 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo Architecture Program Report.

CAED Mission Statement

The mission of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design is to be the premier undergraduate emphasis college of planning, design, and construction in the United States. In order to achieve that position, the College will provide the best possible education for the future generations of men and women who will be responsible for planning, designing, constructing, managing, and preserving the physical environment, 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 among them by creating a teaching/learning
environment based on collaboration, and by conducting research and related creative activity that enhance interdisciplinary modes of practice.

Architecture Department Mission Statement
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.

Departmental Goals
• 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.
• To create teaching, learning and work environments that support physical and mental health and personal and professional growth.
• To provide educational opportunities to pursue design excellence, technical knowledge and contextual understanding in the creation of the built environment.
• To provide educational opportunities to gain an understanding and appreciation for the interdisciplinary nature of design and the profession of architecture.
• To 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.

5. Program Strategic Plan
The following text is taken from the 2004 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo Architecture Program Report.

The program’s strategic plan was developed from the College’s strategic plan (see E2) developed in 1999, and updated in 2001. The Architecture Department’s strategic plan has been in development for a number of years, but was finally adopted June 2002. The Department’s strategic plan has eight total goals that are divided into three broad categories: Integrated Academic Community, Practice-Oriented Community, and Knowledge-Based Learning Community.

A.5a Strategic Plan, A.5b Measures of Success, A.5c Time Line for Implementation
The strategic plan below shows the objectives of each goal regarding the following:
• Priority (high, medium or low)
• Time Line
  – Date—Completed or Proposed for Completion
  – Outcome Assessment Levels—“not met,” “weakly met,” “met,” “well met,” or “in progress”
  – Measures—For carrying out objectives of goals
On page 9, under Goals and Objectives Overview, the measures title listed in the strategic plan is expanded with a narrative and where possible sample activities are listed.
# California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
## Visiting Team Report
### 26 February–2 March 2005

## CATEGORY # 1 INTEGRATED ACADEMIC COMMUNITY:

### GOALS & Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2002 [Met]</td>
<td>A.1.1—Courses/ Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2010 [Met]</td>
<td>A.3.1—Field Trips/Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2006 [In-progress]</td>
<td>A.4.1—Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GOAL A: ADVANCE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY ACTIVITY

To provide educational and professional opportunities for students and faculty to engage in on-campus domestic and international educational programs.

### Objective A.1
Identify common skills and course content to serve multiple majors within the CAED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2002 [Met]</td>
<td>A.1.1—Courses/ Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective A.2
Develop and support opportunities for design studio collaboration and exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Objective A.3
Support cross-disciplinary field trips and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2010 [Met]</td>
<td>A.3.1—Field Trips/Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective A.4
Prepare comprehensive plan for expanded 5th year disciplinary and interdisciplinary program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2006 [In-progress]</td>
<td>A.4.1—Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GOAL B: SUPPORT OFF-CAMPUS EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

To provide educational and professional opportunities for students and faculty to engage in off-campus domestic and international educational programs.

### Objective B.1
Evaluate and coordinate program requirements, approval process and performance expectations for off-campus programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2002 [Met]</td>
<td>B.1 Policy Changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GOAL C: ENCOURAGE UNIVERSITY, COMMUNITY AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

To participate as a major partner in evaluating, contributing to and directing the future physical planning and development of the University, and the surrounding region and community.

### Objective C.1
Increase the involvement of faculty as an expert pool with campus physical planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2001 [WellMet]</td>
<td>C.1 Faculty Involvement with Campus Physical Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective C.2
Increase community involvement activities that support instructional goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## CATEGORY # 2 PRACTICE ORIENTED COMMUNITY:

### GOALS & Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1999 [WeaklyMet]</td>
<td>D.1 Faculty opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2003 [WeaklyMet]</td>
<td>D.2 Practitioner Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2010 [Met]</td>
<td>D.3.1 Inter-college/ inter-department degree programs D.3.2 Minors/ Concentrations Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GOAL D: ENRICH PROFESSIONALLY-BASED CURRICULA

To encourage strong professionally-based curricula that include interdisciplinary opportunities

### Objective D.1
Expand faculty opportunities with discipline related firms and agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1999 [WeaklyMet]</td>
<td>D.1 Faculty opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective D.2
Continue to support means/opportunities for practitioners to participate in educational programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2003 [WeaklyMet]</td>
<td>D.2 Practitioner Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective D.3
Establish and support inter-college, inter-departmental degree programs, minors, concentrations and courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2010 [Met]</td>
<td>D.3.1 Inter-college/ inter-department degree programs D.3.2 Minors/ Concentrations Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective D.4
Expand and enhance lecture series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## GOAL E: ENHANCE CONTENT INTEGRATION

To provide a framework that provide integration opportunities for integrating content across a range of courses

### Objective E.1
Develop and implement a plan to integrate course content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2003 [Met]</td>
<td>E.1 Faculty meetings re curriculum changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL F: DEVELOP SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR SCHOLARLY WORK:

To create an academic environment which promotes faculty, staff and student development by encouraging and supporting the pursuit of teaching excellence, scholarly work, and challenging professional development and responsible service.

| Objective F.1 | Define criteria and support faculty in developing their scholarship of teaching | H | 2003 [In Progress] | F.1 Innovations In Teaching Fund, F.2 CAEDF Teaching Award |
| Objective F.2 | Define criteria and support faculty in developing their scholarship of discovery, integration, and/or application | H | 2003 [In Progress] | F.2 University’s Center for Teaching and Learning |
| Objective F.3 | Define criteria and support faculty in developing departmental, college, university, community and professional service | H | 2003 [In Progress] | F.3 Community Development Grants |
| Objective F.4 | Formulate a plan that will develop and maintain diversity (e.g., pluralism of cultures, values, philosophies) among students, faculty, and staff in order to build a strong and effective learning environment | L | 2003 [Weakly Met] | F.4 University’s Diversity Plan |

GOAL G: IMPROVE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT:

To acquire and develop facilities and equipment for educational needs, technological change and future program growth.

| Objective G.1 | Develop a long range plan for maintaining and enhancing physical facilities and furnishings | H | 2007 [In Progress] | G.1 Renovation Plans (JCA IIb) |
| Objective G.2 | Articulate comprehensive technology applications and implementation plan | M | 2005 [In Progress] | G.2 Interim Computer Policy |

GOAL H: ENHANCE COLLEGE ADVANCEMENT

To plan, coordinate and implement fundraising and outreach programs to secure supplemental public support and increased private support to meet priority needs of the College

| Objective H.1 | Develop a plan for improving communication strategies for highlighting the successes of the department | M | 2003 [Met] | H.1 Role of Associate Advancement Director |
| Objective H.2 | Identify short-term and long-term needs, prioritize needs and update program for support of important initiatives | M | 2004 [In Progress] | H.2 Dean’s meetings w/ Department Heads |
Goals and Objectives Overview

CATEGORY #1 Integrated Academic Community

GOAL A: Interdisciplinary Activity

A.1.1 Courses/Skills—2002 [Met]

EDES 101 Course – Overview of CAED disciplines for first-year students. Range of activities that expose students to the other disciplines of Architecture, City and Regional Planning, Construction Management, Landscape Architecture and Architectural Engineering (e.g., structural engineering). There is a range of collaborative projects required in this course that require the different disciplines to work together, as a way of building collaborative skills for future courses.

The new ArcE 211 Structures 1 Course, starting Fall 03, and focuses on the structural design process in the creation of buildings. This course includes both Construction Management and Architectural Engineering students working alongside Architecture students.

The Arch 106 Course has Construction Management working alongside Architectural Engineering students.

Next year, Architectural Engineering students will take the entire Arch 121, 122 and 123 “Beginning Design and Drawing” course sequence alongside Architecture students.

The Environmental Design Minor provides students from all major programs with the knowledge and ability to integrate such broad concerns as design, construction, history, urbanization, sustainable development and historic preservation with their major field of study. This minor involves six architecture prefix courses.

A.2 Design Studio Collaborations / Exchanges (refer to C6 & E13)—1999 [Well Met]

A selected list of activities includes:

- The Solar Decathlon Project—Architecture and Mechanical Engineering faculty/students collaboration
- Prof. Fowler’s Immersive Visualization Collaboration w/ Computer Science Department, 1999–2001
- Prof Mueller’s Downtown Studio
- Profs. Cabrinha, Fowler, Muller Vertical Housing Studio of 2nd, 3rd & 4th year students

A.3 Field Trips / Activities—2000 [Met]

Field Trips:

The Construction Management and Architecture Departments organized College field trips for faculty to visit projects under construction in Los Angeles and San Francisco during 2000 and 2001. Faculty toured projects and were given overviews of project development. A sampling of projects visited in Los Angeles included: Frank Gehry’s Disney Concert Hall and José Rafael Moneo Catholic Cathedral. In San Francisco, a
sampling of projects included: Hellmuth, Obata + Kassabaum’s Asian Art Museum and Herzog & de Meuron’s De Young Museum and in San Jose, a visit to the Santana Row mixed-use, boutique village.

Activities:

• Recent Poly Canyon Projects (e.g., Tensile Structure, and in-progress Concrete Flower, etc.; refer to E13 & 16) have involved both students and faculty from different departments.

• Faculty invite colleagues from different departments for lectures and reviews.

A.4 Expanded 5th Year Disciplinary/Interdisciplinary Program—2006 [In Progress]

There are some individual fifth year faculty that have made strides in starting the development of a comprehensive plan for fifth year. A sampling of individual faculty efforts that have been successful includes the following:

• A range of projects from Professor Reich’s 2003–04 Housing Studio addressed the sustainability of housing regarding the interaction of the architecture with the natural and built environments. The studio focus required students to consult with a number of disciplines (e.g., planners, politicians, structural engineers, construction managers, etc.) in the development of their projects. Two successful projects were: Rob Hawthorne’s SLO Living: Mixed-Use Housing In Downtown San Luis Obispo, and Lucinda Tay’s Architecture As Prosthetic Cambodia.

• Professor Lucas’s 2003–04 Design Build/Educationally Themed Architecture connected his students to a range of experts outside architecture to assist them in their project development.

The development of a comprehensive plan is projected for completion in 2006.

GOAL B: Support Off-Campus Education Opportunities

B.1 Off-Campus Policy Changes—2001 [Well Met]

Over half of the Architecture Department students, before they graduate, participate in one or more of the following off-campus programs: San Francisco Urban Studies Internship Program, Washington Alexandria Center Consortium, or one or more of the exchange or visiting student programs (refer to C1.2). The Off-Campus Programs Committee voted in March of 2002 to implement two policy changes regarding off-campus programs. They are as follows:

Fall Exhibition of Student Work:

To have each program display a representative sample of the previous year's student work as an annual and formal part of the off-campus programs. The committee's intention is to educate the students before the orientation meetings (presentations to prospective students) in the Fall. The exhibits help students see the range of the program and what they could expect. Those exhibits will begin in Fall Quarter with each program having a week of exhibits in the main architecture office, room 05-212.

Sunsetting Small Programs and Renewed Emphasis on More Popular Programs
A decision of the Off-Campus Programs Committee in June of 2002 was made to not renew those exchange programs which have small numbers of students participating (refer to C9.1).

**GOAL C: Encourage University, Community and Professional Service**

**C.1 Faculty Involvement with Campus Physical Planning—2001 [Well Met]**

Since the last visit the Department’s faculty, have been more visible and effective in impacting the University’s decision making process regarding the campus’ future physical planning.

Some selected examples include:

- Professor Lucas’ authored an Academic Senate Resolution (adopted 05/29/01) on: Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Design and Construction Principles for Cal Poly Buildings, Landscape, and Infrastructure (refer to E23).

- SEE Group faculty (e.g., Pena, M. McDonald, Muller, P. Cooper, Professor Emeritus) have provided input to the campus regarding the importance of incorporating building sustainability principles in developing the “Student Housing North” Project and the new Center for Construction Excellence Building that is part of JCA IIb.

- Professor Fowler’s Third Year Architecture Design Studio in Fall 2000 developed Time Capsule Proposals in celebration of the University’s 100 year old birthday. These academic projects were exhibited for 8 months and included 13 proposals for time capsules, along with interviews/items collected/and voting by the campus community on the favorite project (refer to E13).

At an April 23rd, 2004 public convocation entitled “Education for Sustainability: Engaging the Polytechnic University” President Warren Baker declared Cal Poly a signatory to the Talloires Declaration, a ten point pledge to make the university an agent for practicing, improving and teaching methods of sustainable resource use and environmental protection signed by over 300 university chancellors and presidents worldwide. This event highlighted Cal Poly’s emerging interdisciplinary and interdepartmental efforts to address problems created by outdated environmentally damaging technologies and to promote both innovative and traditional alternatives to solving them. One immediate offshoot of this is a $100,000 CAED Research Project called the Cal Poly Sustainable Technology Park Design that is being funded through the Office of Research and Graduate Programs and which involves six architecture faculty as well as faculty from the CM and LA departments.

**C.2 Community Activities—1999 [Well Met]**

There has been a dramatic increase in the number of faculty community-based projects that is incorporated in the architecture design studio. Many of these community projects have been highlighted in the community via the local media of television news and newspaper coverage. A selected list of projects includes (refer to E13):

- Loh/M. McDonald (Spring Quarter ’99: EDes 420) Downtown Historic Structures Study

- Crotser/M. McDonald (Spring Quarter ’03: Arch 472) Downtown Historic Structures Study
A partial list of community-based projects during the 2003–04 academic year includes:

- **Community Development Grants:**
  - A. Mueller (Fall/Winter/Spring Quarters: Arch 351) Downtown Studio SLO
  - T. Fowler/B. Muller (Winter/Spring Quarters: Arch 252/231/352/307) High Density Housing SLO

- **Other Community Activities:**
  - A. Cooper (Fall '03: Arch 351) Cal Poly's Student Housing North
  - D. Brodie (Winter Quarter: Arch 352/452) Dunes Interpretive Center Guadalupe
  - K. Macdonald (Winter Quarter: Arch 452) Shandon Community Development Project
  - M. Lucas (Fall/Winter/Spring Quarters: Arch 481) Language School SF Tenderloin District
  - J. Reich (Fall/Winter/Spring Quarters: Arch 481) Prosthetic Limb Center Cambodia
  - J. Reich (Fall/Winter/Spring Quarters: Arch 481) Site Selection for Cal Poly's Student Housing North & Library Expansion
  - M. Lucas (Fall/Winter/Spring Quarters: Arch 481) Homeless Center Richmond CA
  - M. Lucas (Fall/Winter/Spring Quarters: Arch 481) Jamestown Center SF Mission District
  - M. Cabrinha (Winter/Spring Quarters: Arch 452/3) Cal Poly Research Park
  - E. Speidel (Fall/Winter Quarters: Arch 231) Habitat for Humanity Cambria, CA

**Category #2 Practice Oriented Community**

**GOAL D: Enrich Professionally-Based Curricula**

**D.1 Faculty Opportunities—1999 [Weakly Met]**

Even though there have been a few faculty that have taken advantage of working with discipline related firms and agencies over the years, opportunities to involve more faculty seem to be limited. The department will explore expanding opportunities for faculty, so more will get involved. Here is a list of activities:

- **Summer Faculty Internships**, which have involved the following faculty:
  - (i) Professor Don Swearingen worked several summers at The Watry Design Group in Redwood City, CA
  - (ii) Professor Merrill Gaines worked several summers at AVRP in San Diego, CA

- **KTGY Group, Inc.** has recently inaugurated a faculty/practitioner “joint venture” that would include one or more of the following:
  - (i) Cal Poly faculty participation in KTGY training seminars and other continuing education programs;
  - (ii) Cal Poly faculty presentations at KTGY on recent travel experiences, design theory, or visualization techniques including 3-D presentation “fly-throughs”, etc.;
  - (iii) Cal Poly faculty participation in KTGY’s IDP mentorship program;
  - (iv) Establishing a Cal Poly design/planning studio located on the KTGY campus;
  - (v) KTGY requesting topics for Cal Poly faculty and students to research (e.g., researching how to maximize high-density infill housing development given
current building code constraints, researching how to convert "grey fields" into housing, etc.)

D2. Practitioner Participation—2003 [Weakly Met]

Even though a very successful pilot program was tested Fall 2003, where the Department invited three practitioners to teach two fourth year design studios, additional practitioner involvement in the classroom has not been planned.

The practitioners that taught Fall 2003 are:

• Las Vegas Studio: Practitioner, Eric Strain, Principle, Assemblage Studio and Jeff Hartnet, Assistant Professor from the University of Nevada at Las Vegas co-taught a studio.
• Avila Beach Studio: Timothy Chappelle, Principle of Arcanum Architects in San Francisco, CA, taught a studio looking mixed-use facility in the water.

There is the potential of both the George Hasselin Chair and the Universal Traveler Programs to assist the Department in improving practitioner involvement in the classroom, but to date these programs have not had any impact.

D3. Inter-college/Inter-departmental degree programs, minors, concentrations and courses—2000 [Met]

Refer to C11.1 for both D3.1 & D3.2 below:

• D.3.1 Inter-college/inter-departmental degree programs
• D.3.2 Minors/Concentrations/Courses


Hearst lecture series, starting in Fall 2002, developed a range of workshops and field trips for students and faculty to participate in (refer to C6).

GOAL E: Enhance Content Integration

E.1 Course Content Integration—2003 [Met]

• The 2005–07 catalogue changes to the curriculum improve the integration of course content in the structures series (New ArcE courses), the new professional practice sequences of courses in first & second year and the consolidation of professional practice course into the fifth year (refer to C11).
• More work is needed to refine the integration of course content across the entire curriculum once the new sequence of courses starts in 2004–05.

Category # 3 Knowledge-Based Learning Community

Goal F: Develop Supportive Environment for Scholarly Work

Even though the criterion has been developed as part of the draft Annual Review for Promotion and Tenure (ARPT) Document, the Department’s Tenured Faculty have not adopted this new criterion that more clearly defines the scholarship of teaching;
discovery, integration, and/or application; along with the criterion for developing departmental, college, university, community and professional service (see below – F1, F2, F3).

There is a concern that the dwindling Department budgets for professional development and field trip expenditures (refer to C6, 1998–2003 Expenditures Chart, page 14), will adversely impact the future of faculty scholarship and community service.

F1. Faculty Scholarship of Teaching—2003 [In Progress]
See E4, Draft Guidelines for ARPT.

F.2 Faculty Scholarship of discovery, integration/application—2003 [In Progress]
See E4, Draft Guidelines for ARPT. On average, 34 WTU’s per year were awarded over the past five years for assigned time for proposal development within the University. For example, the Dean has recently awarded several Department faculty assigned time for participation in both the Solar Decathlon Competition and the Sustainable Technology Park Design. In addition to this, the University has awarded the College eight State Faculty Support Grants over the past five years. Finally, the University makes available approximately $75,000 each year through the Faculty Development Grants and University Services Summer Grants Programs. Since 1998–1999, the University has received 88 proposals from 40 faculty from within the College with the result that faculty from within the College have been recipients of 72 University-funded grants between 1998 and 2003.

F.3 Faculty involvement in departmental, college, university, community and professional service—2003 [In Progress]
See E4, Draft Guidelines for ARPT.

F.4 Diversity Plan—2003 [Weakly Met]
See C4, University Guidelines for diversity. The Department has not yet formulated a discipline specific framework that ties into the University’s plans for improving the demographics of students and faculty. However, the Department continues to maintain Student Academic and Support Services advising that improves access, retention and graduation of students who have been historically, economically and/or educationally disadvantaged. The department also regularly offers courses such as Arch 401 “Toward a Barrier-Free Environment,” Arch 320 “History of Asian Architecture and Built Environment” and ArchX370 “Native American Architecture and Place,” which help give students a deeper understanding of those who are physically disabled or culturally more diverse.

Goal G: Develop Supportive Environment For Scholarly Work

G.1 Physical Facilities Long Range Plan—2007 (In Progress)
• The Joint Cooperative Agreement (JCA) llb, projected for completion in 2007, provides plans for improving the physical facilities for the Department (refer to E12).

G.2 Computer Plan—2005 [In Progress]
• Refer to E17, the Interim Computer Policy, 7/04. This document is the first step in developing this plan.

Goal H: Enhance College Advancement

H.1 Developing a Plan for Improving Communication Strategies for Highlighting the Successes of the Department—2004 [Met]
• With the hiring of the College’s Associate Director for Advancement in 2001, the Department’s ability to communicate the activities in the Department locally has improved.
• The Department needs to take the next step to look at strategies for improving the national and international coverage of activities.

H2. Identify short-term and long-term needs, prioritize needs, and update program for support of important initiatives—2004 [In Progress]
• The Dean’s Department Head Meetings during 2003–04 required each department to set long- and short-term priorities regarding the budget reduction process. The Department Head/Associate Heads in conjunction with the Dean and Associate Dean will formulate clear short- and long-term support for 2004 important initiatives.
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Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Saturday, 26 February

p.m. Team arrival and check-in
4:00 p.m. Team orientation in the Apple Farm Garden Room
6:00 p.m. Dinner with Interim Department Head Will Benedict; Associate Heads Thomas Fowler and Michael Lucas, and Past Heads Allan Cooper and Margot McDonald; Dean R. Tom Jones; and Assoc. Dean K. Richard Zweifel at Grappolo

Sunday, 27 February

7:30 a.m. Breakfast with department head, associate heads, and past heads at the Apple Farm
9:00 a.m Tour of support/department facility: Photo Lab and Studio (Joseph Kasperovich) in Room 05-115
9:30 a.m. Tour of support/department facility: Support Shop (Bart Alford) in Room 21-136E
10:00 a.m. Introduction to the team room (Thomas Fowler) in Room 05-106/105A
10:30 a.m. Team time in the team room
12 p.m Box lunch in the Poly Canyon and brief tour [Attending—Department head, associate heads, past head, and student caretaker, R. Ben Ross]
1:30 p.m. The Solar Decathlon Project overview in the Gallery [Attending—Rob Pena, Sandy Stannard, Tom DiSanto, architecture students and mechanical/electrical engineering students/faculty]
2:30 p.m. Meeting and tour with CAED’s Media Resource Collection (MRC) Director Vicky Aubourg in the Media Resource Center
3:30 p.m. Meeting and tour with University’s Kennedy Library Staff Member Mary M. Somerville, Ph.D., Assistant Dean (filling in for CAED Librarian Sariya Talip Clay, who is on sabbatical WQ 05) in the Kennedy Library Lobby at the front desk
4:30 p.m. Meeting with the entire architecture faculty in Room 05-100
5:30 p.m. Reception (by invitation only) with faculty, students, administration, staff, alumni/ae, and local practitioners in the Gallery
7:00 p.m. Team-only dinner at the Apple Farm
Monday, 28 February

7:00 a.m. Breakfast and entry meeting with Dean R. Tom Jones and Associate Dean K. Richard Zweifel at the Apple Farm

8:30 a.m. Entry meeting with Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Robert C. Detweiler, and Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education W. David Conn in Room 01-305

9:45 a.m. Meeting with Campus Self-Study Group—Steve Kaminaka, Linda Bomstad, and others in Room UU-219

11:00 a.m. Meeting with CAED Career Counselor and Cooperative Education Coordinator Carole Moore in Room 124-224

11:30 a.m. Meeting with Student Academic Services (SAS) Counselor Trish Stewart, in Room 124-224

12 p.m. Lunch with faculty area coordinators at the Vista Grande (Attending: ECS — Rob Pena; Practice — Pat Hill; History/Theory — Chris Yip; Digital Tools and Design Visuals and 1st-Yr. Design—Brent Freeby; 2nd-Yr. Design—Howard Weisenthal; 3rd-Yr. Design—John Lange; 4th-Yr. Design—Margot McDonald; 5th-Yr. Design—Jonathan Reich)

1:30 p.m. Meeting with CAED department heads in Room 05-201a (Attending: LA: Walt Bremer; CM: Al Hauck; CRP: William Siembieda; AE: Abe Lynn)

2:30 p.m. Team review of student work in the team room and visit to studios

6:00 p.m. Meeting with entire architecture student body at Phillipps Hall (PAC)

7:15 p.m. Team dinner with selected alumni/ae at the Vista Grande

Tuesday, 1 March

7:30 a.m. Team-only breakfast at the Apple Farm

8:30 a.m. Team review of student work, team room, and visit classes

11:00 a.m. Meeting with staff in Room 05-201a (Attending: Roxana Lopez, Office Manager; Yvonne Lynch, Administrative Assistant; Tess Sema, Receptionist; Staci Wellman, Scheduler; CAED Computer Technicians: Steve Spencer, Danny Feuerstein; Joseph Kasperovich, Photo Presentation Facility; Bart Alford, Manager and Doug Allan, Assistant Manager, CAED Support Shop; Ellen Notermann, Director CAED Advising Center; Vicky Aubourg, Director CAED Media Resource Center, Tanya Kiani, Director and Ray Ladd, Assistant Director, CAED Advancement)

12 p.m. Lunch with College Base Fee Committee (CBF) and selected student leaders (Attending—CBF: Sara Troy, President (and also 5th-Yr. Rep.); Franklin LaPointe, Vice President (and also 5th-Yr. Rep.); Laing Chung, Co-Secretary (and also 5th-Yr. Rep.) Marya Mikati, Co-Secretary (and also 1st-Yr. Rep.); David Huber, 1st-Yr. Rep.; Stephanie Simonds and Erin Ward, 2nd-Yr. Reps.; Megan Dorrian and Deric Mizokami, 3rd-Yr. Reps.; Stephanie Petersen and Trixie Castillo, 4th-Yr. Rep. Clubs: Renewable Energy Club, Chris Oestrein (ME); CAED Ambassadors Program, Karl Johnson; Student Council, Karl Johnson; Alpha Rho Chi, Mary Lawrence; AIAS, Todd Duncan
1:30 p.m.  Team report writing time in the team room
7:30 p.m.  Team-only dinner at the Big Sky

Wednesday, 2 March

7:00 a.m.  Exit meeting breakfast with interim department head, associate heads, and past heads at the Apple Farm
8:30 a.m.  Exit meeting with Dean Jones and Associate Dean Zweifel in the Dean’s Office
10:00 a.m. Exit meeting with Provost Detweiler and Vice Provost Conn in Room 01-305
11:30 a.m. Exit meeting with the faculty, staff, administration, and students in Chumash
12:30 p.m. Team departures
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald L. Skaggs, FAIA
Team Chair
Representing the AIA

Lance Jay Brown, FAIA
Team member
Representing the ACSA

Beverly Frank
Team member
Representing the AIAS

Barbara A. Sestak, AIA
Team member
Representing the NCARB
4.6 Catalog (or URL for retrieving online catalogs and related materials)

Catalogue link:
5.1 Appendix - Annual Reports

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

See Part 1, Section 1.3.3 Faculty Credentials for copy of signed statement from official within the institution responsible for preparing and submitting statistical data that all data submitted to the NAAB through the Annual Report Submission system since the last site visit is accurate and consistent with reports sent to other national and regional agencies including the National Center for Education Statistics.

Annual Reports included are (submitted prior to 2008):

2007
2006
2005
PART 2 — NAAB Visiting Team Report - "II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation"

CONDITION "NOT MET"

12.29 Comprehensive Design
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.

Response:

• The adoption of curriculum changes (started 2005-06) have improved technical support course sequencing (Structural Engineering, Environmental Control Systems and Professional Practice Courses), and content integration, along with reducing the total number of B.Arch units; the department is in the process of establishing program-level learning outcomes and methods for monitoring student attainment of learning outcomes through appropriate direct and indirect assessment methods. The design level coordinators in collaboration with the other area coordinators (practice, history & ECS) developed a draft white paper June 2006 that proposes a series of recommendations for improving learning outcomes assessment of all courses within the curriculum. The area coordinators have continued to meet during the 2006-2007 academic year to discuss the implementation priorities so the department can focus on improving the visible manifestation of mechanical systems in design studio projects.

CONDITIONS "MET", BUT WITH VISITING TEAM COMMENTARY

5. Human Resources
Limited staffing impedes access and/or use of the photo lab, the shop, and the Media Resource Center (MRC). The university administration indicates that these issues are in the process of being resolved.

Response:

• The ability of the college to hire students again as part of the Lydia Humphrey Scholarship Program to help in the staffing of these resources has been resolved as of Summer 2005. Under the new scholarship guidelines the annual award amount has been increased and students can now be hired from any one of the five departments (not limited to architecture students anymore) in the college. Plans are currently in progress to increase the Shop Technician from part-time to full-time in the 2007-08 academic year.

7. Physical Resources
Current studios are filled to capacity with 18 students per section. These studios do not currently accommodate space for in-class reviews. This is a hardship. Due to the lack of gallery space, final project reviews are difficult.

Response:

• A priority of the department is keeping enrollment at this capacity level.
• During the summer of 2005 the department installed pinnacle board (tack surface) in several rooms, and converted an additional classroom to a seminar setting with tack board on the walls. These changes will provide much needed pin-up and critique space throughout the year.

• Several design studios are pursuing fundraising options for the purchase of workstations that are more efficient and have smaller footprint in the available classroom space, thus providing more available room.

12.22 Building Systems Integration

While there was overall evidence of the ability to integrate various building systems, there was only general evidence of the ability to integrate mechanical systems. The team found this criterion minimally met.

Response: See the response to 12.29 Comprehensive Design.

PART 3 — NAAB Visiting Team Report - "5. Causes of Concern"

• 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.

Response:

• The college-based fees (CBF), a supplemental fee collected from all students in the department, is considered a temporary solution for offsetting the department’s state funding shortfall. We are working to increase the amount of private funding for the department to offset dwindling state funding. That will allow us to improve the financial support for faculty development and increase the annual allocations for operating and equipment (O&E) expenses.

The CSU is anticipating some easement in funding shortfalls due to California’s recent economic upswing. In addition, there is pending legislation that will require that all CSU registration and housing fees remain in a trust fund to be allocated strictly to the CSU. If this legislation passes, it is anticipated that there will be less scramble for State general fund dollars, and again should ease the financial stress on the campus and department.

The new department head is actively pursuing new strategies for improving fundraising from private sources.

• 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.

Response:

• The University is attempting to deal with the cost of housing challenge for new faculty with the construction of a faculty housing project with the first phase of homes made available in the Winter of 2007. Two of our probationary faculty have secured units in this new housing development. The department is unsure at this time what impact of this housing project will have in assisting future probationary hires.

• The department had a 100% acceptance rate of all five of the first choice probationary faculty candidates during the 2004-2005 search. The high quality of the applicant pool allowed the department to hire four faculty as opposed to three.
• After a failed permanent department head search 2004-2005, a new department head has been hired and he started in August 2006.

• In 2005 the department has adopted new guidelines for Appointment Retention Promotion Tenure (ARPT), and the first cycle of faculty to follow these procedures were hired in the 2005 – 2006 academic year. The ARPT guidelines have been helpful to faculty in clarifying the expectations of the department for faculty development.

• To assist faculty in understanding available department resources, the department updated the following policies in January 2005: Sabbatical/Difference In Pay, Computer, and Travel. These policies are now posted on the department's website for easy reference.

The department will conduct a Fall 2007 search of four new tenure track faculty who are projected to start teaching in the program by Fall 2008.

• **While advising services are available, they are inadequate in supporting the needs of the majority of the students.**

Response:

• The department is taking steps to clarify and promote the advising services to students. The move of the advising office Fall 2005 from a room within the department to a more visible and highly student trafficked location off of the College lobby next to the College's Advising Center Director, has helped a great deal. The department's Web Site redesigned January 2005 has enhanced the availability of curriculum information that students can access. Additional advising resources are continuing to be added to the web site as they are developed.

• Starting Fall 2005 Faculty advisors visited all freshman design classes to introduce themselves and the advising services available in the department. This mass orientation includes information for all architecture students on curriculum (architecture, support and general education) requirements, as well as services offered by the department and college advising centers. This in-depth advising orientation will be conducted every fall quarter.

• Beginning with grades for Winter Quarter 2006, the department is conducting a more thorough review of grades and progress in the major for every architecture student. Students who either fail a major or support course, or who appear not to be making significant progress in the major are being called in to meet with advisors. The results of this first effort proved very promising, and both students and advisors appreciated the opportunity to discuss progress and study plans. The new level of mandatory advising has proved helpful and will be continued.

• As of Fall 2006, the newly implemented People Soft Computer System allows academic advisors to have online access to a student's unofficial transcript. Having access to this historical information assists both the advisor and the student in supporting the needs of the student.

• **There is a 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.**

Response:
Since half of the fourth year students go off campus to participate in established study abroad programs, many students that remain on campus fourth year (the reasons for staying range from academic, financial, and personal) feel there should be a greater variety of academic opportunities available. The department is in the process of redefining the role, experiences and overall education goals for fourth year.

While the department is redefining the fourth year, some new plans are underway:

• The department began a pilot program in 2005-06, for interested fourth year students to participate in a quarter long co-op and design studio experience with an architecture firm. This program (The Professional Studio Program) allows students to work on actual firm projects for pay along with taking a fourth year design studio at the firm for academic credit. Students obtain 8 units of Co-op Credit (Professional Elective) and 5 Units of 4th Year Design Studio and Professional Practice activity course credit. The principles in the firm act as the studio design critics and they also work with department faculty to establish project and learning objectives. Following that successful pilot program (10 students during the 2005-06 academic year and one firm) the department expanded this program to include three large firms in 2006-07. For 2007–08 four architecture firms have committed to participate in the Professional Studio Program. The department is continuing to expand the number of architecture firms that will participate in this program.

• The mix of faculty teaching in fourth year has been changed to include visiting professionals along with recently hired and tenured faculty, so students will have an opportunity to experience a variety of approaches and building types in their design studios.

• The fourth year faculty developed a white paper June 2006 to define the overall education goals for the fourth year. The recommendations of this white paper will continue to be discussed with the entire faculty during 2007-2008. Implementation priorities will be established from these discussions.

PART 4 — NAAB Visiting Team Report - "Changes To The Accredited Program"

The department has hired a permanent department head, Henri de Hahn, who started August 2006.

There are no other changes to the accredited program or reports on any other topic the program wants to bring to the attention of the NAAB that may affect its adherence to the Conditions.
### STUDENT DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 Year</th>
<th>B.Arch</th>
<th>B.Arch</th>
<th>M.Arch</th>
<th>M.Arch</th>
<th>M.Arch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PreProf Five-year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Working Part-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Stud. Serv. by Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Students*</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Isle Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Degrees Awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Afr.-Amer</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Amer. Ind.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Asi/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Hispanics</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min Req. SAT/ACT/GRE Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>varies w/gpa (CSU requirement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Applicants</td>
<td></td>
<td>1782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Target/Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Studio/Faculty Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>18:01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Include Eskimos and Aleuts

**Includes four-year program component of 4+1 yrs. B.Arch degree and 4+2 yrs. M. Arch degree.

***Non-Professional: baccalaureate degree that is not part of an accredited professional program.

### FACILITY/RESOURCE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Library LCNA or 720-729 Collection</td>
<td>613 (LCNA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Architecture Collection in Departmental Library</td>
<td>1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library LCNA or 720-729 Collection</td>
<td>16,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Architecture Collection in University Library</td>
<td>10,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Library Architecture Slides</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library Architecture Slides</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Library Architecture Videos</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff in Dept. Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Computer Stations</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Spent on Information Technology</td>
<td>91,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget for Library Resources</td>
<td>50,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per-Capita Financial Support Received from University</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Outside Monies Received by Source</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Area (Net Sq. ft.)</td>
<td>49,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area (Gross Sq. ft.)</td>
<td>61,428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77376</td>
<td>83114</td>
<td>90924</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64260</td>
<td>69670</td>
<td>73872</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53832</td>
<td>58155</td>
<td>62100</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46056</td>
<td>60224</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FACULTY DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Total</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Faculty</th>
<th>Tenured Faculty</th>
<th>Tenure-Track Positions</th>
<th>FTE Administrative Positions</th>
<th>Faculty Engaged in Service to Comm.</th>
<th>Faculty Engaged in Service to Univ.</th>
<th>FT Faculty who are U.S. Licensed Registered Architects</th>
<th>PT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk</th>
<th>FT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Total</th>
<th>Ph.D.</th>
<th>M.A. or S.</th>
<th>Prof. M. Arch</th>
<th>B. Arch</th>
<th>Post Prof. Masters</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **FT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk**: 
- **PT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk**: 

### Faculty Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc.</th>
<th>Assist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Include Eskimos and Aleuts

June 2007
PART 2 — NAAB Visiting Team Report - "II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation"

CONDITION "NOT MET"

12.29 Comprehensive Design

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.

Response:

• Following the recent adoption of curriculum changes (started 2005-6) that improved technical support course sequencing, and content integration, along with reducing the total number of B.Arch units; the department is in the process of establishing program-level learning outcomes and methods for monitoring student attainment of learning outcomes through appropriate direct and indirect assessment methods. The design level coordinators in collaboration with the other area coordinators (practice, history & ECS) have developed a draft white paper June 2006 that proposes a series of recommendations for improving learning outcomes assessment of all courses within the curriculum. These recommendations will be discussed with the entire faculty 2006-2007, and implementation priorities established so the department can focus on improving the visible manifestation of mechanical systems in design studio projects.

CONDITIONS "MET", BUT WITH VISITING TEAM COMMENTARY

5. Human Resources

Limited staffing impedes access and/or use of the photo lab, the shop, and the Media Resource Center (MRC). The university administration indicates that these issues are in the process of being resolved.

Response:

• The ability of the college to hire students again as part of the Lydia Humphrey Scholarship Program to help in the staffing of these resources has been resolved as of Summer 2005. Under the new scholarship guidelines the annual reward amount has been increased and students can now be hired from any one of the five departments (not limited to architecture students anymore) in the college.

7. Physical Resources

Current studios are filled to capacity with 18 students per section. These studios do not currently accommodate space for in-class reviews. This is a hardship. Due to the lack of gallery space, final project reviews are difficult.

Response:

• A priority of the department is keeping enrollment at this capacity level.

• During the summer of 2005 the department installed pinnacle board (tack surface) in several rooms, and converted an additional classroom to a seminar setting with tack board on the walls. These changes will provide much needed pin-up and critique space throughout the year.
12.22 Building Systems Integration
While there was overall evidence of the ability to integrate various building systems, there was only general evidence of the ability to integrate mechanical systems. The team found this criterion minimally met.

Response: • See the response to 12.29 Comprehensive Design.

PART 3 — NAAB Visiting Team Report - "5. Causes of Concern"

• 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.

Response:

• The college-based fees (CBF), a supplemental fee collected from all students in the department, is considered a temporary solution for offsetting the department’s state funding shortfall. We are looking into increasing the amount of private funding for the department to offset dwindling state funding. That will allow us to improve the financial support for faculty development and increase the annual allocations for operating and equipment (O&E) expenses.

The CSU is anticipating some easement in funding shortfalls due to California’s recent economic upswing. In addition, there is pending legislation that will require that all CSU registration and housing fees remain in a trust fund to be allocated strictly to the CSU. If this legislation passes, it is anticipated that there will be less scramble for State general fund dollars, and again should ease the financial stress on the campus and department.

• 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.

Response:

• The University is attempting to deal with the cost of housing challenge for new faculty with the construction of a faculty housing project with the first phase of homes available the end of 2006, according to the information on the Cal Poly Housing Corporation web Site. One of our probationary faculty has already secured a unit in this new housing development. The department is unsure at this time what impact of this housing project will have in assisting the new department future probationary hires.

• The department has had a 100% acceptance rate of all five of the first choice probationary faculty candidates during the 2004-2005 search. The high quality of the applicant pool allowed the department to hire five faculty as opposed to three. Of these, four new faculty started fall 2005 and one will start fall 2006.

• After a failed permanent department head search 2004-2005, a new department head has been hired and he will start August 2006.

• The department has recently adopted (January 2005) new guidelines for Appointment Retention Promotion Tenure (ARPT), but the first cycle of faculty to follow these procedures was not until the 2005 – 2006. The ARPT guidelines have been helpful to faculty in clarifying the expectations of the department for faculty development.
• To assist faculty in understanding available department resources, the department recently updated the following policies (January 2005): Sabbatical/Difference In Pay, Computer, and Travel.

• **While advising services are available, they are inadequate in supporting the needs of the majority of the students.**

**Response:**

• The department is taking steps to clarify and promote the advising services to students. The move of the advising office fall 2005 from a room within the department to a more visible and highly student trafficked location off of the College lobby next to the College's Advising Center Director, seems to have helped. The department's Web Site redesigned January 2005 has enhanced the availability of curriculum information that students can access. Additional advising resources are continuing to be added to the web site as they are developed.

• Starting Fall 2005 Faculty advisors visited all freshman design classes to introduce themselves and the advising services available in the department. This mass orientation included information for all architecture students on curriculum (architecture, support and general education) requirements, as well as services offered by the department and college advising centers. This in depth advising orientation will be conducted every fall quarter.

• Beginning with grades for Winter Quarter 2006, the department is conducting a more thorough review of grades and progress in the major for every architecture student. Students who either fail a major or support course, or who appear not to be making significant progress in the major are being called in to meet with advisors. The results of this first effort proved very promising, and both students and advisors appreciated the opportunity to discuss progress and study plans. The new level of mandatory advising should prove helpful in the future and will be continued.

• **There is a 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.**

**Response:**

• Since half of the fourth year students go off campus to participate in established study abroad programs, many students that remain on campus fourth year (the reasons for staying range from academic, financial, and personal) feel there should be a greater variety of academic opportunities available. The department is in the process of redefining the role, experiences and overall education goals for fourth year.

While the department is redefining the fourth year, some new plans are underway:

• The department began a pilot program in 2005-2006, for interested fourth year students to participate in a quarter long co-op and design studio experience with an architecture firm. This program (The Professional Studio Program) allows students to work on actual firm projects along with taking a fourth design studio in the firm. The principles in the firm act as the studio design critics and they also work with department faculty to establish project and learning objectives. This has been a successful pilot program that included the participation of 10 students during the 2005-2006 academic year and one firm. One additional firm has committed to participate in the Professional Studio Program for 2006 – 2007 and three other firms have expressed interest.
• The mix of faculty teaching in fourth year has been changed to include visiting professionals along with recently hired and tenured faculty, so students will have an opportunity to experience a variety of approaches and building types in their design studios.

• The fourth year faculty developed a white paper June 2006 to define the overall education goals for the fourth year. The recommendations of this white paper will be discussed with the entire faculty during 2006-2007. Implementation priorities will be established from these discussions.

PART 4 — NAAB Visiting Team Report - "Changes To The Accredited Program"

There have been no changes to the accredited program or reports on any other topic the program wants to bring to the attention of the NAAB that may affect its adherence to the Conditions.
**STUDENT DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For Accredited Programs Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Design Studio Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Working Part-Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Stud. Serv. by Dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Students*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Isle Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Degrees Awarded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Afr.-Amer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Afr. Ind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Asi/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Hispanics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min Req. SAT/ACT/GRE Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Applicants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Target/Goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Studio/Faculty Ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Include Eskimos and Aleuts

**Includes four-year program component of 4+1 yrs. B.Arch degree and 4+2 yrs. M. Arch degree.

***Non-Professional: baccalaureate degree that is not part of an accredited professional program.

**FACILITY/RESOURCE DATA**

| Department Library LCNA or 720-729 Collection | 613 (LCNA) |
| Total Architecture Collection in Departmental Library | 1319 |
| University Library LCNA or 720-729 Collection | 16,465 |
| Total Architecture Collection in University Library | 10,120 |
| Departmental Library Architecture Slides | 125,000 |
| University Library Architecture Slides | 0 |
| Departmental Library Architecture Videos | 201 |
| Staff in Dept. Library | 1 |
| Number of Computer Stations | 55 |
| Amount Spent on Information Technology | 91,854 |
| Annual Budget for Library Resources | 50,972 |
| Per-Capita Financial Support Received from University | n.a. |
| Private Outside Monies Received by Source | n.a. |
| Studio Area (Net Sq. ft.) | 49,916 |
| Total Area (Gross Sq. ft.) | 61,428 |
**FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77376</td>
<td>83114</td>
<td>90924</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64260</td>
<td>69670</td>
<td>73872</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53832</td>
<td>58155</td>
<td>62100</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46056</td>
<td>60224</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACULTY DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Category</th>
<th>Department Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Faculty</td>
<td>43.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Positions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Administrative Positions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Engaged in Service to Comm.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Engaged in Service to Univ.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty who are U.S. Licensed Registered Architects</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Include Eskimos and Aleuts*
NAAB Visiting Team Report - "5. Causes of Concern"

• 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.

Response:

• The college-based fees (CBF), a supplemental fee collected from all students in the department, is considered a temporary solution for offsetting the department's state funding shortfall. We are looking into increasing the amount of private funding for the department to off-set dwindling state funding. That will allow us to improve the financial support for faculty development and increase the annual allocations for operating and equipment (O&E) expenses.

• 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.

Response:

• The University is attempting to deal with the cost of housing problem for new faculty with the construction of a faculty housing project to be completed by the beginning of next year. The department is unsure at this time what impact of this housing project will have in assisting the new department probabilatory hires.

• The department has had a 100% acceptance rate of all five of the first choice probationary faculty candidates during the 2004-2005 search. The high quality of the applicant pool allowed the department to hire five faculty as opposed to three. Of these, four new faculty will start fall 2005 and one will start fall 2006.

• After a failed permanent department head search 2004-2005, a new search for department head is underway with the application deadline closing September 13, 2005.

• The department has recently adopted (January 2005) new guidelines for Appointment Retention Promotion Tenure (ARPT). The ARPT guidelines have been revised to clarify the expectations of the department for faculty development.

• To assist faculty in understanding available department resources, the department recently updated the following policies (January 2005): Sabbatical/Difference In Pay, Computer, and Travel.
• While advising services are available, they are inadequate in supporting the needs of the majority of the students.

Response:

• The department is taking steps to clarify and promote the advising services to students. Starting Fall 2005, the advising office is moving from a room within the department to a more visible and highly student trafficked location off of the College lobby. The department Web Site was recently redesigned (January 2005) to enhance the availability of curriculum information that students can access. Additional advising resources will be added to the web site as they are developed.

• Beginning Fall 2005 faculty advisors will visit all freshman design classes to introduce themselves and the advising services available in the department. This mass orientation will include information for all architecture students on curriculum (architecture, support and general education) requirements, as well as services offered by the department and college advising centers.

• There is a 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.

Response:

• Since half of the fourth year students go off campus to participate in established study abroad programs, many students that remain on campus fourth year (the reasons for staying range from academic, financial, and personal) feel there should be a greater variety of academic opportunities available. The department is in the process of redefining the role, experiences and overall education goals for fourth year.

While the department is redefining the fourth year, some new plans are underway:

• Starting 2005-2006, the department will begin a pilot program for interested fourth year students to participate in a quarter long internship with a local architecture firm. This internship allows students to work on actual firm projects along with taking a fourth design studio in the firm. The principles in the firm will act as the studio design critics and they will also work with department faculty to establish project and learning objectives. So far three students have signed up for this opportunity, even though it was announced at the end of Spring 2005. If this pilot program is successful it is anticipated that a full design section could participate and will run every quarter, improving the opportunities for fourth year students that stay on campus fourth year.

• Some newly hired tenured track faculty will be provided an opportunity to teach in the fourth year, so students will have an opportunity to experience new approaches to the design studio.
CONDITION "NOT MET"

12.29 Comprehensive Design
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.

Response:
• Following the recent adoption of curriculum changes (starting 2005-6) that improve technical support course sequencing, and content integration, along with reducing the total number of B.Arch units; the department is in the process of establishing program-level learning outcomes and methods for monitoring student attainment of learning outcomes through appropriate direct and indirect assessment methods. This change allows the department to focus on improving the visible manifestation of mechanical systems in design studio projects.

CONDITIONS "MET", BUT WITH VISITING TEAM COMMENTARY

5. Human Resources
Limited staffing impedes access and/or use of the photo lab, the shop, and the Media Resource Center (MRC). The university administration indicates that these issues are in the process of being resolved.

Response:
• The ability of the college to hire students again as part of the Lydia Humphrey Scholarship Program to help in the staffing of these resources has been resolved as of Summer 2005.

• The department's student college base fee (CBF) student committee did approve money, starting in 2005 to hire a shop assistant to keep this facility open for longer hours. The additional evening and weekend hours have proven beneficial to the students.

7. Physical Resources
Current studios are filled to capacity with 18 students per section. These studios do not currently accommodate space for in-class reviews. This is a hardship. Due to the lack of gallery space, final project reviews are difficult.

Response:
• A priority of the department is keeping enrollment at this capacity level.

• During the summer of 2005 the department installed pinnacle board (tack surface) in several rooms, and converted an additional classroom to a seminar setting with tack board on the walls. These changes will provide much needed pin-up and crit space throughout the year.

12.22 Building Systems Integration
While there was overall evidence of the ability to integrate various building systems, there was only general evidence of the ability to integrate mechanical systems. The team found this criterion minimally met.

Response: • See the response to 12.29 Comprehensive Design.
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#### STUDENT DATA

For Accredited Programs Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 Year</th>
<th>B.Arch</th>
<th>B.Arch</th>
<th>B.Arch</th>
<th>M.Arch</th>
<th>M.Arch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PreProf</strong></td>
<td><strong>PostPreProf</strong></td>
<td><strong>PostNonProf</strong></td>
<td><strong>PostNonProf</strong></td>
<td><strong>PostNonProf</strong></td>
<td><strong>PostNonProf</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Students</td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Students</td>
<td>793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Design Studio Students</td>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Working Part-Time</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Stud. Serv. by Dept.</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Students*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Isle Students</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin Students</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Students</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grads. Fin. Estab. No. Yrs.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Women</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Afri-Amer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Amer. Ind.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Asi/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Awarded Hispanics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min Req. SAT/ACT/GRE Score</td>
<td>varies w/gpa (CSU requirement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Applicants</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Accepted</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Target/Goal</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Studio/Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>18:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Include Eskimos and Aleuts
**Includes four-year program component of 4+1 yrs. B.Arch degree and 4+2 yrs. M. Arch degree.
***Non-Professional: baccalaureate degree that is not part of an accredited professional program.

---

#### FACILITY/RESOURCE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>556 (LCNA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Library LCNA or 720-729 Collection</td>
<td>1,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Architecture Collection in Departmental Library</td>
<td>9750 (LCNA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library LCNA or 720-729 Collection</td>
<td>12,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Architecture Collection in University Library</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Library Architecture Slides</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library Architecture Slides</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Library Architecture Videos</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff in Dept. Library</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Computer Stations</td>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Spent on Information Technology</td>
<td>6,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per-Capita Financial Support Received from University</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Outside Monies Received by Source</td>
<td>49,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Area (Net Sq. ft.)</td>
<td>61,428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69,164</td>
<td>82,231</td>
<td>97,482</td>
<td>76,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61,412</td>
<td>68,279</td>
<td>73,164</td>
<td>62,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43,340</td>
<td>53,885</td>
<td>58,200</td>
<td>48,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49,824</td>
<td>59,702</td>
<td>66,312</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FACULTY DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Department Total</th>
<th>NO. FULL-TIME FACULTY CREDENTIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ph.D. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Faculty</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>D. Arch 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>M.A. or S. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Positions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prof. M. Arch 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Administrative Positions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B. Arch 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Engaged in Service to Comm.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Post Prof. Masters 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Engaged in Service to Univ.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Faculty who are U.S. Licensed Registered Architects</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Other 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Faculty who are U.S. Licensed Registered Architects</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Architects</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Graduate TAs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc.</th>
<th>Assist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American Faculty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Faculty*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Island Faculty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin Faculty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Faculty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Include Eskimos and Aleuts
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5.2 Appendix 2 – List of Documents to be Available in the Team Room

Documents list (Available on program's Web Site and also in the team room):
http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/current/index.html
Located under " RESOURCES ":
AIA Diversity and Inclusion
Cal Poly Cheating and Plagiarism Policy
Cal Poly Diversity
Cal Poly Quick Facts
Cal Poly Sexual Harassment Prevention Policy
Cal Poly Students Rights and Responsibilities
CAED Construction Management Policy
CAED Wireless & Server Connection Guidelines
Computer Policy
Grading Policy
Studio Enrollment Policy
4th Year Off-Campus Policy
4th Year Portfolio Requirements
4th Year Independent Study Policy
Digital Fabrication Laboratory
Studio Use Policy
Time Conflict Request Policy

http://www.arch.calpoly.edu/administration/index.html
Located under " RESOURCES ":
Field Trip Guidelines
Search & Screen Process Policy
Advising Policy
Cheating and Plagiarism Policy
Construction Management Minor Policy
Curriculum Committee Policy
Faculty Development Funds Policy
ARPT
- Appointment, Retention, Promotion & Tenure Guidelines (.pdf)
- Peer Review Committee Membership & Procedures
- Periodic Evaluation Assistance
- Professional Development Plan Guidelines
- Faculty Evaluation Report Guidelines
- Syllabus Guidelines
- Student Work Portfolio Guidelines
- Curriculum Vitae Guidelines

Additional Documents Available in Team Room
- Diversity Learning Objectives
- Shared Governance Document (Draft)
- Learning Culture Policy (Draft)
- Memoranda: 10/07/08; 06/19/09; and 11/16/09 Regarding Five-Year Enrollment Plan
- AeDPress Publications List and Publications
- Academic Standards for Faculty
- Appointment, Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (ARPT) Guidelines
- Faculty Workload Policy
- List of Professional Development
- List of Field Trips
- Copies of letters and emails sent to parents, alumni, donors, and potential supporters
- Copies of Periodic Surveys
- Cal Poly Career Services Statistics
- Projected Enrollment Chart
- Professional Development and Field Trip Expenditures
- Sampling of Selected Transfer Student Criteria and Related Evidence
- Cal Poly Campaign Priorities + CAED 2020 Vision
- Plans of Physical Plant