

Architecture Department
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California
November 30, 2011

Prepared by Thomas Fowler IV, AIA, NCARB
Program Administrator: Henri de Hahn
Date of last accreditation visit: February 12 - February 16, 2011

PART 2 — NAAB Visiting Team Report - "II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation"

CONDITION "NOT MET"

Student Performance Criteria

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

[X] Not Met

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

Response:

Year level coordinators will develop strategies for integrating this requirement across all design studios sections in both ARCH 353 (Third Year Building Design Course) and ARCH 481 (Fifth Year Thesis Building Design Course).

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

- A.2. Design Thinking Skills**
- A.4. Technical Documentation**
- A.5. Investigative Skills**
- A.8. Ordering Systems**
- A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture**
- B.2. Accessibility**
- B.3. Sustainability**
- B.4. Site Design**
- B.5. Life Safety**
- B.8. Environmental Systems**
- B.9. Structural Systems**

[X] Not Met

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

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

Response:

See B.5 response.

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

[X] Not Met

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

Response:

See B.5 response.