WOODBURY UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

Architecture Program Report for 2015 Visit for Continuing Accreditation

Master of Architecture (MArch)
Pre-professional degree plus minimum 63 graduate credits
Non-pre-professional degree plus minimum 93 graduate credits

Bachelor of Architecture (BArch)
Minimum 160 undergraduate credits

Previous visit: 2012 (MArch) and 2008 (BArch)

“The executive committee approved the following: 1. The term of continuing accreditation for the B.Arch. is extended by one year to 2015. 2. The request to schedule a concurrent review of both the B.Arch. and the M.Arch. is approved. 3. This action will align the visit schedule for both programs, as proposed by Woodbury in its February 28 request,” (March 22, 2013).

“As a result, the professional architecture program Master of Architecture was formally granted a three-year term of initial accreditation, (March 20, 2013).

“After reviewing the Focused Evaluation Program Report submitted by Woodbury University School of Architecture as part of the focused evaluation of its Bachelor of Architecture program, in conjunction with the Focused Evaluation Team Report, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has found that the changes made or planned by the program to remove the identified deficiencies are satisfactory,” (November 4, 2011).

“As a result, the professional architecture program Bachelor of Architecture was formally granted a six-year term of accreditation with the stipulation that a focused evaluation be scheduled in three years to look only at Human Resources and Financial Resources and the progress that has been made in those areas,” (July 22, 2008).

Submitted to the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB)
September 7, 2014
SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

Norman Millar, AIA, Dean
norman.millar@woodbury.edu
818.252.5130

Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, AIA, Associate Dean
ingalill.wahlroos-ritter@woodbury.edu
818.252.5185

Marc Neveu, PhD, Chair of Architecture, Los Angeles
marc.neveu@woodbury.edu
818.252.5180

Catherine Herbst, AIA, Chair of Architecture, San Diego
catherine.herbst@woodbury.edu
619.235.2900 x.412

LOS ANGELES
7500 Glenoaks Boulevard, Burbank/LA, CA 91510
818.252.5121

SAN DIEGO
2212 Main Street, San Diego, CA 92113
619.235.2900

WOODBURY UNIVERSITY

Luís Ma. Calingo, PhD, President
president@woodbury.edu
818.252.5101

David Dauwalder, PhD, Executive Vice President and Provost
david.dauwalder@woodbury.edu
818.252.5116

Submitting the report and person to whom questions should be addressed: Associate Dean Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Woodbury University School of Architecture thanks the many members of the university community who contributed to this report. In particular we acknowledge the contributions of Nedra Peterson, University Librarian, Tamara Blok, Registrar's Office, Kenneth Jones, Vice President of Finance and Administration, Celestia (Cleo) Williams, Director of Enrollment Services Group, Mauro Diaz, Interim Vice President of Enrollment Management, Shari Gibbons, Chief Marketing Officer, and Phyllis Cremer, Vice President of Student Development. We also thank the many staff members who work in these offices.

We gratefully acknowledge the moral and intellectual support of David Dauwalder, Executive Vice President and Provost.

Many members of our faculty contributed directly to this report; we thank you for your time and thoughtful assessments. We extend our gratitude to Galina Kraus, Nare Gabrielyan and the School of Architecture work-study assistants for assembling, organizing and formatting data for the report. We are grateful for the precise and speedy expertise of Institutional Researcher Bruce Feinstein. Special thanks go to Vic Liptak, who offered much needed help with the final assembly of information.

This is our first architecture program report that includes both undergraduate and graduate professional programs at both locations. We acknowledge the dedication and continued support of Dean Emeritus Louis M. Naidorf, FAIA, who took us to our very first NAAB accreditation and well beyond.

We speak for the faculty, students, alumni and staff in recognizing the immense contribution to the Woodbury School of Architecture made by our colleague, Professor Nick Roberts, AIA. We dedicate this report to his memory and to the future he helped make possible.

Norman Millar, AIA
Dean, Woodbury School of Architecture

Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, AIA
Associate Dean, Woodbury School of Architecture

Marc Neveu, PhD
Chair of Architecture LA

Catherine Herbst, AIA
Chair of Architecture SD
Part One. Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement

1 Identity and Self-Assessment
   1. History and Mission
   2. Learning Culture and Social Equity
   3. Response to the Five Perspectives
   4. Long-Range Planning
   5. Self-Assessment Procedures

2 Resources
   1. Human Resources and Human Resource Development
   2. Administrative Structure and Governance
   3. Physical Resources
   4. Financial Resources
   5. Information Resources

3 Institutional Characteristics
   1. Statistical Reports
   2. Annual Reports
   3. Faculty Credentials

4 Policy Review

Part Two. Educational Outcomes and Curriculum

1 Student Performance Criteria
   1. Overview of Curricular Goals
   2. Matrix

2 Curricular Framework
   1. Regional Accreditation
   2. Professional Degrees & Curriculum
   3. Curriculum Review & Development

3 Evaluation of Preparatory/Pre-professional Education

4 Public Information
   1. Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees
   2. Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
   3. Access to Career Development Information
   4. Public Access to APRs & VTRs
   5. ARE Pass Rates

Part Three. Progress Since the Last Site Visit

1 Summary of Responses to the Team Finding
   1. Responses to Conditions Not Met
   2. Responses to Causes of Concern

2 Summary of Responses to Changes in the NAAB Conditions
Part Four. Supplemental Information

1 Course Descriptions and Supporting Curricular Information 103
2 Faculty Matrix and Resumes 115
3 Visiting Team Reports of 2008 and 2012 200
4 Catalog, Student Handbook, and Faculty Handbook URLs 276
5 Response to Offsite Program Questionnaire 277

6 Appendices
   1. Manifesto for Studio Culture 279
   2. School of Architecture facilities 282
   3. Architecture faculty and student development 289
   4. Lectures, exhibits and visiting critics 294
   5. WASC reaffirmation letter (regional accreditation) 299
Part One (I): Institutional Support and Commitment to Continual Improvement

I.1 Identity and Self-Assessment

I.1.1 History and Mission: Woodbury School of Architecture

With facilities located in Burbank/Los Angeles and San Diego, the Woodbury School of Architecture offers a five-year, NAAB-accredited, professional Bachelor of Architecture (BArch), a two- and three-year NAAB-accredited professional Master of Architecture (MArch), a one-year post-professional Master of Science in Architecture (MSArch) specializing in Real Estate Development, Landscape and Urbanism, Drylands Design or Urban Policy, a CIDA- and NASAD-accredited Bachelor of Fine Arts in Interior Architecture (BFAIA), and a two- and three-year Master of Interior Architecture (MIA).

Woodbury University’s School of Architecture (SoA) is committed to investigating and extending the social, urban, economic, environmental, technological, and formal dimensions of architecture. The school emphasizes, analyzes, and debates the role of the architect/citizen as cultural communicator and builder responsive to societal and environmental challenges. We integrate into the curriculum recent innovations in computer-aided design, multimedia, and sustainable technologies. Our students reflect the region’s vitality and diversity, and are our greatest asset. We provide them with a strong skill base, rich interdisciplinary dialog, and generous support resources.

We are an intensely urban school that at the same time recognizes and explores its deep embeddedness in the surrounding landscapes. We focus acutely on the distinct problems and opportunities of socially, culturally, and environmentally sustainable space making in Los Angeles, San Diego, Tijuana, Southern California and the American West. At the same time, we offer extensive opportunities for international study in Latin America, Asia, and Europe.

We maintain a critical, inventive, resourceful, and exceptionally dedicated faculty representing diverse interests and strengths. We train our students, who are ethnically, economically, and academically diverse, as articulate critical thinkers and highly capable practitioners, confident in local as well as global discourse. Issues of sustainability, responsible advocacy, and appropriate and innovative use of materials and manufacturing processes are raised throughout our programs, and an entrepreneurial spirit of agility and risk-taking is a hallmark of our faculty’s approach.

Woodbury School of Architecture delivers a strong and effective education that has garnered regional attention and national prominence. Woodbury students distinguish themselves in local, regional and national design competitions and scholarship awards; our BArch alumni often go on to elite graduate schools. All of our graduates enter the workforce with a reputation for having strong professional skills. Enrollment in the school has more than doubled since 2000.

I.1.1.A Dean’s Vision

The School of Architecture is emerging as a strong international leader in architectural education. Our vision for the next five-year cycle is to solidify our commitment to critically effective architecture-by focusing on issue-oriented problems, challenges and opportunities of a globalized 21st century and within the diversifying practices of architecture that our graduates will construct. Specifically these include:

• The influences associated with the Pacific Rim and our direct connections with Latin America and Asia,
• The challenges associated with sprawl and the growth of cities worldwide such as water supply, energy, infrastructure, transit, affordable housing, border issues, climate change, and natural disasters,
• Emerging ideas about alternative practices, policy, and forms of entrepreneurship, and
• The opportunities identified with Southern California as a multicultural center of innovative contemporary design and lifestyle.
In the late 19th century, Los Angeles was a rapidly growing city with a population of approximately 11,000. New business enterprises were being established and community leaders looked forward to expansion and growth driven by a real estate boom. In 1884, responding to the needs of the city’s growing business community, F.C. Woodbury, an educator and entrepreneur, arrived from San Francisco and founded Woodbury Business College, as it was initially named. The link between Woodbury and the economic infrastructure of Southern California began from a historic storefront on North Main Street in the center of the local business community. By World War I, Woodbury College had established a solid reputation for individual instruction – an approach that continues today. The following is a timeline of major developments since World War I:

• 1926 Woodbury is chartered by the State of California as a collegiate educational institution of higher learning conferring graduate and undergraduate degrees.
• 1931 Woodbury becomes a college of business administration and design, establishing the division of professional arts focusing on three design fields closely allied to business: interior, fashion, and graphic design.
• 1937 Woodbury builds new classroom and administration facilities at 1027 Wilshire Blvd.
• 1961 Woodbury is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).
• 1969 Woodbury changes its charter and adds the Master of Business Administration (MBA) program.
• 1972 Woodbury becomes a non-profit institute of higher learning.
• 1974 Woodbury College becomes Woodbury University.
• 1985 Woodbury University acquires a 22-acre campus in northern Los Angeles straddling the boundary with the city of Burbank (former home of one of the nation’s oldest convents), adding new classroom and administration buildings over the next two years.
• 1987 Woodbury University moves to its north LA campus from downtown.
• 1994 Woodbury organizes its undergraduate and graduate programs into three schools: the School of Architecture and Design, with departments of architecture, fashion design, graphic design, and interior design; the School of Business and Management, with departments of accounting, business and management, computer information systems, and marketing; and the School of Arts and Sciences, with departments of humanities and of natural and social sciences, to provide a full range of general education courses.
• 1996 Woodbury gains Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) status with the federal government.
• 1998 Woodbury converts to a semester system from a quarter system.
• 1998 Woodbury establishes an additional location for its BArch program in San Diego in conjunction with Mesa Community College at the former Point Loma Naval Air Station under the direction of Geraldine Forbes, and changes the name of its Interior Design program to Interior Architecture.
• 2001 Woodbury receives its first HSI grant of $2.2 million from the federal government to renovate its Information Technology Systems (ITS), improve the teaching of basic skills and foundation courses, and support faculty development and technology in the classrooms.
• 2001 Woodbury’s Board of Trustees embarks on a capital campaign to implement a 10-year Master Plan, beginning with the conversion of the former gymnasium into a new design center (2001); including the addition of a new Woody’s Café to the Cabrini Auditorium (2002); a new 340-car parking lot on the upper campus (2006); a new 23,000-square-foot School of Business building including a 250-seat auditorium on the main quad (2008); a new 19,000-square-foot architecture studio building in the LA architecture complex (2008); a new 27,000-square-foot facility in the Barrio Logan district of southeast downtown for the San Diego architecture program (2008); and the new Isaacs Faculty Center in the converted Wilshire Hall, providing each fulltime faculty member with a private office for the first time (2009).
• 2004 Woodbury’s Faculty Association adopts a Faculty Senate mode of governance.
• 2005 Woodbury’s School of Business and Management refines its name to the School of Business, housing the departments of accounting, business & management, and marketing in anticipation of a bid for accreditation by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB).
• 2006 Woodbury’s School of Arts and Sciences is reorganized into the Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies (ITS), housing the departments of math and natural science, art history, academic writing, politics and history, and interdisciplinary studies.
• 2007 Woodbury’s School of Architecture and Design is reorganized into two new schools: the School of Architecture and the School of Media, Culture & Design, the latter housing the departments of animation, communication, fashion design, graphic design, interior architecture and psychology.
• 2008 Woodbury achieves National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) accreditation in the departments of interior architecture, graphic design, fashion design and animation.
• 2008 Woodbury establishes the Arid Lands Institute in the School of Architecture directed by Hadley Arnold and Peter Arnold.
• 2009 Woodbury’s School of Architecture receives a $2.8 million 5-year HSI PPOHA grant from the Department of Education to expand programming. Its Arid Lands Institute receives a Housing and Urban Development grant for $600,000, with an additional $100,000 in support from community collaborators including the City of Burbank and Rio Arriba County, New Mexico.
• 2010 Woodbury’s School of Media, Culture & Design receives a 5-year HSI grant of $3.2 million to develop new programs in filmmaking, game arts & design, and media technology.
• 2012 Woodbury University inaugurates its thirteenth president, Dr. Luis Calingo.
• 2014 Woodbury’s School of Business receives its initial Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) accreditation.
• 2014 Woodbury has a current graduate and undergraduate enrollment of over 1,600 students, with more than a third of those in the School of Architecture, nearly the same in the School of Business, and about a quarter in the School of Media, Culture & Design and ITS. The university, responding to its mission of professional and liberal arts education, now anticipates growth to over 3,500 students by 2025.

I.1.1.C University Mission Adopted 2013

CORE PURPOSE: Why we exist and what we do
Woodbury University empowers people to do extraordinary things. We transform students into liberally educated professionals and socially responsible citizens by integrating the four pillars of transdisciplinarity, design thinking, entrepreneurship, and civic engagement into all programs:

Transdisciplinarity
Thinking and acting holistically by bridging multiple perspectives and practices

Design Thinking
Creating impactful solutions by linking needs and functions to limits and possibilities

Entrepreneurship
Pursuing visionary opportunities to realize innovative knowledge, practice or product

Civic Engagement
Strengthening communities by actively applying critical knowledge, skills and values

We achieve academic excellence by creating external partnerships, implementing effective internal processes, and ensuring quality in all programs and services.

OUR CONTRIBUTION TO SOCIETY: What our graduates do
Successful Woodbury graduates are ambassadors for the university. They are innovative leaders who help individuals and communities flourish. They are known for being strong communicators, ethical thinkers and creative problem-solvers with a deep commitment to sustainability and social justice. They are knowledgeable in their disciplines and eager for collaboration and continuous learning. They integrate professional skills with global citizenship, entrepreneurial energy, and intellectual curiosity. Woodbury graduates make a difference.
VISION: Our desired future state
By 2025, our distinctive ability to integrate transdisciplinarity, design thinking, entrepreneurship, and civic engagement in education and scholarship will have secured us a place among the top 100 regional universities in the United States. Our core values or the principles that guide us are:
Community – Integrity – Professionalism – Aspiration -- Agility

Woodbury University is committed to providing the highest level of professional and liberal arts education. The integrated nature of our educational environment cultivates successful students with a strong and enduring sense of personal and social responsibility. We prepare innovative learners who are adept at communicating and willing to cross the boundaries of knowledge in a rapidly changing and complex world.

I.1.1.D School of Architecture History

The following is a timeline of major developments toward and within the School of Architecture, starting with the launch of the interior design program in 1931:

• 1931 Woodbury College launches an interior design program.
• 1984 Woodbury University adds a new architecture major directed by Don Conway.
• 1994 Woodbury receives its initial NAAB accreditation under the leadership of Lou Naidorf.
• 1996 Woodbury completes a new architecture studios building.
• 1996 Woodbury hires Linda Pollari as chair of interior design.
• 1997 Woodbury’s BArch program receives its first 5-year NAAB term.
• 1998 Woodbury establishes an additional location for its BArch program in San Diego in conjunction with Mesa Community College at the former Point Loma Naval Air Station under the direction of Geraldine Forbes, and changes the name of interior design to interior architecture.
• 1999 Woodbury hires Norman Millar as chair of architecture.
• 2001 Woodbury’s San Diego BArch program moves to a downtown location at 8th and C.
• 2002 Woodbury hires Randy Stauffer as chair of interior architecture.
• 2005 Woodbury’s department of architecture initiates a 12-month post-professional master’s degree in Real Estate Development for architects in San Diego, and the department of interior architecture is accredited by FIDER (now CIDA).
• 2005 Woodbury’s School of Architecture receives a $1 million gift from the renowned architectural photographer Julius Shulman, which makes it possible for Woodbury to establish the Julius Shulman Institute.
• 2007 Woodbury’s School of Architecture establishes a $50,000 annual Maxine Stussy Frankel Faculty/Student awards program thanks to a $1 million endowment in the Frankel Foundation.
• 2007 Woodbury’s School of Architecture receives the collection of West Coast modern painter Jan Stussy from the Frankel Foundation, valued at over $4 million.
• 2007 Woodbury’s School of Architecture and Design is reorganized into two new schools: the School of Architecture and the School of Media, Culture & Design. Norman Millar becomes the director of the School of Architecture, Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter and Catherine Herbst become Associate Directors of LA and SD respectively.
• 2008 Norman Millar becomes the dean of the School of Architecture, Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter and Catherine Herbst became the chairs of LA and SD programs.
• 2008 The new 19,000-square-foot architecture studio building is erected and occupied in the LA architecture complex.
• 2008 Woodbury’s San Diego BArch program moves to a renovated 27,000-square-foot facility in Barrio Logan just southeast of downtown San Diego.
• 2008 Woodbury’s interior architecture program achieves National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) accreditation.
• 2008 The school houses the newly-established Arid Lands Institute directed by Hadley Arnold and Peter Arnold.
2009 Woodbury’s department of interior architecture leaves the School of Media, Culture & Design and joins the School of Architecture.

2009 Woodbury’s School of Architecture launches its MArch program, Barbara Bestor is appointed LA graduate chair, and Vic Liptak is appointed School of Architecture associate dean.

2009 Woodbury’s School of Architecture receives a $2.8 million 5-year HSI PPOHA grant from the Department of Education to expand programming. The Arid Lands Institute receives a Housing and Urban Development grant for $600,000, with an additional $100,000 in support from community collaborators including the City of Burbank and Rio Arriba County, New Mexico.

2010 SoA establishes the new Architecture + Civic Engagement (ACE) Center, arising from the former CCRD and reinventing the engagement of community and architecture.

2010 Woodbury hires Cathryn Copper as San Diego Librarian.

2011 Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter is appointed LA architecture graduate chair, Jeanine Centuori appointed LA architecture undergrad chair, SoA Communications Office is established and Mimi Zeiger is hired as its inaugural director.

2012 Vic Liptak is appointed interim senior vice president of Academic Affairs, Randy Stauffer is appointed associate dean, Kristin King is appointed interior architecture interim chair, SoA Career and Outreach Office is established, Catherine Roussel is hired as the SoA Career and Outreach coordinator.

2012 Woodbury’s MArch program receives its initial NAAB accreditation. Hector Perez is appointed coordinator of the San Diego MArch program.

2013 Randy Stauffer is appointed associate vice president of Academic Affairs, Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter is appointed SoA associate dean, Eric Olsen is appointed interim LA graduate chair.

2013 SoA establishes the Urban Policy Center under the direction of Bill Roschen and Christi Van Cleve.

2013 Jesse Brink is hired as communications director.

2014 Marc Neveu is hired as LA chair of architecture, Mark Ericson and Ewan Branda are appointed LA graduate and undergraduate coordinators respectively, Christoph Korner is hired as chair of interior architecture. With administrative reorganization, Catherine Herbst remains SD chair of architecture for both BArch and MArch programs. Hector Perez remains graduate coordinator in SD.

2014 School of Architecture launches the Master of Interior Architecture program.

The school itself is emerging as a leader in architecture education. Milestones since our 2008 visit include:

- “The Future Belongs to Woodbury,” cover article in the March 2011 issue of Architect, the magazine of the AIA
- 2011 ACSA Administrators Conference in Hollywood, CA, successfully co-chaired by Woodbury Dean Norman Millar and UC Berkeley Professor Margaret Crawford
- Emergence of the new Architecture + Civic Engagement (ACE) Center, arising from the former CCRD and reinventing the engagement of community and architecture
- Election of Dean Norman Millar to the ACSA presidency in 2012 (he is currently past president through June 2015)
- Arid Lands Institute initiatives including the school-wide fall 2011 semester of water and culminating in the national Drylands Design Conference in March 2012
- Interior Architecture program named as among the nation’s top 10 by Design Intelligence in Fall 2010
- Both undergraduate and graduate programs in architecture named as among the best 10 in the west by Design Intelligence, Fall 2011
- Randall Stauffer, chair of Interior Architecture, named by Design Intelligence as one of the most admired educators of 2012
- WUHO, our gallery space on Hollywood Boulevard, led by Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, emerging as an established Los Angeles event space shared with the LA Forum for Architecture and Urban Design
- State-of-the-art shop and digital fabrication equipment in place in the shops and labs in both Los Angeles and San Diego
- Dean Norman Millar awarded the LA AIA Educator Award in Fall 2014
I.1.1.E School of Architecture Mission

WOODBURY : ARCHITECTURE : TRANSFORMS

Consistent with the university’s mission, the School of Architecture is committed to the education and training of articulate and innovative design professionals. The curricula prepare our students to balance the need to work competitively in the marketplace with the equally important concerns of ethical conduct and social responsibility. Woodbury’s faculty, students and graduates are committed to architecture that is:

- **Intelligent**, articulating a critical position. We are architects and critical thinkers who produce other architects and critical thinkers.
- **Effective**, addressing the challenges of contemporary life. We believe in the radical possibilities of architecture’s social, environmental and formal relevance.
- **Transformative**, effecting change through the power of beauty and the potential of education.

The Woodbury architecture curricula integrate transdisciplinarity, design thinking, entrepreneurship, and civic engagement to support this mission through the development within our students of five areas of expertise: critical thinking, representation, design, building and professionalism.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity

The School of Architecture is committed to an architectural education that radically transforms our community members, the profession, and our surroundings. The learning culture at Woodbury School of Architecture is optimistic and promotes respect, sharing, innovation and engagement. It is continually renewed as instructors and returning students take an active role in introducing new students and faculty to good studio practices, making an explicit effort to articulate and model expectations of healthy studio culture, and reviewing and debating educational expectations each semester.

The Woodbury San Diego and Los Angeles chapters of the AIAS, including both undergrad and graduate architecture students, revised and refined our studio culture policy in spring 2010 into a Manifesto for Studio Culture; the new policy reflects greater student involvement in the construction of both their education and their attitude toward professional practice, and eloquently engages all community members in joint responsibility for the culture of learning here.

The Manifesto for Studio Culture spells out best practices our community embraces throughout the Woodbury architectural education. Students and faculty review and discuss the policy with each other at the beginning of each semester. The community expects each faculty member, each student, and each studio to abide by the policy, and to continually offer revisions and updates to it. The policy is assessed annually by the faculty, usually near the beginning of the academic year, and by the AIAS, usually near the end of the academic year. Suggestions for revisions or rethinking are shared between these two bodies, and changes are ratified by both. The current manifesto was proposed by the students in summer 2014 and will be reviewed and ratified by the faculty in fall 2014.

The School of Architecture supports a variety of ways to address breaches of the policy and other threats to the learning culture. First and foremost, students and instructors are encouraged to communicate early and openly with each other about perceived infractions. When a need arises to address studio culture issues more broadly than on a case-by-case basis within studio, active AIAS members and all students are expected to take their studio’s concerns to the AIAS for discussion and recommended action. The officers of the AIAS are also expected to bring recommendations for emending or enforcing the studio culture policy to the school administration or to a faculty meeting for discussion and action. Secondly, the school administration coordinates with the Office of Student Development to support open forums as needed at which students, faculty and administrators sit together to discuss issues of concern or importance. Actions resulting from the forum are disseminated to the school community via email and are also addressed at the next all-school meeting. Within the SoA, chairs, coordinators, the associate dean, and the dean maintain an open-door policy so that a student may bring an individual concern directly to a
person who can set a response in motion. Architecture faculty academic advisors and their student advisees mutually support each other’s engagement with the learning culture through one-on-one discussions each semester about academic planning, program expectations, and academic success.

The Manifesto for Studio Culture is distributed in all studios each semester and is posted on our website at architecture.woodbury.edu.

In addition to the studio culture manifesto and the general means noted above of fostering a learning environment of mutual respect and engagement, student leaders and school and program administrators initiate roundtables as needed or desired. These meetings bring together studio representatives and school/program administrators, who sit down together and discuss what’s working well, where the stressors are, and how we can continue to develop an environment of support. Student initiatives and events are proposed at the roundtable, and the administration gets valuable feedback on student aspirations, expectations, and even disappointments. Mid-semester roundtables have provided a safe environment for constructive criticism that instructors have been able to use to make positive adjustments. A program coordinator may also call for special topic roundtables as needed; for example, in January 2012 the graduate chair in LA organized an international graduate student roundtable. As a direct result of that discussion, the MArch program launched *Groundwork* for summer 2012, an immersive two-week summer program to prepare incoming students for graduate architecture work, including workshops in digital fabrication, shop safety and use, common software (Revit, Rhino, Illustrator), design thinking, time management and cultural expectations, in particular student-faculty communication and an introduction to studio culture and fieldwork. The success of *Groundwork* 2012 has led to its continued offering each subsequent year. Students at SoA roundtables can be confident that their concerns are not only heard but acted upon. Suggestions made by graduate students at a roundtable in spring 2012 resulted in the development of a graduate studio on the intersection of building and digital fabrication technologies, offered in fall 2013. And at the end of the 2013 spring semester, graduating graduate students requested a roundtable with the dean, chair and graduate faculty to request clarification about, and make suggestions for, the continuing development of the fall thesis preparation course (Criticism 4), thesis studio, and faculty thesis advisors.

The Woodbury University Faculty Association, in conjunction with the Office of Student Development, revised and ratified the university-wide academic honesty policy on Sept. 19, 2008. The policy preamble is reproduced here, as it eloquently states the university vision of shared responsibility for academic integrity:

"Because the integrity of the academic enterprise of any institution of higher education requires honesty in scholarship and research, academic honesty is required at Woodbury University. Academic integrity is important for two reasons. First, independent and original scholarship ensures that students and scholars derive the most from their educational experience and the pursuit of knowledge. Second, academic dishonesty violates the most fundamental values of a community of scholars and depreciates the achievements of the entire university community. Accordingly, Woodbury University views academic dishonesty as one of the most serious offenses that a member of our community can commit. Adherence to the Academic Honesty Policy reflects the commitment of our community to the ideals of learning, research, and scholarship."

The full policy may be found in the Student Handbook (URL in section IV.4). Every syllabus in the architecture curricula, both graduate and undergraduate, contains the following statement:

"POLICY ON ACADEMIC HONESTY
Woodbury University faculty and students have adopted an academic honesty policy that reflects and sustains the integrity of our work and the university. You are expected to know the policy and uphold it in practice and in spirit. The Academic Honesty Policy may be found on the Academic Affairs page on the Portal. The Academic Affairs site link is http://my.woodbury.edu/Staff/AA/default.aspx"
I.1.2.B Social Equity at Woodbury School of Architecture

Civic engagement is one of the four pillars of a Woodbury University education, and social responsibility is its foundation. Social equity, an aspiration arising from social responsibility, is a cherished value in the Woodbury architecture community of faculty, students, staff, and friends.

Woodbury University provides its faculty, students and staff, irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation, with an educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach and work.

In spring 2013, the university hired a special needs coordinator, Teresa Young, who reports to Vice President of Student Development Phyllis Cremer. There is now a University Special Needs Advisory Committee that reviews and recommends policies in support of our increasing special needs population.

The university’s policy on diversity and nondiscrimination is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students and staff through the University Catalog, the Student Handbook, the Faculty Handbook, and the university website:

“Woodbury University is committed to providing an environment that is free of any form of discrimination and harassment based upon an individual’s race, color, religion, sex, gender identity, pregnancy, national origin, ancestry, citizenship status, age, marital status, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, sexual orientation, military or veteran status, genetic information, or any other characteristic protected by applicable state or federal law, so that all members of the community are treated at all times with dignity and respect. It is the university’s policy, therefore, to prohibit all forms of such discrimination or harassment among university faculty, students, staff, and administration.”

Woodbury University’s equal employment/nondiscrimination clause and policy read as follows:

“Nondiscrimination Clause: Woodbury University agrees, and obligates vendors and/or contractors, not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of the employee’s or applicant’s race, religion, marital status, national origin, ancestry, citizenship, gender, sexual orientation, age or physical handicap, and that all contracts and subcontracts awarded by the university shall contain a like nondiscrimination clause.

“Policy: The university shall make a good faith effort to include within its employ members of underrepresented groups in numbers proportionate with the minority composition of the population of the County of Los Angeles.

“Procedures:
1. Equal Employment Practices
The University represents that it will provide equal employment practices through:
a. Ensuring that in its employment practices persons are employed and employees are treated equally and without regard to or because of race, religion, marital status, ancestry, national origin, citizenship, gender, sexual orientation, age or physical handicap.
b. Stating in solicitations or advertisements for employees that all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to their race, religion, ancestry, national origin, sex, age, or physical handicap. Such statement shall appear as “Woodbury University is an EEO/AA employer.”

2. Affirmative Action Plan
a. The university shall recruit and make efforts to promote applications from minorities through:
(1) Advertising employment opportunities in minority community news media as applicable.
(2) Encouraging present minority employees to refer friends and relatives.
b. The university shall continually evaluate personnel practices to ensure that hiring, upgrading, promotion, transfer, demotion, etc. are made to achieve and maintain an ethnically diverse work force.
c. The university shall make a good faith effort to contract with minority contractors, subcontractors and vendors for services and supplies by taking affirmative actions. Where problems are experienced in complying with affirmative action obligations, the University shall document its good faith effort to comply with the requirements.”
Criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, reappointments, compensation, and promotion are outlined in detail in the Faculty Handbook, Section C: Personnel Policy (URL in section IV.4). The Faculty Association has asked all academic divisions to prepare a school policy handbook to supplement the faculty handbook and identify policies and procedures specific to the academic division. The SoA handbook is in draft form; school faculty have approved a search committee guide and an information guide for new faculty. The school is committed to social equity in its faculty searches, and the faculty have a healthy ongoing debate about how to understand and increase diversity in the fulltime and adjunct faculty.

On July 18, 2014, the university approved a new policy on sexual misconduct, enhancing its former policy on Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Involving University Employees and satisfying Title IX requirements. The introduction to the policy is below; the full policy may be found on the university portal, (my.woodbury.edu, password protected), under Human Resources. (We will provide the team with access to appropriate password-protected sites during the spring 2015 NAAB visit.)

“Woodbury University is committed to providing a non-discriminatory and harassment-free educational, living and working environment for all members of our community including students, faculty, staff, and guests. All members of the campus community are expected to conduct themselves in a manner that does not infringe upon the rights of others. This policy prohibits all forms of sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, stalking, intimate partner violence, and sexual exploitation. Misconduct of this nature is contrary to Woodbury’s institutional values and prohibited by state and federal law.”

School of Architecture Diversity Plan
In the fall of 2014, a new Dean’s Advisory Committee was formulated to develop a School of Architecture Diversity Plan. Members of the committee include fulltime faculty members Ingalill Wahloos-Ritter, Hector Perez, Annie Chu, adjunct faculty member Louis Molina, Human Resources Director Natalie Avalos, and Vice President of Student Development Phyllis Cremer. A draft plan is expected to be presented prior to the 2015 NAAB visit and will serve as a model for a university-wide diversity plan.

Regular opportunities exist for architecture faculty, staff, and students to provide input into program governance. The school’s administration – dean, associate dean, chairs, and coordinators – gathers every other week in the Deans/Chairs/Coordinators (D/C/C) meeting to set, revise and evaluate progress in the school’s academic, programmatic, and advancement agenda, and to discuss issues and concerns as they arise. The school has an all-faculty meeting once a semester, a faculty retreat or workshop each year, and program faculty meetings approximately once a month in Los Angeles and once a month in San Diego. SoA faculty, students, and staff have access to the formulation of policies and procedures, including curriculum review and program development, primarily through the dissemination of information at program faculty meetings, via the portal, and two-way exchange of ideas via direct email. In addition, students and staff bring concerns and initiatives directly to the chairs, who then present these issues as agenda items for the next faculty meeting, at the program or school level, whichever is appropriate. Student (typically an AIAS co-chair) and staff representatives are invited to faculty meetings by the convener; faculty reserve the right to ask that non-faculty members leave for confidential discussions. The AIAS also invites school administration or faculty to forums it sponsors when a student issue of particular importance or urgency arises. Catherine Roussel, AIA, SoA Career and Outreach coordinator, acts as advisor to AIAS.

The School of Architecture is committed to improving the dissemination of information and decisions made at faculty meetings by publishing the agendas and minutes of all faculty meetings on the Architecture page of the university portal (my.woodbury.edu, password protected). In 2013-14 administrative coordinator Galina Kraus initiated SoA staff meetings to include all staff members from both LA and San Diego. These meetings serve to enhance communication between campuses and programs and between faculty, administration and staff, and to foster community. SoA staff members (administrative coordinators and assistants, digital/analog making facilities managers, communications director, outreach coordinator, and admissions counselors) as well as members of the Office of Student
Development and Advancement staff provide information and requests to chairs or to the faculty meeting facilitator for dissemination and discussion at faculty meetings. Staff and student issues are also discussed regularly in the D/C/C meetings.

In the summer of 2014, members of the School of Architecture authored and implemented new safety protocols for the Making Complex. We now hold monthly meetings to discuss safety, budgetary and operational issues. Attendees include Andrea Dietz as PPOHA coordinator, Debra Abel, Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, shop and DFL managers from LA and SD, and university administrators or staff as needed.

Woodbury University and the School of Architecture are fortunate to exist in, reflect and celebrate the exciting diversity of the Southern California megalopolis. Our vision of providing excellence in professional and liberal arts education to the people of our region and attracting international students to increase global perspective and connectedness is intrinsic to our identity. Woodbury University is nationally recognized as a Hispanic-serving institution (HSI), and has received awards and grants for our achievements in serving a diverse student population.

The BArch program was recognized with an Excelencia in Education award in 2008; the university topped the Education Trust list of institutions graduating Latino students at rates near those of white students in 2010; the Department of Education has awarded Woodbury three Title V grants (a cooperative grant with Los Angeles Valley College in 2002, the PPOHA grant for the School of Architecture in 2009, and an individual development grant in 2010 for new degree programs in the School of Media, Culture & Design); and HUD awarded the Arid Lands Institute a $600,000 grant in 2009 as part of its HSIAC (Hispanic Serving Institutions Assisting Communities) development program.

With regard to race, ethnicity, and residency, the university’s undergraduate student population identifies itself as 37% Caucasian-American and 28% Hispanic-American, with smaller but significant percentages of students identifying as African-American (5%), Asian-American (10%), and non-resident (20%). Of those who identify as Caucasian-American, we estimate about 40% are of Armenian heritage. In the BArch program, the numbers are 31% Caucasian-American and 39% Hispanic-American, with smaller numbers but identifying as African-American (2%), Asian-American (12%), and non-resident (15%). These data are reported for spring 2014 enrollment. Our graduate architecture students are 41% non-resident, compared to 18% university-wide grad non-residents, 18% Hispanic-American (cf. 17% university-wide), 29% Caucasian-American (54% university-wide), 9.5% Asian-American (cf. 6% university-wide) and 2.5% African-American (cf. 5% university-wide). As the MArch program grows in visibility and in number of students, we expect to continue to have a large number of students from outside southern California, including international applicants, but we also expect to draw more local applications.

It has been historically true that architecture programs at Woodbury have had a higher male enrollment than female (S14 ratio: 32% female/68% male in the BArch), while Woodbury overall has a slightly higher female enrollment than male that is statistically 50%-50%. A good deal of this reflects the way many people still think of the profession, even in 2014. Our admissions counselors and our faculty who do recruitment take care to present work and images of students and faculty of both sexes, diverse color and ethnicity, and across the age span. Our SoA grad programs have the same gender ratio as the university-wide grad ratio: 52% female, 48% male.

The most important work we do at Woodbury in pursuit of diversity does not focus on color, ethnicity or sex; rather we strive to offer educational opportunities to students from across the socio-economic spectrum and to those who come from families without a deep history of higher educational pursuits. IPEDS data show that 73% of our undergraduates received financial aid in 2012, and 49% received Pell grants. The College Student Inventory, a survey that our incoming first-time freshmen take, reveals that about 73% of those responding in F13 will be the first generation in their family to earn a college education.
The 5-year Title V PPOHA (Promoting Post-Baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans) grant supported the development of our graduate programs from 2009-14, both in keeping them accessible through scholarships and in growing their visibility so that they could vie with longer-established regional programs for graduate students of diverse backgrounds. It formed an important part of our current strategic plan for maintaining diversity in the School of Architecture and growing it specifically in the graduate programs. The grant, its timeline and its results are included in the documents provided in the team room.

I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives

The presidency of Dr. Luís Calingo is entering its third year, and a set of university-wide strategic initiatives is in place. As we reflect on the five perspectives, we recognize how the architecture education we have worked on over the past decade and a half has influenced the university’s mission and vision. The Woodbury Integrated Student Experience, for example, rests on the goal that all undergrads have at least one experience in each of these five categories before graduation: study away, work experience or internship, civic engagement, leadership, and faculty-driven research. These already play important roles in the work our faculty and students undertake within the School of Architecture, and to a large part define who we are. That we understand them through the five perspectives, and that we have stewarded the larger university to embrace them, we believe is 21st century evidence of Boyer and Mitgang’s observation that architecture education builds community.

I.1.3.A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community

With the successful launch of our MArch program, the faculty have realized a long-held dream and Woodbury School of Architecture has achieved equal footing with other local programs, all of which offer professional graduate degrees (UCLA, USC, SCI-Arc, Cal Poly Pomona, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, and the New School of Architecture). With its growing body of graduate students, the School of Architecture also achieves a certain educational parity (internally perceived) with the School of Business, which has long offered an MBA, has just achieved AACSB accreditation, and which stakes its viability on its graduate programs. The faculty and students of Woodbury’s professional architecture programs are eager to demonstrate academic excellence internally and externally and to further promote it.

In our long-range plan, the perspective of architectural education and the academic community is developed in all nine of our objectives: the success of our students; continuing curriculum and program development; developing assessment and maintaining accreditation; developing the school’s faculty and staff; developing and overseeing school and program policies and procedures; improving communication and outreach; developing and overseeing a budget with appropriate resource allocation; achieving more effective fundraising and development; and planning, developing and maintaining facilities and technology. In our self-assessment procedures, this perspective influences curricular and programmatic review and development, effective communication, and alignment of resources.

Commitment to holistic, practical and liberal arts based education

The professional architecture programs benefit from and contribute to the university’s commitment to transdisciplinary collaboration. The School of Architecture works actively with the three other academic divisions that comprise Woodbury University: the School of Business, the School of Media, Culture & Design, and the College of Transdisciplinarity. The School of Architecture also has a strong collaboration with the university’s first semi-autonomous research center, the Arid Lands Institute (ALI), first launched within the School of Architecture. It houses four other centers of research and practice: Architecture + Civic Engagement Center (ACE), which now supports a university strategic initiative and is moving toward a semi-autonomous structure, the Julius Shulman Institute (JSI), the Rome Center for Architecture and Culture (RCAC), and the Urban Policy Center (UP Center).

The School of Architecture embraces transdisciplinarity through our graduate fieldwork requirement, its long-time multiple offerings in undergraduate study away, and its commitment to exposing students to both normative and alternative practices. The College of Transdisciplinarity (COT) benefits our students by creating and sustaining wider discussions across the disciplines through curricular and co-curricular opportunities. COT faculty contribute to architecture education through their participation in studio.
reviews, their co-teaching with architecture faculty in History and Theory courses, their support of and contribution to the study-away programs, and their commitment to deliver elective courses of transdisciplinary interest to our students in areas such as Urban Studies, which now offers a minor.

Architecture students may choose to do elective studies in the School of Business. Undergrads can minor in management, marketing, or fashion marketing. MArch students without a business background may take six pre-MBA courses offered in a 7-week format, serving as graduate electives, preparing them for admission to the 1-year MBA program on completion of their professional architecture studies.

The architecture programs benefit from the emergence of the School of Media, Culture & Design (MCD) as a major player in the university as it attracts support from the giants of the film, video and animation industries of Los Angeles and the San Fernando Valley. MCD collaborations with the "industry" include hosting a conference on the Mediated City (architecture and urbanism in media), collaborating with ASIFA-Hollywood, the Los Angeles chapter of the International Animated Film Society, and working with the SAG (Screen Actors' Guild) Foundation. Ric Heitzman, associate professor of Animation, has opened his stop-motion animation mini-studio to our BArch and MArch students since Fall 2011. Many of our students find their design thinking enhanced by foray into other design fields; MCD offers such opportunities through minors and elective studio courses.

The Arid Lands Institute, the first semi-autonomous research center established at Woodbury University, directly offers architecture students opportunities to explore the built environment and its resource issues throughout their education. The co-directors of ALI, Hadley Arnold and Peter Arnold, are longtime adjunct faculty in the School of Architecture and have offered studio field experiences in the American West since 2002. ALI supports student and faculty research in hydrology issues, whether from a landscape urbanism standpoint, from the perspective of emerging technologies, or from an economic or entrepreneurial approach to responsible infrastructure development. With its 3-year HUD grant ALI supported students doing summer fieldwork in New Mexico working on water and aridity issues.

Faculty service
Fulltime faculty in the School of Architecture consistently demonstrate their serious commitment to university service as part of what it means to be a teaching scholar. They are active participants on committees and task forces, and play a leading role in faculty governance.

The School of Architecture elects a senator to serve a two-year term on the Faculty Senate, the governing body elected by the Woodbury University Faculty Association (WUFA). Many of our fulltime faculty have filled this role; several have also been elected as senators-at-large. The school has also had a strong presence in the senate leadership, with two former SoA faculty serving as president of WUFA, two serving as secretary, and one as vice president. Fulltime SoA faculty serve on the elected Faculty Personnel Committee, which evaluates and makes recommendations to the provost regarding the qualifications of all persons under consideration for faculty appointment, reappointment, advancement, and sabbatical. SoA faculty serve on all university-wide faculty committees, both elected and appointed, and also support university initiatives such as strategic planning and re-affirmation of regional accreditation. A list of current SoA faculty appointments to university committees can be found in section IV.6.3.

Faculty contribution to the university and the greater academy (scholarship, teaching, community engagement)
In addition to the ongoing transdisciplinary discourse in the classroom, the School of Architecture contributes to the intellectual and social life of the institution and architecture education and practice more broadly through a variety of public programs, including conferences, lecture series, and exhibitions. Architecture faculty are well represented at the university-wide faculty workshops each August, as well as at annual celebrations of Woodbury Week in October and commencement ceremonies in May. Faculty regularly attend and present at ACSA national and regional conferences. Dean Norman Millar is now serving as past-president of the ACSA, having just completed a very successful year as president. He represents ACSA on NCARB’s Licensure Task Force (LTF), which is exploring an integrated path to licensure upon graduation in the US. He is the academic liaison on the executive committee of the
California Architecture Foundation (CAF) and has served as educational regent since 2008. San Diego chair Catherine Herbst is a past educational regent of the CAF. Dean Millar also served on the organizing committee for the California Architectural Education Summit, co-sponsored by CAF and the AIA California Council. Associate Dean Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter is a sought-after panelist, speaker and session moderator at symposia and conferences, including ACADIA and the ACSA national conference. Los Angeles chair Marc Neveu is the current executive editor of the Journal of Architectural Education. Woodbury School of Architecture is fully engaged in the national discourse on architectural education.

ACE Center
Jeanine Centuori, director of the former CCRD in Hollywood, renewed her practice at the intersection of profession, education, and civic response by developing the Architecture + Civic Engagement Center. ACE promotes civic engagement with projects for non-profit groups dedicated to social and environmental justice. Projects explore relevant societal issues such as the American with Disabilities Act, architecture in developing parts of the world, and guerilla urbanism. Projects typically begin with relationships formed between community-based organizations and groups of students. Upper-division vertical studios explore community topics, and grants then support additional design research. The ACE Center is a public resource providing inspiration and education for the public, and is now a strategic initiative of the university with programming expanding beyond the School of Architecture into the three other schools and co-curricular activities. Stan Bertheaud is working with Jeanine Centuori to bring ACE programming to San Diego.

Drylands Design Competition and Conference
Co-Directors Hadley Arnold and Peter Arnold of ALI partnered with the California Architectural Foundation (CAF) to host the Drylands Design Conference in March 2012 on Woodbury’s main campus. “Retrofitting the West: Adaptation by Design” brought together architects, landscape architects, artists and engineers with leading environmental thinkers, scientists, and renowned conservationists to debate a range of design strategies for the future. More than 200 educators, design professionals and students attended the conference. The CAF devoted the 2012 William Turnbull Design Competition to Drylands Design to synchronize opportunities. In an innovative cross-disciplinary collaboration, ALI and UCLA’s Institute of the Environment and Sustainability provided technical and policy advising to five research award winners chosen from the design competition. At the conference, the five award-winning teams presented their design proposals and discussed policy implications.

Lecture Series, Exhibits and Events
The School of Architecture produces an annual public lecture, exhibit and event series that brings audiences from across the region to Los Angeles, Hollywood and San Diego. A complete list of lectures, exhibits and events from Fall 2012 through Spring 2014 at both locations is included in section IV.6.4.

Public dissemination
Our faculty’s work is shared with the university and the public predominantly in these three ways: through the Woodbury School of Architecture website; in the national and international press; and in presentations and exhibitions in academic and public venues. The Woodbury University Hollywood Outpost (WUHO) hosts monthly architecture events open to the public. Jeanine Centuori’s public art/architecture projects and ACE projects are published extensively in both the local press and architecture and design media. Linda Taalman just finished a six-week speaking tour at Europe’s architecture and education venues; her IT house and DIA: Beacon museum have been highly publicized. Marcel Sanchez-Prieto’s Modulo Prep project in Tijuana has been widely covered since winning a PA Design Award. Catherine Herbst and Todd Rinehart’s work was included in MIX: 9 San Diego Architects at the Museum of Contemporary Art, San Diego; in fact all 9 architects had ties to our program. Barbara Bestor’s residential projects have repeatedly been published in the Los Angeles Times and the New York Times, as well as in her book, Bohemian Modern: Living in Silver Lake. Norman Millar’s work has been featured in the LA Times and Dwell Magazine. In 2014 two SoA faculty received Graham Foundation grants: Joshua Stein (with Del Harrow) and Anthony Fontenot. Anthony and Linda Taalman were invited to a panel discussion with Beatrice Colamina at the 2014 Venice Biennale. Maxi Spina’s recently completed Jujuy Redux Building in Argentina was a finalist in the Architizer A+ Awards and has been widely published. Eric Olsen has been invited to international exhibitions in Rotterdam and Milan, and Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter has exhibited her
explorations in glass as material and meaning at the Centre Georges Pompidou in Paris and the Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

With our well-established Communications Office and the appointment of Jesse Brink as director of Communications, the School of Architecture will continue to lead in public recognition for the university through the dissemination of professional work and demonstration of teaching effectiveness, in internal public forums like the Faculty Development Workshops, in external public forums such as presentations and lectures at other institutions, and through a concerted publication effort that is at the heart of the responsibilities of the Communications Office.

Student contribution to the university (service and community engagement)
Both graduate and undergraduate architecture students have opportunities to contribute to school governance and the university’s intellectual and social life. They both elect representatives to Woodbury’s two AIAS chapters and can and do attend chapter meetings and national forums. The AIAS organizes community service and design opportunities on and off campus, has an active Freedom by Design group, and sponsors a regular series of panel colloquia called Architects Beyond Architecture.

The university offers opportunities for architecture students, including participation in the Associated Students of Woodbury University (student governance); the Community Honor Council, a group of students, faculty and staff that represents the community’s interest in upholding our standards and values; and various student groups that organize around shared interests.

The School of Architecture offers public programs every year that enhance the life of the university and provide architecture students, graduate and undergraduate, with opportunities to contribute to campus culture. Students help organize the school’s lecture series and the Grand Critique, an annual review of Woodbury architecture education led by students of recognized achievement in their penultimate BArch year. Students will be instrumental in preparing the team room for the March 2015 NAAB visit. With the school expanding its public programming and systematic communications, student involvement through teaching and research assistantships in our programs and centers is vital to the quality, breadth and identity of the public face of Woodbury School of Architecture. Our students embrace the opportunity to invent and re-invent the role of architecture students in the intellectual life of the school and campus, with the strong support of the architecture faculty and the administration.

Opportunities provided for faculty scholarly and teaching development
The university supports the ongoing intellectual, professional, and creative development of faculty within the School of Architecture through its annual Faculty Development Awards and sabbaticals. The university also supports faculty through programs and fellowships in the College of Transdisciplinarity, the hosting of faculty development workshops and other faculty development opportunities including Faculty Learning Communities, and through available course release to pursue scholarly and professional development. The school supports the development of its faculty through funding for travel and participation in professional and academic conferences and meetings.

Annual Faculty Development Awards
The Faculty Development Committee, appointed through the Faculty Senate, grants awards annually to fulltime and adjunct faculty whose proposals are judged to have the potential for greatest impact. Award recipients present their work the following year at a faculty colloquium and/or exhibition. In past years, awards to faculty from the School of Architecture have funded scholarly and design activities leading to exhibitions and publications on the architecture of military installations; the relationship between film and architecture; intelligent materials and their use; urban waste harvesting; emerging Asian cities; and a catalog of diagrammatic thinking and graphical systems in design practice. For a complete list of recent awards to architecture faculty, please see section IV.6.3.

Sabbaticals
Fulltime faculty members may apply to the Faculty Development Committee for sabbaticals after six years of service. Sabbaticals are granted for the purpose of fostering the professional growth and intellectual enrichment of faculty and for the improvement of programs of courses of study at the university.
Sabbatical awards acknowledge faculty who have displayed exemplary service and whose proposals promise the greatest contributions to their field. Sabbatical projects for architecture faculty include photographic research (Gerard Smulevich) and WUHO development (Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter).

College of Transdisciplinarity Fellowships
The College of Transdisciplinarity provides a variety of means for faculty to focus on the problems of bringing transdisciplinarity and its perspectives into the life of the university. The Senior Fellows Program brings together scholars and practitioners, activists and artists from across the disciplines in order to enrich the educational experiences of our students and faculty. Senior Fellows commit to a period of research, teaching and/or service to the institute and the university for at least one academic term, part-time or fulltime; the contribution may take the form of applied or theoretical research that explores the issues and boundaries of transdisciplinarity, the development of pedagogies and curricular programs dedicated to a transdisciplinary vision, the teaching of courses in interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary studies, or any combination of the three. Professor Paulette Singley held a Senior Fellowship in spring 2008 to develop and enhance the history and theory program within the School of Architecture and collaborated on developing the curriculum for the recently launched Urban Studies minor.

Julius Shulman Institute
Named for and endowed by the renowned architectural photographer, the Julius Shulman Institute at Woodbury University provides programs that promote the appreciation and understanding of architecture and design. Created in 2005, the JSI focuses on Shulman’s enduring involvement in the principles of modernism. The institute funds lectures, seminars, tours, and special workshops at area schools as well as at community organizations. The JSI also maintains an archive and research center, with the photographer’s workbooks, books, correspondence, awards, and other artifacts of his career serving as a resource for students and scholars. Since its inception, the Julius Shulman Institute has funded several public programs at the School of Architecture, named its first fellows and designated a Julius Shulman Professor of Practice.

The JSI hosts the annual event honoring excellence in architectural photography. Iwan Baan received the first annual Julius Shulman Award for Photography in 2010; Richard Barnes in 2011; Pedro Guerrero in 2012; Catherine Opie in 2013; and Grant Mudford in 2014. Dr. Emily Bills, coordinator of the Urban Studies program in the College of Transdisciplinarity, directs the JSI.

Arid Lands Institute
ALI is an education, research and outreach center of Woodbury University that trains adaptive, resourceful and inventive designers and leaders in addressing water scarcity, increased hydrologic variability, and climate change in the arid and semi-arid American West.

In 2011 ALI completed its three-year project funded by HUD for research, development and education about water issues in collaboration with the communities of Burbank, CA and Embudo-Dixon, NM. The Drylands Design Competition and Conference were part of this project. ALI has hosted visiting international researchers and graduate assistants from across the country. It has launched a Fellows Program, in which fellows undertake research or study in areas that advance the mission of the institute. Fellows are drawn from the academic divisions of Woodbury and from outside institutions. Each fellow is expected to make a specific contribution, which may or may not include teaching, to the institute that is outlined in his or her appointment letter. The fellows program is designed specifically to attract scholars who will enhance and further the work of the institute for a finite (semester- or year-long) term.

Faculty Development Workshops and Opportunities
The Office of Academic Affairs, the Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, and the Faculty Association work together to provide meaningful workshops for all faculty, fulltime and adjunct, to develop their teaching effectiveness; scholarly, creative or professional contributions to an intellectual discourse; and commitment to university service. Faculty Development Workshops are held each August and occasionally in the spring.
The Faculty Development Committee, an elected subcommittee of the Faculty Association, has as its main charge the awarding of Faculty Development Grants and recommendations on sabbaticals, but it also supports the Faculty Development Workshops and collects and disseminates faculty development resources, with the assistance of the systems librarian. Architecture faculty, both fulltime and adjunct, regularly seek external funding for their professional and scholarly interests, and institutional support for these endeavors appears to be increasing.

Available course release
The Faculty Association and the Office of Academic Affairs have developed guidelines and an evaluation process for faculty to apply for course release in order to pursue scholarship or other faculty development opportunities and responsibilities beyond the normal demand. Faculty may request a course release through arrangement with their chairs; the release becomes part of one’s contractual obligations and thus the results of scholarship enabled through the release must be presented in one’s next contract renewal application.

Throughout the university, opportunities for studying away have proliferated. The School of Architecture has always been a leader in offering students study-away programs and developing faculty to lead them; in fact the MArch curriculum requires a summer of fieldwork prior to the graduate thesis year. The university is developing a system to organize the opportunities for international studies and help match faculty and students with those opportunities.

I.1.3.B. Architectural Education and Students
Woodbury School of Architecture actively supports our students in developing the resources and disposition to live and work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth and dignity are nurtured and respected, in assuming leadership roles within the school and within the profession, in understanding the breadth of professional opportunities, in making thoughtful, deliberate informed choices, and in developing the habit of lifelong learning.

In our long-range plan, the perspective of architectural education and students is developed in eight of our nine objectives: the success of our students; continuing curriculum and program development; developing assessment and maintaining accreditation; developing the school's faculty and staff; developing and overseeing school and program policies and procedures; improving communication and outreach; achieving more effective fundraising and development; and planning, developing and maintaining facilities and technology. In our self-assessment procedures, this perspective influences curricular and programmatic review and development as well as student success and alignment of resources.

The integrated student (nurturing diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, dignity)
Woodbury University provides education that promotes the integration of a student's personal and professional principles. In the School of Architecture, all programs support this goal through focused faculty advising of individual students, through co-curricular opportunities for interpersonal exchange among faculty and students, and through mentoring and work experience opportunities that faculty extend to students.

The traditional undergraduate daytime student body is 28% Hispanic American, 10% Asian American, 37% Caucasian American, 5% African American, and almost 20% international (based on Spring 2014 enrollment), with a 50/50 gender split. The Office of Institutional Research estimates that about 40% of those who identify themselves as white are of Armenian heritage. Within the BArch program, 39% of our students identify as Hispanic American, 12% as Asian American, 31% as Caucasian American, 2% as African American, and 15% as international. Our gender split remains an area of opportunity: two-thirds of our undergrads are male, and only one-third female. In our graduate architecture programs, 52% of our students are female, 48% male. Our grad programs are also 41% international, 18% Hispanic American, 9.5% Asian American, 28% Caucasian American, and 2.5% African American.

The student body at Woodbury is diverse in its preparation, its ethnic and cultural origins, and its socio-economic status. The School of Architecture embraces this diversity and acknowledges the value of one’s
own identity and experience as it relates to the personal and professional path one forges. This is the foundation of the Woodbury architectural education, and we build our curricula to ensure that entering classes cohere while students maintain and celebrate individual identity. We believe studios do so when individuals with a sure sense of self that is valued by the community practice the exchange of information and the sharing of new learning and designing experiences – these are the hallmarks of a healthy learning culture and a vibrant architecture community. Diversity is our community strength; respect for difference is basic to our school’s norms and expectations.

Woodbury University is designated by the federal government as a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI). The School of Architecture was able to build on that designation with a 5-year Promoting Post-baccalaureate Opportunities for Hispanic Americans (PPOHA) grant to fund expansion of our graduate programs. Full PPOHA reports from the grant period, which ends in October 2014, will be available in the team room for the March 2015 NAAB visit. This year we submitted an application for another 5-year PPOHA grant for the expansion of our new Master of Interior Architecture program, which will benefit all SoA students if granted starting in October 2014.

Leadership roles in the school
A first-cohort graduate student, Mike Rucinski, spearheaded the renewal of an AIAS chapter at Woodbury Los Angeles in 2009. The LA chapter is co-chaired by an undergrad and a grad student; the SD chapter has a single chair. The School of Architecture supports our AIAS chapters, provides seed funding, and supports travel to AIAS national meetings.

In fall 2011 then-Graduate Architecture Chair Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter initiated the Graduate Student Roundtable Lunch to provide further self-governance opportunities for grad students. See the discussion in I.1.2.A Learning Culture at Woodbury above.

Students are taking a leading planning role in the Woodbury tradition of the Grand Critique. Beginning in fall 2011, graduate students helped the undergraduate honorees in Los Angeles prepare their presentations and emceed the event. With growth in the graduate program in San Diego, we expect to expand this new take on an important tradition south.

Leadership roles in the profession
Our curriculum and co-curricular support nurture professional leadership as a goal for our students. They express a strong desire to become licensed; many hope to establish their own practices. Our curricula focus on professionalism and leadership in ARCH 250, 450, and 620. These professional practice courses promote IDP, as well as introducing students to ethical and legal practices within the profession, and focus on the emerging leadership roles architects must embrace for sustainable development of our globalized environment.

We believe that an important part of preparing students for leadership roles in the profession is for our faculty to model those roles. Among our fulltime faculty, the dean, associate dean and chairs are highly respected both for their practices and their contributions to the academy. Norman Millar, AIA serves on the California Architecture Foundation board (the outreach arm of AIACC), the ACSA Board, the NCARB Licensure Task Force and the Hollywood Design Review Committee; Catherine Herbst, AIA has served as regent. Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, AIA has been elected to the AIA|LA board of directors. Marc Neveu is the executive editor of the *Journal of Architectural Education*. Many of our fulltime and adjunct faculty serve or have served on the board of the LA Forum for Architecture and Urban Design. Annie Chu was appointed Cultural Affairs commissioner for the City of Los Angeles. We have sought out community leaders for key adjunct roles: Ted Smith and Jonathan Segal, FAIA co-direct the MRED program in San Diego; Helena Jubany, FAIA, architect and longtime civic leader (commissioner on the LA Department of Building and Safety Board) teaches an undergrad Professional Practice course; and Bill Roschen, AIA, former president of the LA City Planning Commission, and Christi Van Cleve, AIA, developed and direct the Urban Policy Center, teaching a series of policy courses.
Exposure to the breadth of practice contexts and opportunities

Our faculty members seize opportunities to expose our students to a diversity of architectural practices. Ethical professional behavior supported by keen observation skills and opportunistic invention guides our programs. Built on the premise that intentional dislocation leads to transformation, our studios regularly take students off campus and into communities, locally, regionally and internationally. The MArch program offers a fieldwork-based curriculum that begins with a close observation of the program’s home city in the first semester, requires regular field trips in the studio sequence, and turns to student-initiated fieldwork with a summer of study in a host city or community chosen by the individual student. The BArch program requires fieldtrips in the first year of architecture studio and in each subsequent year, and offers a robust set of summer study-away opportunities. Woodbury has offered faculty-led study-away programs since 1997 in Paris and Barcelona, expanding to India, South Korea, Japan, Nanjing, Beijing, Berlin, Peru, Tahiti, Argentina, and other locations. We have an ongoing presence in Italy through the recurring semester-long RCAC program led by Professor Paulette Singley. Our local studios provide rich opportunities for civic engagement and non-profit design.

The primary goal of the field trips, fieldwork, and study away is to transform the student’s perspective by asking for close observation of context, deep analysis, and innovative synthesis in design solutions. Individual students are exposed to new and different contexts. When they return they are asked to work together to share observations and develop analyses. Students use the lessons they derive from the diverse contexts of architectural practice to support individual and collective learning, delivering an educational outcome greater than the sum of its parts. Summer study-away studios in particular prepare students for contemporary architectural practice by asking them to work in groups, by turns leading, following, and collaborating, and developing a strong foundation in clear communication and teamwork.

Setting learning agendas toward deliberate choice and lifelong engagement

As part of developing within each student appropriate affective knowledge gain (the disposition toward intellectual curiosity), SoA programs ask each student to construct a specific learning agenda responsive to his/her goals and professional aspirations. Woodbury faculty recognize each student’s life experience as valid and vital to her or his success in education and beyond. The students’ preparation provides a rich degree of variation, so beyond the shared core curriculum, each student in consultation with his/her faculty advisor and the Career and Outreach coordinator constructs an individualized education. As we continue to develop curricular focuses based on faculty research interests and emerging issues in the built environment, we encourage our professional students to choose their electives with a goal larger than the course content from an individual class in mind.

Each student works in the fall semester prior to the thesis/degree project studio to identify and develop a focus or thesis statement to test during the degree project or graduate thesis studio in the spring. These projects require both a great deal of self-reflection, in identifying one’s specific area of inquiry, and self-discipline, in bringing the project through research and development to manifesting a design proposal and publicly defending it. A successful project depends on mutual respect between the student and his/her advisors; our faculty relish the challenges and rewards of working one-on-one with advanced students on an intellectually rigorous design project.

I.1.3.C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment

Woodbury School of Architecture is committed to making licensure a clear prospect for all students in the professional programs.

In our long-range plan, the perspective of architectural education and the regulatory environment is developed in six of our nine objectives: the success of our students; continuing curriculum and program development; developing assessment and maintaining accreditation; developing the school’s faculty and staff; developing and overseeing school and program policies and procedures; and improving communication and outreach. In our self-assessment procedures, this perspective influences curricular and programmatic review and development, alumni success, and alignment of resources.
Sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure
Woodbury architecture students and graduates are known for their skills and ability and are sought after in the regional professional community for part-time work while they are students, and after graduation for full-time employment. We continue to monitor the mutual levels of influence the graduate and undergraduate students are having on each other, especially in terms of increasing networking possibilities.

The SoA has had a dedicated Career and Outreach coordinator (COC), Catherine Roussel, AIA, since summer 2012, a position initially made possible through the PPOHA grant but now fully funded by the university. The COC directs the school’s architecture and interior architecture career development efforts, seeks and develops co-curricular opportunities for student professional development, is the IDP coordinator, and acts as the school’s liaison to Career Services in the Office of Student Development. She has a dual report to Dean Millar and the Vice President for Student Development. The COC is developing a system for tracking data related to student and alumni career development and licensure.

Exposure of students to internship requirements: Intern Development Program (IDP)
The COC ensures that all students are aware of the IDP program and have support for enrolling in it. She is the SoA liaison to NCARB and the IDP program, and attends the annual IDP Coordinators Conference. In the BArch program, IDP information is distributed in ARCH 250 Professional Practice 1 and ARCH 450 Professional Practice 3; both courses provide solid preparation for the transition from education to profession. In the MArch, IDP information is disseminated in ARCH 620 Practice 1, with Catherine as one of two co-instructors. As instructor for the graduate Practice 1 course, she has initiated a work sample portfolio as a course requirement in ARCH 620. She is working to support a similar requirement in ARCH 450. She has an open-door policy and tracks the number of individual students and alumni with whom she meets each semester in support of IDP and other career development opportunities.

Catherine has identified a goal shared between the SoA and the university’s Career Development office: timely completion of work experience/internship. All undergraduate majors at Woodbury require either work experience or a curricular internship. For the SoA, an expected outcome of the required 160 hours of work experience is the two-way benefit between one’s studies and one’s initial professional experience. Catherine’s goal is to have 100% of the BArch students complete their work experience prior to beginning their capstone project. Additionally, she is developing a database in order to understand where our students are working, the value they are adding to their work places, and how our students’ work performance influences the perception of the SoA in the professional field.

Graduate students seek opportunities to gain IDP hours and many international students who plan to practice outside the states recognize the benefits of work experience within the American profession. The COC has worked with faculty to develop a 0-credit (tuition free) graduate course for international students who wish to work during their studies.

The SoA career development plan also includes a proposal to modify the academic worksheet to include a record of a student’s work experience and other career development opportunities. Catherine has a number of initiatives underway for additional career development opportunities. We are improving our understanding of graduates’ post-graduation employment and plans through the First Destination survey, which is a university-wide project. We plan to participate in ACSA’s data gathering effort contributing to our shared knowledge of architectural education career outcomes. A full report of her office’s efforts and accomplishments will be available in the team room for the March 2015 NAAB visit.

Student understanding of the role of the registration board
Woodbury School of Architecture maintains a strong relationship with the California Architect’s Licensing Board. Each year, Woodbury sends one representative, usually the dean, to the Licensing Board’s meeting on architectural education. In alternate years, Woodbury School of Architecture has hosted that meeting on the Los Angeles campus in Hensel Hall.
The COC invites representatives from NCARB to speak with students each year. These presentations are scheduled to be of greatest convenience to students and faculty. Topics include licensure, successful progression through the IDP, and a brief overview of the ARE.

While Woodbury School of Architecture is among the youngest of California’s architecture schools, and therefore has among the fewest graduates with licenses, Dean Norman Millar, who now also serves as a regent for the California Architecture Foundation associated with the AIA California Council, has maintained an active involvement in the statewide discussion of the relationship of licensure to education. In his role as 2013-14 ACSA president he was active in reigniting the conversation about integrating licensure and architecture education. During the 2014-15 academic year the SoA, in conjunction with the California Architects Board, state and local components of the AIA and a consortium of participating architecture firms, plans to submit a proposal in response to NCARB’s anticipated RFP to be considered as one of the NAAB-accredited programs participating in the Integrated Licensure Upon Graduation initiative.

**Proportion of graduates who have sought and achieved licensure since the previous visit**

The NCARB data do not tell us which of our alumni are sitting for the ARE. The COC is tracking who is seeking and achieving licensure each year, though the information is likely to be more robust for more recent graduates. A survey of incoming MArch students indicate that a majority intend to take the ARE exam. In the first destination survey for recent alumni mentioned above, we will be including a question about licensure intent, and so will capture some data for new alumni from both the BArch and MArch programs. The California schools with MArch programs tend to have higher pass rates as well as higher proportions of graduates seeking to achieve licensure, so we expect our rates to increase as the graduate program evolves and as our Career and Outreach efforts bear fruit.

Information provided by NCARB for the five-year period from 2008 through 2012, for version 4.0 exams, shows a lower pass rate among those of our BArch graduates testing than for those of most but not all California schools. However, in six of the seven exam areas (Program, Planning & Practice; Building Design & Construction Systems; Schematic Design, Structural Systems, Building Systems, and Construction Documents & Services) the trend is toward an increase in the pass rate, sometimes a dramatic increase. In one area (Site Planning & Design), the rate remains approximately level. We also see a trend of more alumni sitting for the ARE.

**I.1.3.D. Architectural Education and the Profession**

One of the five realms of study in the Woodbury architecture curriculum is Practice, which encompasses professionalism, or the ability to manage, argue, and act legally, ethically, and critically in society and the environment.

In our long-range plan, the perspective of architectural education and the profession is developed in eight of our nine objectives: the success of our students; continuing curriculum and program development; developing assessment and maintaining accreditation; developing the school’s faculty and staff; developing and overseeing school and program policies and procedures; improving communication and outreach; achieving more effective fundraising and development; and planning, developing and maintaining facilities and technology. In our self-assessment procedures, this perspective influences curricular and programmatic review and development, student and alumni success, and alignment of resources.

**Practicing in a global economy and recognizing design’s positive impact on the environment**

Our students are asked to draw on first-hand observation, reflect on their life experiences, and integrate this with rigorous research, analysis, and critique. Beginning in the first semester and throughout the sequence of the curricula, we ask students to interrogate current events and challenges and understand them in the context of relevant precedents. The demographic trends of Southern California, the economic promises and costs of globalization, the social and economic realities of immigration, the transition from agrarian to urban society, the legacy of post-industrial economies and the prospects of a creative economy: these are not merely taught at Woodbury, they have also been lived by our students and faculty, and their direct experience is valued as an important knowledge-based springboard.
Our student body now has more international students in both the BArch and MArch than we would have predicted when we were planning the graduate program, and this has been of great benefit to students and faculty alike. Our international graduate students tend to have come from strong pre-professional programs, and have studied and practiced architectural responses to contexts outside southern California and the United States. The global practice of architecture exists within our studios, and the sense of the world as a shared resource is palpable. Our mission statement declares the value of this aspect of the perspective: Woodbury's faculty, students and graduates are committed to architecture that is effective and transformative, and we believe in the radical possibilities of architecture's social, environmental and formal relevance.

*Understanding the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines*

Woodbury's architecture faculty and curriculum, and the university's transdisciplinary culture, continually prepare students to practice and assume new responsibilities and diverse and collaborative roles as architects working with professionals from other disciplines. ARCH 620 Practice 1 (MArch) and ARCH 450 Professional Practice 3 (BArch) specifically explore the collaborative nature of professional practice, and many of our electives, including the Policy sequence and courses developed as Arid Lands Institute research seminars, ask students to develop transdisciplinary ways of working and designing.

*Respect client expectations, advocate for design based solutions responding to multiple needs*

While the emphasis on issues-oriented design studios and the development of critical thinking and writing skills throughout the programs prepare students for practices that are informed, collaborative, and build leadership, several elements of the program tackle professionalism within the context of client relations and response/responsibility to multiple needs and diverse constituents (not just clients) head on. It is, for example, one of the central learning outcomes of ARCH 620 and ARCH 450, and it is also discussed in the theory sequence in both the graduate and undergraduate programs (ARCH 556 Crit 3 and 648 Crit 4; ARCH 330 Theory of Architecture and 448 Professional Practice 2: Degree Project Preparation). In 556 and 330, students are introduced to the range of practices that have made significant contributions to the emerging canon. In 620 and 450, students learn the professional context for their design methodologies and proposals. In 648 and 448, students are asked to evaluate and practice theory and techniques for analyzing and integrating design methodologies, client or user needs, and site conditions into criteria for preparing for an architectural project. The demands of the client, the constraints of changing, or outdated, codes, and the weight of professional responsibility to people and communities larger than the client provide a principal basis for thoughtful programming, site design, and form making throughout the thesis/degree project process.

*Contribute to the growth and development of the profession*

Architecture students take advantage of the many opportunities offered within and through the Woodbury architecture community to engage with the profession. They serve as research assistants to faculty and programs that stake out new territory for the profession, including the Arid Lands Institute, the Architecture + Civic Engagement Center, and the Urban Policy Center. They work with the LA Forum for Architecture and Urban Design to stimulate ongoing debate about contemporary, alternative, and/or radical architectural practices. They participate in the Woodbury AIAS, creating opportunities for other students through AIAS programming and developing leadership abilities.

**I.1.3.E. Architectural Education and the Public Good**

Throughout Woodbury School of Architecture, direct engagement with social and environmental challenges provides the foundation for architecture that is relevant, intelligent and effective. Issues of sustainability, from the ecological through the social, economic and cultural, are integral to the study of architecture at all levels.

In our long-range plan, the perspective of architectural education and the public good is developed in six of our nine objectives: continuing curriculum and program development; developing assessment and maintaining accreditation; developing the school's faculty and staff; improving communication and outreach; achieving more effective fundraising and development; and planning, developing and maintaining facilities and technology. In our self-assessment procedures, this perspective influences
programmatic review and development, effective communication, student and alumni success, and alignment of resources.

**Active, engaged citizens responsive to a changing world**
Because Woodbury is a minority-serving institution in a highly diverse cosmopolitan setting, cultural diversity is the normative experience for study, teaching, and practice. Woodbury Architecture students are well adapted to lives and practices that embrace cultural diversity; while we are a small community, one does not find a climate of homogeneity or insularity here. With a strong liberal arts foundation, issues-oriented design curriculum, emphasis on critical thinking and writing skills, and ample technical skill set, all set within the explosive diversity of Southern California, Woodbury graduates are poised to compete in the workforce and critically engage many forms of social, economic, and professional change, with cultural diversity one form of change among many.

**Knowledge acquisition to address pressing contemporary and future challenges through design, conservation and responsible professional practice**
Woodbury graduates seek out knowledge to address pressing contemporary and future challenges because their education is based on field observations and immerses them repeatedly in research-based projects, and because their faculty role models have diverse research-based practices, both traditional and alternative.

All students are introduced to the joys and rigors of devising a research-based critical approach to architecture throughout the program. MArch students engage critical research in Crit 1 during their first semester, during the summer fieldwork studio, and in the Thesis Preparation semester. BArch students are introduced to critical research in Studio 1A, and every subsequent studio asks them to practice and develop their critical and research skills. The upper-division theory sequence, ARCH 330 Theory of Architecture, ARCH 334 Urban Design Theory, and ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues all ask students to reflect on their own experiences through the prisms of architectural theory and practice. Out of the struggle to articulate purpose and processes, architectural practice emerges as the sort of challenge our alumni will reinvent across the course of a lifetime, keeping it newly relevant.

Whether or not this moment of research-based radical critique and independent spirit can be sustained in the face of student loan debt, an uncertain economy, family obligations or cultural expectations after graduation, it is a powerful moment to witness in the education of an architect.

**Ethical implications of decisions**
Ethics at Woodbury are taught at a number of levels. They are instilled, we hope and believe, in the studio and classroom through norms and expectations of ethical conduct – rule-abiding honesty, trust, and mutual respect – between students and faculty. The mechanics of ethical conduct as a professional – doing what you say you are going to do, when you say you are going to do it – are modeled by the faculty in the studio and in practice, and expected from students at all times. As noted above, the realm of Practice requires professionalism, the ability to manage, argue, and act legally, ethically, and critically. Within the Woodbury architecture community, this is spelled out in the Manifesto for Studio Culture Policy, initiated by the students in 2010. The professionalism, or integrity of process, with which students conduct themselves in class is also part of their evaluation (and with which faculty conduct themselves, part of their evaluations). The integrity of the profession in terms of legal ethics is taught in ARCH 620 and ARCH 450: the obligations and rewards of responsible and accurate adherence to contracts and codes. Architecturally, the ethic of aligning performance with critical and aesthetic intent is crucial to faculty evaluation of student work, and, in time, to each student’s growing ability to critique, measure, and evaluate the integrity of her/his own work. Professional ethics in terms of the larger tradition of architect as provider of social critique, environmental leadership, and aesthetic excellence is fundamental to all levels of the Woodbury architecture curricula.

**Reconciling differences between architect’s obligation to client and to public**
The School of Architecture challenges each student and faculty member to decide, to take a principled position and hold it firmly. But the SoA does not say which position or principles to take – we hold that such decisions are process-based, and insist in our programs from the first through the final semester on
the student’s continual, critical evaluation of appropriateness: of representation methods; of form, cultural meaning, and symbolic languages; of structure, materiality, and building methods; of environmental performance across scales and time. Our students’ ability to articulate a tension or contradiction between the demands of a client or the public and their critique of those demands is precisely the basis for supporting and evaluating their creative response. Addressing with precision, in each student project in each studio, the student’s understanding of the tensions between perceived social obligation and perceived creative autonomy is the basis of a critical and responsive pedagogy as well as a critical and responsive architecture. By requiring a clearly articulated statement of critical intent in all projects, the School of Architecture has established a tradition that locates the creative enterprise fundamentally at the intersection of process and communication, and allows the faculty to measure the only thing that matters: our students’ ability to formulate and align their visions of form and matter with their unique critical observations and stated intentions. The effectiveness of this tradition in training leaders extends seamlessly into the graduate program as we develop not only professional architects, but professional teachers as well.

*Nurturing civic engagement*

One of the four pillars of a Woodbury University education is civic engagement, strengthening communities by actively applying critical knowledge, skills and values. The university community asserts that all action has impact on the planet and that understanding that impact and accepting responsibility for one’s actions is the moral and ethical condition for the educated global citizen.

In the School of Architecture, we argue that the greatest strength of our programs is the value we collectively place on the public good. At every stage and in every studio, graduate and undergraduate, we present the discipline of architecture as a social art beholden to multiple stakeholders – some individual, some collective, some abstract – an art that shapes the built environment by balancing the complex processes in which those stakeholders engage.

A continuous discourse about the processes, the stakeholders, the practice of our art is alive and vibrant among our faculty. Diversity of opinion is a treasured asset of the School of Architecture, held by faculty and students alike. We embrace the civic and civil debate about architecture’s role and architects’ responsibility, and the ethical implications of our design proposals and projects for the built environment. But we do not hold a singular vision of the role, the responsibility, and the implications. Our disagreements are social, political, economic and aesthetic. They are intellectual but no less heartfelt for that. Besides a sustained focus on social and environmental issues in studios and supporting courses, Woodbury architecture students are exposed to and part of this vigorous debate about the architect’s role in (creating and) solving these problems. The debate is the intellectual glue that holds the school together or forces it to unravel from semester to semester, and the greatest single explanation of how the school nurtures a climate of civic engagement and commitment to professional and public services. It inevitably becomes the substance of the Woodbury architecture student.

*Commitment to professional and public service and leadership*

If we hope to develop and sustain an independent spirit and a research-based critical approach to architecture within our students and alumni, it is because most of us on the faculty have struggled to do so ourselves. The fulltime and adjunct faculty at Woodbury are practicing, research-based architects and designers with idea-driven practices, incorporating diverse disciplines and embracing collaborative roles. As examples, Dean Norman Millar was part of a ground-breaking generation of “everyday urbanists” in Los Angeles, for whom practical, theoretical, and academic work focused on populist strategies for reoccupying overlooked landscapes and marginal urban spaces. His house in Echo Park, inspired by the generic mini mall, can be cited as a real example of “everyday architecture.” Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter’s interest lies in investigations of materiality as a carrier of potential form, function, meaning, program and appropriation. Catherine Herbst (with partner Todd Rinehart)’s residential and commercial practice injects sensitive craft and humanism into context-responsive design, never forgetting the actual experience of people and their potential to find delight in space and place. Marc Neveu sits on the board of the New York-based think tank Terreform ONE, an organization committed to smart city design and ecological planning. Jeanine Centuori’s practice is largely rooted in an investigation of the possibilities of public art and the public landscape, real estate development, and universal design, a set of preoccupations that
shape a large part of her contribution to the school and the university. Eric Olsen’s interest is in the role of water, electricity and air in innovations in material and building systems. Linda Taalman has built a successful practice around innovations in premanufactured components as featured in the IT house. Ted Smith has built an academic and professional career on integrating the economics and aesthetics of architecture as real estate developer and builder as well as designer. Mark Owen, adjunct faculty and Woodbury graduate, focuses on advanced technologies of representation. Hector Perez, Jose Parral and Marcel Sanchez-Prieto integrate theory, practice and advocacy along the bi-national border region. Gerard Smulevich and Peter Arnold are accomplished photographers, using the camera to explore intersections between architecture, urbanism, landscape, and infrastructure, and in turn using their photographic research to inform design and teaching work. Hadley Arnold’s work and teaching focus on the relationship between water and urban form, and architecture’s role in reshaping that relationship. Paulette Singley, trained as a historian/theorist as well as an architect, explores her interest in film, architecture, and “dirty urbanism” in the classroom and research, while Stan Bertheaud maintains an overlapping practice in architecture, screenwriting and television production.

These examples and others serve as strong role models for our students to follow as they develop a commitment to professional and public service and leadership. Faculty role models help our students place the field of architecture beyond mere professional service provision and into a lifetime of practice and research grounded in critical ideas, diverse and collaborative roles crossing over disciplines, and an expanding knowledge base.

I.1.4 Long-Range Planning

The School of Architecture at Woodbury University has identified a multi-year set of objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission, culture and strategic initiatives of the university, and the five NAAB perspectives: (A) Architectural Education and the Academic Community, (B) Architectural Education and Students, (C) Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment, (D) Architectural Education and the Profession, (E) Architectural Education and the Public Good. Data are collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform future planning and strategic decision making in the School of Architecture.

Nine Objectives for Continuous Improvement

This section briefly describes the multivalent process by which the SoA deliberates upon and identifies its objectives for continuous improvement, and updates its ongoing 5-year plan for satisfying these objectives. The SoA has identified nine objectives for continuous improvement that guide and measure the success of its long-range planning. The objectives are in order of priority along with the NAAB perspectives they encompass or address.

1. Student Success A, B, C, D
2. Curricular Development A, B, C, D, E
3. Assessment and Accreditation A, B, C, D, E
4. Faculty/Staff Development A, B, C, D, E
5. Policies and Procedures Development and Oversight A, B, C, D
6. Communications and Outreach A, B, C, D, E
7. Budget Development and Oversight A
8. Fundraising and Development A, B, D, E
9. Facilities and Technology Planning, Development and Maintenance A, B, D, E

SoA Five-Year Plan for Continuous Improvement 2014-15 to 2018-19

At the core of the SoA 5-Year Plan is the recognition that it is based on a set of goals-and-outcome driven activities that are part of an iterative process, repeated year after year, with continual improvement based on quantitative assessments of success.

1. Student Success A, B, C, D

The commitment to providing a fluid and holistic timeframe of student success that stretches from recruiting and admissions, to enrollment and academic progress, to timely graduation, employment and
licensure is the driver of the SoA Student Success 5-year plan. The goals and outcomes of the plan include the following:

• The SoA administrators, faculty and staff will work with departments across the university following the protocols of the university-wide Student Experience Process Improvement initiative. This initiative aims for a positive student interface that ties together the student’s full experience from initial contact as potential applicant through successful graduation and placement in a grad program or first employment opportunity of high quality; the achievement of licensure; and development of alumni who embrace responsibility to their alma mater. It also provides for professional development of all those involved in the interface (staff, faculty, administrators) so that their work is effective, satisfying, meaningful, and provides personal/professional growth.

• The SoA administrators, faculty and staff will develop and continuously improve an annual system of working with the university offices of Enrollment Management and Marketing/Communications to develop and maintain a rigorous year-to-year recruiting calendar of targeted milestones. The system will follow documented best practices in policies and procedures to achieve desired program size for all programs within 5 years.

• The SoA administrators, faculty and staff will develop and continuously improve an annual system of working with the protocols of the Woodbury Integrated Student Experience (WISE) initiative providing exceptional student experiences based on high-impact educational practices, including internship, civic engagement, study-away, faculty-mentored scholarship, and leadership development, in order to significantly improve student success as well as retention and graduation rates each year.

• The SoA administrators, faculty and staff will update and maintain a system of working with the offices of Human Resources, Student Development, Finance and Facilities Management to provide a continuously improving environment for academic learning and professional preparation. The overall goal is to become more safe and secure each year, including but not limited to adhering to the 2014 Shop Safety Protocols, the 2014 Emergency Plan, the 2014 Sexual Misconduct Policy, and installing a key card access system and security cameras in studios by fall 2015.

• The SoA Career and Outreach Office, working with administrators and faculty, will aim for 100% participation in its Graduating Student Survey and its 6-Months-Out Survey in order to better understand the graduate school acceptance and attendance rates as well as the employment rates (in traditional practice and alternative disciplines) of SoA graduates in order to develop best practices to improve those rates.

• The SoA Career and Outreach Office, working with administrators, faculty and architecture firms, will aim to increase the percentage of enrolled students following the traditional curricular path who are registered in the NCARB’s IDP in order to increase the number of students and alumni on the path to licensure.

• The SoA administrators, faculty and staff will develop a pilot program proposal to be submitted to NCARB in 2015 that provides evidence of the full support and participation of Woodbury University, the SoA faculty, the California Architect’s Board (CAB), the California Council of the AIA (AIACC), and a consortium of participating architecture firms, and that includes an outline of an additional path through Woodbury’s architecture curricula with a timeline for satisfying IDP requirements and passing the ARE before completion of the program to result in licensure upon graduation for successful participating students.

2. Curricular Development A, B, C, D, E
In order to assure the relevancy of its programs within the emergent global disciplines of architecture and interior architecture, the SoA Curricular Development 5-year plan is a calendar-based system of meetings and retreats whereby the SoA continuously refines and improves the curricular and co-curricular aspects of its professional education. The goals and outcomes of the plan include the following:

• The SoA Curriculum Committee, made up of department chairs and program coordinators, will maintain a structured calendar of regular monthly meetings to develop proposals for updating and modifying existing curricula including assigning new NAAB SPCs, changing course descriptions, adjusting grading rubrics, developing new courses, and defining milestones to be satisfied (e.g., portfolio review standards). The committee will present proposals for full SoA faculty approval and then submit them to the WUFA Curriculum Committee.
The SoA will maintain its schedule of at least one SoA-wide faculty retreat per year to focus on a particular aspect of the curriculum (e.g., history-theory, comprehensive design, foundation design studios), debating best teaching practices, course outcomes, assessment procedures and presenting samples of student work, to assure that our curricula maintain relevancy in the emerging global discipline of architecture.

The School of Architecture will continue with its tradition of the annual Grand Critique event at both locations, when three top students in their final year present work representing their progress through the program from the beginning. The Grand Critique concludes with a commentary on the strengths and weakness of the program and a student/faculty debate, so that the relevancy of the program can be measured from the student perspective and with student input.

3. Assessment and Accreditation A, B, C, D, E
In an ongoing process of evaluation, analysis, and improvement, the SoA Assessment and Accreditation 5-year plan ensures that it is meeting its own educational goals and institutional principles as well as the current and evolving conditions for accreditation within its disciplines (NAAB, CIDA and NASAD) along with those of its regional accreditor WASC. The goals and outcomes of the plan include the following:

- The SoA administration and faculty will maintain an ongoing system of assessment of how well their departments meet the conditions for accreditation with a special focus on "conditions not met", and "conditions of concern" from previous Visiting Team Reports, developing and implementing an action plan to better satisfy those conditions, including faculty workshops and retreats to discuss best practices in meeting SPCs or to develop strategies to improve other conditions which may be unmet or causes of concern.
- The SoA administration and faculty will continue to engage in structured "conditions-adjustment" phases aligned with the 5-year ARC cycle of updating the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, in order to begin a new conditions-adjustment phase prior to the next accreditation visit if required, or following any accreditation visit based upon the previous Conditions for Accreditation (such as the conditions-adjustment phase Woodbury will enter immediately following the 2015 NAAB visit based upon to 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation).
- The SoA administration and faculty, working in conjunction with the university’s other academic units, will continue to engage in structured "conditions-adjustment" phases aligned with the Western Association of Schools ad Colleges (WASC) cycle of updating conditions for regional accreditation, to maintain WASC accreditation.
- The SoA administration and faculty will continue to develop and maintain a rigorous procedure of periodic (5-year) program review for all of its degree programs to ensure that they are successful in assessing program learning outcomes and meeting program core competencies, in order to satisfy Woodbury’s internal program assessment requirements.

4. Faculty/Staff Development A, C, D, E
The SoA values the advancement of its faculty and staff members and demonstrates that it takes responsibility for supporting growth by following the SoA Faculty/Staff Development 5-year plan. The goals and outcomes of the plan include the following:

- The SoA administration including dean, associate dean, chairs, and program coordinators will maintain an ongoing process of thorough, fair and open performance evaluation of full-time and adjunct faculty and staff so that each SoA member has a continuing opportunity for improved performance.
- The SoA administration in conjunction with senior faculty will maintain a regular calendar-based schedule of mentoring full-time faculty in successfully preparing the reflective self-assessment of their teaching effectiveness, professional and scholarly activities and achievements, and university service in order to improve their applications for appointment renewal and/or rank advancement to the personnel committee.
- The SoA administration including dean, associate dean, chairs, and program coordinators will maintain an ongoing process of supporting individual growth and development of full-time and adjunct faculty and staff including but not limited to supporting professional development travel; participation in workshops, symposia, competitions, exhibitions, and professional organizations;
the development of special coursework or programs; and other assignments and opportunities that provide for personal and professional advancement and achievement.

5. Policies and Procedures Development and Oversight A, B, D
The driver of the SoA Policies and Procedures Development and Oversight 5-year plan is the belief that a collective process of reflection, collegiality and communication can help us to continuously refine and improve the efficiency, transparency, and equity of our daily operations. The goals and outcomes of the plan include the following:

- The SoA Handbook Dean Advisory Committee, working with the seven other Dean Advisory Committees (Study Abroad, Communications, Curriculum, Lecture Series, Facilities, Diversity, and Visiting Faculty Search) will complete the compilation of the SoA Handbook in the 2014-15 academic year, and develop a calendar and process to continually update and improve it every subsequent year.
- The office of the dean, working with the Dean and Chairs Committee and the recommendations of the Dean Advisory Committees, will maintain an ongoing and structured dialog among the SoA faculty to continually improve administrative structures and governance.
- The Woodbury chapter of the AIAS will have a regular calendar for reviewing and updating the SoA Studio Culture policy to ensure that it remains current, relevant, and appropriate.

6. Communications and Outreach A, B, C, D, E
At the core of the SoA Communications and Outreach 5-year plan is a new focus on marketing, which began in the 2013-14 academic year in a university-wide rebranding initiative under the leadership of the chief marketing officer. The goals and activities of the SoA Communications Office expand beyond promotion of news and events, to directly engage such challenges as increasing enrollment, solidifying alumni relationships, supporting resource generation beyond tuition income, creating reliable employment channels for graduates and improving the SoA reputation. The goals and outcomes of the plan include the following:

- The SoA will employ a responsive approach in all communications activities, tracking indicators such as inquiry entry points, sources of awareness among event attendees, and newsletter click-through rates, to improve and develop successful methodologies.
- The SoA will facilitate intra-university communications, serving as a "bridge" between constituencies (e.g. admissions, development, other schools within the university) to prevent redundancy and increase synergy.
- The SoA will strategically expand national awareness among multiple audiences, with a bipartite focus on groups directly responsible for recommending architecture programs to potential students and a general "popular" audience.
- The SoA will continue to develop recruiting collateral and student-facing communications plans that express the school's unique qualities while simultaneously speaking to potential students' concerns and questions in an enticing and approachable format.
- The SoA will greatly increase targeted social-media-based communications campaigns, driving traffic toward the newly launched (Summer 2014) website, optimized for visitor tracking and visitor connection with the SoA.

7. Budget Development and Oversight A
The SoA embraces its responsibility to advocate for and manage the institutional resources allocated to it in alignment with current and emerging priorities and with a spirit of entrepreneurism. The goals and outcomes of the plan include the following:

- The SoA administration will develop and maintain a rigorous, responsible, calendar-based system for entrepreneurial management of its allocated resources including appropriate maximization of class size through minimization of class sections relative to enrollment numbers, effectively monitoring maximum faculty workloads, establishing an equitable system of assigning stipends and course release, maximizing impact of all account expenditures while coming in at or under budget, and prioritizing expenditures when university-wide budget reduction is required, and to use its success to advocate for continuing or additional budget allocation.
- The SoA administration working with its faculty, staff, and students will develop an annual system
of identifying, justifying and prioritizing on-going and new budget needs that concludes at the end of the fall semester to successfully advocate for the SoA in the cabinet’s annual budget allocation process for subsequent fiscal years.

8. Fundraising and Development A, B, D, E
The need for a more robust SoA Fundraising and Development 5-year plan arises from an understanding that dependence on internal institutional tuition-based funding alone will not satisfy SoA long-range aspirations. The goals and outcomes of the plan include the following:

• The SoA will continue to grow its Advisory Council, whose members collectively act as ambassadors and the primary volunteer resource for external support. Council members advance contact between the broader community and the SoA, assist the school in accessing resources of influence, provide feedback on the evolving realities of professional practice, build recognition and advance the reputation of the school, and support transitional programs such as work experience and internships that assist students and graduates in developing their successful careers.

• The SoA will continue to work with the university development office to build and update an ongoing “case for support” to strengthen its efforts in growing SoA endowments and in securing major gifts and grants designated to support capital campaigns, faculty development opportunities, programs and centers, and student scholarships.

• The SoA will continue to work with the university development office to continue to improve a successful track record of long-term relationship building, including identifying individuals and organizations that may be aligned with the SoA’s “case for support”, confirming that these individuals and organizations are qualified to provide major gift support, and stewarding the relationships over time to successful major gift solicitations.

9. Facilities and Technology Planning, Development and Maintenance A, B, D, E
A commitment to effective and forward-looking deployment of current and emerging technologies and facilities drives the SoA Facilities and Technology Planning, Development and Maintenance 5-year plan. The goals and outcomes of the plan include the following:

• The SoA administration, Facilities Dean Advisory Committee, faculty and staff will develop an annual process for assessing the condition and viability of current facilities and technologies, assembling a list of maintenance, repair or replacement requests for the annual multi-year internal budgeting process that occurs during the fall semester, and updating the evolving SoA case for external support with the SoA development officer as well.

• The SoA administration, Facilities Dean Advisory Committee, faculty and staff will develop an annual process for identifying and prioritizing technologies commonly available at other regional schools of architecture and emergent technologies that serve the specific interests and future needs of our faculty and students to maintain a progressive and competitive advantage.

Long-Range Planning Process
The process by which the SoA identifies its objectives for continuous improvement can be expressed in the annual calendar of meetings. This calendar of regular meetings provides a framework for collectively working toward the nine objectives, and meeting discussions reveal the key performance indicators or information and data needed to inform their development.

Dean and Provost, once a month
Regular planning meetings between the dean and the provost place SoA planning in context with the other schools and university departments and help the dean prioritize the nine objectives from the perspective of the president’s cabinet and the board of trustees.

Dean and Associate Dean, once a week
Historically, these meetings have dealt with whatever is the most pressing subset of the nine objectives. Beginning with summer 2014, the agenda will be regularized to ensure all nine objectives are attended to each meeting.
Deans Coordinators Chairs (D/C/C) Meetings, twice a month
Convened by the associate dean, these meetings include the chairs of interior architecture, LA architecture and San Diego architecture, the graduate and undergraduate architecture coordinators in LA and San Diego, and the dean. A typical meeting touches on a minimum of five of the objectives but often it will address all nine.

Program Faculty Meetings, once a month
Interior architecture and Los Angeles and San Diego architecture meetings are convened by faculty facilitators. Faculty meetings typically focus on no more than three of the nine objectives.

Focused Faculty Roundtables, two to three times a semester
Convened by the associate dean or the appropriate department chair, these meetings typically focus on Curricular Development or on Assessment and Accreditation.

All-School Planning Meetings and Retreats, once or twice a year
Fulltime faculty and adjunct faculty from all programs in LA and San Diego are invited to meet at an all-day meeting convened by the dean and/or associate dean, usually focused on the objectives of Curricular Development or Assessment and Accreditation.

Student Feedback to Faculty Advisors, at least once a semester
At least one one-on-one meeting is scheduled each semester between every student and their faculty advisor. In addition to assisting the students in the development and oversight of their academic plan and path towards graduation and licensure, faculty advisors serve as a conduit for student feedback to the rest of the faculty and chairs. All objectives except Budget Development & Oversight and Fundraising & Development are likely to be addressed in this feedback loop.

Student Feedback, ongoing
The dean, associate dean, chairs and coordinators maintain an open-door policy and serve as ongoing go-to people with whom students voice their concerns and creative input. All objectives except Budget Development & Oversight and Fundraising & Development are addressed in this feedback loop.

Graduate Student Lunch Meetings, once a semester
The chair schedules a lunch meeting for all graduate students, the coordinator, the associate dean, and the dean. Generally the agenda is focused on one or two of the nine objectives, most often Curricular Development, Student Success, or Faculty/Staff Development. As needed, a meeting specific to international student issues is convened.

Course Evaluations and Student Surveys, once a semester
These regular surveys provide feedback on the objectives of Student Success, Assessment and Accreditation, Curricular Development and Faculty Development.

SoA Advisory Council, two to three times a year
The SoA Advisory Council meetings assist the dean, the development officer and the director of communications with the objectives of Fundraising & Development and Communications & Outreach, and have an impact on Budget Development & Oversight.

President’s Cabinet, once a week
The president’s cabinet consists of the chief officers in Academic Affairs, Enrollment Management, University Marketing, Finance and Administration, University Advancement, and Student Development, as well as the academic deans and dean of the faculty. The cabinet works with the president to develop his agenda including annual budgets, new programs and strategic initiatives. The cabinet has influence on all nine SoA objectives for continuous improvement.

Board of Trustees, four times a year
The university’s board of trustees meets quarterly. The president and his cabinet are invited to attend. The president’s cabinet members sit as non-voting members on the board committees, which include
Academic and Student Affairs, Finance, Development and Alumni Relations, Governance, and Building and Grounds. These committees make recommendations for board approval. The board has influence on all nine SoA objectives for continuous improvement.

University-wide Faculty Development Workshops, once a semester
The Faculty Association hosts half-day workshops each semester that typically focus on issues addressing the objectives of Faculty Development, Curricular Development, or Assessment and Accreditation.

University-wide Strategic Planning, once every three to five years
University-wide strategic planning is generally associated with some milestone such as the build-up to a major regional accreditation visit (WASC), the launch of a new capital campaign, or the appointment of a new university president (our current milestone). All nine SoA objectives for continuous improvement are likely addressed (see Other Programmatic and Institutional Planning Initiatives below).

Long Range Planning Data and Information
The SOA long-range planning objectives are informed by data and information from a number of internal sources. The main data and information source comes from the institutional researcher in the department of Information Technology, who sends out regular reports that are calendar-based such as course evaluation results, alumni surveys, graduation surveys, etc. The institutional researcher is also available for special assignments like preparing annual NAAB statistical reports or reports for APRs. Other sources include but are not limited to the following:

- The president’s cabinet receives university-wide budget and enrollment updates at its weekly meetings.
- The Business Office sends departmental budget updates to the SoA dean, associate dean, chairs, San Diego administrative director and LA administrative coordinator as often as once a week showing burn rates against annual budgets.
- Admissions distributes weekly reports breaking down new student applications into admits, deposits and cancels for all programs and compares them to the same time the previous year.
- Prior to each semester the Office of Student Development notifies each school of its returning students who haven’t re-enrolled so faculty can reach out and encourage them to do so.

An emerging external source of data and information that helps at various stages of the academic calendar is from the data link on the web site of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA): www.asc-a-arch.org/data

Other Programmatic and Institutional Planning Initiatives
Two university-wide long-range planning initiatives are integral to the SoA long-range planning objectives, sometimes influencing the objectives and sometimes being influenced by the objectives. They are the Woodbury University Strategic Plan 2013-2025 and the Woodbury University Master Plan 2014-2016.

Woodbury University Strategic Plan 2013-2025
Upon assuming office in July 2012, President Luis Calingo set to work developing a new strategic plan from work that the university had begun prior to his arrival. The strategic plan and the eight strategic initiatives for capacity building were approved on April 18, 2013 and based upon the following.

- **Vision** By 2025, our distinctive ability to integrate transdisciplinarity, design thinking, entrepreneurship, and civic engagement in education and scholarship will have secured us a place among the top 100 regional universities in the United States.
- **Core Values** Community, Integrity, Professionalism, Aspiration, Agility
- **Three Horizons**
  - Horizon I (2013-2016) Capacity-Building. Build strategy, organization, systems, and a creative and innovative culture to enable the achievement of a competitive advantage.
  - Horizon II (2016-2020) Growth. Achieve growth in enrollment and resources resulting from realized competitive advantage and innovations.
• **Strategy Map**
  Student and Stakeholder Focus: S1 Improve student learning and success; S-2 Improve student and stakeholder satisfaction and engagement.
  Financial Sustainability Focus: F1 Increase net income; F2 Expand resource base.
  Process Focus: P1 Academic excellence; P2: Operational excellence.
  Capacity-Building Investments: C-1 Human capital; C-2 Information capital; C-3 Organization capital.

• **Balanced Scorecard**
  Student Learning and Success: (a) graduation rates, (b) return on investment, and (c) student loan default rate
  Financial Sustainability: (d) NACUBO composite financial index, (e) FTE enrollment, and (f) tuition dependency
  Academic and Operational Excellence: (g) composite academic excellence index, (h) endowment per FTE student, and (i) student financial aid gap
  Faculty and Staff Satisfaction and Engagement: (j) “Great Colleges to Work For” survey

• **Strategic Challenges**
  *Differentiation* of Woodbury’s liberal arts-based professional education in light of new workforce demands of a diverse and global 21st century environment.
  Educating students for *professional competence and responsible citizenship* in a democratic society.
  Sustainability of Woodbury’s *commitment to access to quality higher education.*
  Preparing students for jobs that don’t yet exist.

8 Strategic Initiatives for Capacity Building 2013-2016

(1) **Four Pillars of Woodbury Education**
Outcomes: Four pillars of Woodbury education – transdisciplinarity, design thinking, entrepreneurship, civic engagement – defined in clear, concise, and impactful sentences; four pillars infused into academic assessment and program review for the purposes of achieving Balanced Scorecard metrics for student success and academic excellence
Owner: Executive Vice President & Provost

(2) **Woodbury Integrated Student Experience (WISE)**
Outcomes: Woodbury University becomes known for its exceptional student experiences based on high-impact educational practices, including internship, civic engagement, study-away, faculty-mentored scholarship, and leadership development
Owner: Chief Marketing Officer

(3) **Civic Engagement**
Outcomes: Recognition in the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll; methodology developed and implemented for collecting and deploying university-wide civic engagement information
Owner: Vice President & Chief Enrollment Officer

(4) **Healthy and Sustainable Campus**
Outcomes: Participation in the Sustainability Tracking, Assessment, and Rating (STAR) system of the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education; recognition at the STAR Reporter level or better
Owner: Dean of the School of Architecture

(5) **Revenue Diversification**
Outcomes: Business plans for fifth school (professional, adult, and continuing education), cyber campus, and at least five revenue-generating opportunities (including online degree programs) prepared, based on Academic Program Marketability Assessment (APMA)
Owner: Chief Information Officer
(6) Student Experience Process Improvement
Outcomes: Positive student interface that ties together the student’s full experience from initial contact as potential applicant through successful graduation and placement in a grad program or first employment opportunity of high quality; development of alumni who embrace responsibility to their alma mater; professional development of all those involved in the interface (staff, faculty, administrators) so that their work is effective, satisfying, meaningful, and provides personal/professional growth.
Owner: Dean of the School of Business

(7) University as a Community Leader
Outcomes: Integrated Branding Strategy and Comprehensive Marketing Plan that drives enrollments to FTE goals; Fund Raising Campaign Plan that moves us to higher contributed revenue to 10% of expense budget by 2015, 15% by 2020, and 20% by 2025; Volunteer Program with 500 active alumni and friends
Owner: Dean of the School of Business

(8) Technology Acquisition
Outcomes: Gaps in academic and administrative technologies closed to enable the accomplishment of strategic plan goals
Owner: Executive Vice President & Provost

Campus Master Plan 2014-15
Woodbury University is seeking a qualified individual or firm to develop and provide site-specific planning services for the development of a campus master plan for 7500 Glenoaks Blvd, Burbank/Los Angeles. The site consists of 22.5 acres for Woodbury University’s main campus; it does not include the San Diego campus. Aside from a small parcel at the extreme southeast corner of the property situated in the city of Burbank, most of the site is in the City of Los Angeles. The site currently has approximately 20 buildings, four main parking lots, and extensive hardscaping and landscaping. The campus atmosphere is a large recruiting tool for new students, staff, and faculty. As such, maintaining an understanding the existing identity of place in order to plan for a future identity will be an important part of the planning process. Campus environments represent the identity and values of the community they serve. To this end the development of the campus master plan should reflect the ongoing strategic initiatives developed for the strategic plan (see above). The scope of service includes the following required tasks:

Task 1: Inventory existing planning policies, infrastructure conditions and constraints, and plans developed over the past five years
Several processes have been in place to collect the space needs of the community, develop planning ideas, inventory existing spaces, understand existing infrastructure and its constraints and respond to day-to-day facility needs. The first task will be to sift through these different documents in order to apply still-current planning needs into the planning process (documents provided by Woodbury University.) The selected planner will work with the university to review the documents and prioritize past information as it informs the new campus plan.

Task Two: Inventory existing strategic documents
Development of the campus master plan should be rooted in the vision and mission expressed in the strategic plan and its eight key strategic initiatives. The selected team will work with the owners of each strategic initiative to understand how these initiatives are best implemented into the campus planning and implementation process. Some initiatives may have direct physical impact on the design and build out of the new plan as it progresses; others will be reflected in the university’s identity. The selected planner will develop a strategy for realizing the strategic initiatives through the development of the new campus plan.

Task Three: Conduct interviews with key personnel from different constituencies of the university
In addition to reviewing existing and past documents developed for earlier planning needs, the selected planners will develop a strategy for including the community in helping determine the needs of physical and design requirements on campus. The planner will determine the best strategy for obtaining
community involvement and buy-in of the planning process and plan development. Documentation of community involvement must be recorded and archived for assessment and accreditation purposes.

Task Four: Develop the Master Plan
Once the inventories of past and future needs are collected, the consultant will be responsible for developing a campus master plan that addresses the following key issues:
1. Campus identity
2. Campus systems
   • Program utilization and clarity
   • Built environment / form
   • Instructional spaces with an appropriate mix of classrooms, studios and labs to meet current and future program growth
   • Emerging information technology trends and their effect on space
   • Staff work spaces
   • Residential spaces
   • Student affair and development spaces
   • Food service
   • Open space for recreation and formal gatherings
   • Open space for learning
   • Landscaping
   • Pedestrian circulation
   • Vehicular circulation
   • Parking
   • Mechanical and electrical services and infrastructure
   • Signage
   • Lighting
3. Future development
4. Healthy and sustainable planning practices
5. Processes for assessing and evaluating development needs

Task Five: Prepare all required CEQA documents for the proposed project
The consultant will prepare all documents necessary under CEQA to meet compliance requirements. The consultant will coordinate with the Lead Agency and provide a complete proposal for preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as necessary. The proposal will include a general scope of the anticipated EIR, general timeline and budget necessary to complete.

Task Six: Implement strategy
The consultant will identify an action plan with realistic steps, strategies and recommendations to retain existing systems while incorporating proposed changes, to foster the development open land and rehabilitation of existing structure to meet future student capacity. The strategy should also highlight physical and code challenges that may exist on Woodbury University's campus.
The implementation plan will provide a step-by-step approach to follow up on the Campus Plan to answer the basic questions: How can the project be phased? What are projected preliminary costs for proposed planning strategy? How do we involve internal and external community in proposed changes? What are suggested time frames for building out different parts of the proposed plan?

The firm Rios Clemente Hale was selected as the Master Plan consultant on August 1, 2014.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures

The School of Architecture’s ongoing self-assessment takes place at many levels: in the individual classroom or studio, at programmatic milestones such as the Thesis Preparation and Thesis Studio for grad students and the 3rd-year portfolio review for undergraduates, through faculty peer-review, through the curriculum workgroup and ad-hoc task forces, and in the D/C/C group. Importantly, we
reserve annual faculty retreats as opportunities to focus on curricular or programmatic areas for continual improvement.

SoA faculty participate in school-wide retreats each fall semester. We have used these gatherings to assay various modes of assessment, from Strengths/Weaknesses/Opportunities/Threats exercises (used on several occasions) to pecha-kucha presentations focused on specific learning outcomes to small-group work sessions generating many ideas for later refinement into curricular change. For example, in our last School of Architecture retreat in the spring of 2014, we discussed the role of history in the architecture curriculum. Faculty presented course syllabi throughout the curriculum not just in traditional history and theory classes, but also in visualization, building technology and practice, that presented historical case studies and methodologies for presenting historical interpretations of course material. We developed the retreats into assessment events, partly in response to the NAAB cycle, partly in response to the WASC extended cycle of reaffirmation, and partly because as the faculty grew it became clear that regular faculty meetings could not provide an adequate venue for self-assessment procedures.

During their exit interview following their February 2008 Capacity and Preparatory Review visit, the visiting WASC accreditation team identified the self-assessment procedures of the architecture program as a model for other disciplines at the university to follow. The 2008 NAAB visiting team also identified Self Assessment Procedures as a well-met condition in the BArch program. The 2012 Visiting Team from the MArch Initial Accreditation Visit noted that the School of Architecture has a detailed assessment plan and coordinates its procedures to include expectations of our regional accrediting body (WASC) as well as the university’s program review group, the Educational Planning Committee.

The final stage of WASC reaffirmation was the Educational Effectiveness Review in 2010. It required each academic division to clarify curricular goals and learning outcomes; identify when they are introduced in the curricular and when they are mastered; establish clear rubrics for assessing these outcomes; and develop a multi-year assessment plan with an internal feedback loop that uses the outcomes of assessment to feed continual improvement and to align resources with goals.

These methods of self-assessment have led the School of Architecture to identify specific areas of excellence and weakness in carrying out its mission. On balance, we determined our strengths were sufficient to move forward with our strategic plan to develop and grow our graduate programs both for professional and post-professional architecture education in both locations, as well as within the discipline of interior architecture. We built on program strengths cited in the 2008 VTR as conditions met or well met, and redressed what were weaknesses in the BArch program (conditions not met, minimally met, or causes of concern) as we launched the MArch program. In addition, the self-assessment we undertook for regional accreditation served us well in providing an overlay or holistic vision of what we currently do well, what we could easily do well with focused attention, and where we are still emerging.

The main cycle driving our assessment procedures is the NAAB professional accreditation cycle, which with this report and upcoming visit is now coordinated to include both our BArch and MArch programs. Tied to that cycle is an internal program review requirement overseen by the university’s Educational Planning Committee (a faculty association elected standing committee). On a larger scale, the SoA also must prepare for WASC reaffirmation. Just as the long-range plan presents an annual calendar of processes for continual improvement, the self-assessment procedures identified here outline a process to ensure that we are setting goals and making progress toward meeting them. At an assessment retreat/workshop in 2011, faculty worked on intentional foregrounding of the five perspectives, which are tied to the self-assessment process outlined below.

**Assessment Procedures**

- **Curriculum review and development:** Assess the effectiveness of the curricula – the courses and their sequencing – to see whether our students are achieving appropriate learning outcomes and effectively constructing their education.
- **Programmatic review and development:** Assess programs beyond the course and sequence level, including activities, opportunities for faculty, staff and student development, mission and vision, to determine how each program is transforming and to direct that transformation. The
assumption is that every program will change over time, and those changes should be intentional whenever possible and lead to improvements.

- **Measuring student success**: Assess the success of the students in each program, to determine whether academic preparation requirements are appropriate to support programmatic and curricular goals, whether students are making academic progress at a rate appropriate to their level (graduate or undergraduate), whether they are self-reflective about their education and able to provide self-direction, and whether students are graduating on time – and when they aren’t, why they aren’t.

- **Measuring alumni success**: Assess the success of SoA alumni to see whether they are satisfied with their education (this perception may change over time), whether they have found desired employment or other desired opportunities, whether they are taking the licensing exam and at what rate they are passing, and whether they are able to balance educational debt with their professional salary.

- **Providing effective communication of SoA mission/aspirations/achievements**: Assess whether the School of Architecture is conveying its message of educational opportunity and growing academic excellence to appropriate and broad (growing) audiences, manifested by communication responses tracked in multiple media, attendance at SoA events, and contributions to SoA development.

- **Alignment of resources**: Assess whether the needs and appropriate, realistic goals of the SoA are allocated adequate resources to meet the needs and achieve the goals in a reasonable and intentional timeline.

**Assessment Plan**

- **Curriculum review and development** takes place regularly in the Curriculum Workgroup, in department faculty meetings, at faculty and student roundtables, at meetings that review specific realms of the curriculum with faculty teaching courses in those realms (e.g. Visualization, Criticism, etc.), and at the fall faculty retreats, leading to curriculum refinement and changes.

- **Programmatic review and development** takes place in retreats leading to development of focuses, one-time or ongoing academic opportunities, and greater faculty development opportunities (FT and adjunct), and in preparation for larger assessment cycles.

- **Measuring student success** takes place in an ongoing manner by identifying current data sources (Office of Institutional Research) and developing and applying new instruments for gathering data. It is evaluated through quantitative data (progress and persistence, time to graduation, awards count) and qualitative data (self-reported course evaluations, advising feedback loop). Measuring student success is crucial not only to the SoA but to the university’s strategic plan under President Calingo’s leadership.

- **Measuring alumni success** takes place in an ongoing manner by identifying current data sources (IR, Alumni Relationships in Advancement, and the Office of Career Development) and by developing and applying new instruments for gathering data. It is evaluated through quantitative and qualitative data (desired employment, other desired opportunities, ability to handle graduate debt, pass rates for licensure, satisfaction with education reported over time). Measuring alumni success is also critical to the university’s strategic plan under President Calingo’s leadership.

- **Effective communication** is evaluated in conjunction with the Office of Communication and its 5-year plan. The SoA Office of Communication is working well and closely with the new chief marketing officer and her team. Measurable goals are identified (number, frequency and importance of media citations, for example) and achievement may be measured by increased and more effective development campaigns. As with measuring student and alumni success, measuring effective communication is integral to President Calingo’s strategic plan, which relies on developing and implementing evidence-based best practices.

- **Alignment of resources** is evaluated annually through the budget process, by measuring development opportunities provided for faculty, identifying and evaluating key performance indicators for the school, and through qualitative data regarding faculty, staff and student satisfaction with physical and academic resources.
All assessment procedures support the multiples scales of program review: external professional (NAAB), internal program review, and regional reaffirmation. In addition, the assessment procedures intersect with and support the development of the five NAAB perspectives and their manifestation in the School of Architecture’s professional programs as follows:

A. Architecture Education and the Academic Community
B. Architecture Education and Students
C. Architecture Education and the Regulatory Environment
D. Architecture Education and the Profession
E. Architecture Education and the Public Good

Curriculum review and development supports perspectives A, B, C and D.
Programmatic review and development supports perspectives A, B, D, and E.
Measuring student success supports all the perspectives.
Measuring alumni success supports perspectives C, D, and E.
Providing effective communication supports perspectives A and E.
Alignment of resources supports all the perspectives.

The assessment procedures outlined above and the process by which they take place inform and support the SoA’s ability to make strong progress in its long-range plan, which is predicated on aligning resources with aspirations in the pursuit of ever greater academic quality.

Recent results of SoA self-assessment will be provided in the team room. Examples of improvements based on self-assessment include the development of a strongly recommended portfolio class to support 3rd-year portfolio review; a spring semester BArch comprehensive studio portfolio review similar to the one implemented in the MArch program, revisions to the MArch curriculum away from originally proposed three emphases and toward a refocusing on fieldwork and the five realms (Studio, Criticism, Visualization, Building and Practice); and the development of a career and outreach specialist position within the SoA to support perspectives C, D, and E.

Institutional Requirements for Self-Assessment
The university’s Educational Planning Committee revised the academic program review process in 2011-12; it was approved in April 2012 by the Faculty Senate, the chief academic officer, and the president. Academic program review guidelines and policies will be provided in full in the visiting team room as noted in section I.4 Policy Review. The policy requires programs that undergo an external professional accreditation review, such as the professional architecture programs’ review by NAAB, to determine optimum alignment of the external and internal cycles, and it allows them to re-purpose the external document for internal review with important topics and statistics called out for easy identification. The program submits the external document with a summary that also fills any gaps between information reported externally and information required internally.

I.2 Resources

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development

The School of Architecture maintains appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. These resources include fulltime and adjunct instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support. The school supports the personal and professional development of its faculty, staff and administration through employment policies and faculty personnel policies.

The Woodbury School of Architecture faculty is a faculty engaged in professional practice and scholarly activities; the demands of a highly competitive urban architecture market require faculty to continue their education. Southern California’s growing demand for sustainable design requires practicing faculty to stay current with changing codes, professional standards such as LEED certification, and evolving materials and building methods. Built work and permits pulled are probably the best evidence of faculty members
staying current. A number of our faculty publish prolifically (articles, journals, contributions to books), and some publish and practice.

Because so many of our faculty define their professional development through their design practice and their publications, situating the projects they undertake within a greater intellectual discourse and bringing that discussion directly into the classroom and studio, we have no faculty who rest on their laurels. The School of Architecture nurtures integrated faculty who define holistically their practice of architecture through teaching, scholarly and professional development, and service to their communities.

The SoA strongly encourages faculty involvement with professional organizations such as the AIA. The school pays for AIA membership for all full-time faculty who are members and request support. The school has also paid for faculty members to become LEED certified. The school funds adjunct faculty professional development if the opportunity directly supports program improvement and funds are available. For example, the SoA annually funds adjunct faculty member Mark Owen’s participation in Autodesk University Conference. Annual attendance at this conference allows Mark to learn new computational tools and techniques from leaders in the architectural profession and the academy in order to bring cutting-edge technology to students in the courses he teaches each year. The university provides support for individual faculty initiatives through Faculty Development Grants, available to both full-time and adjunct faculty, and sabbatical project funding. Recent proposals that have received Faculty Development Grants include Mark Ericson’s and Ewan Branda’s proposal for a SoA faculty publication, Berenika Boberska’s proposed research project in California City that developed from her graduate visualization seminar, and Curt Gambett’s symposium on waste and infrastructure at WUHO.

The SoA supports the personal and professional development of its staff as well. It encourages staff members to seek out educational opportunities and to attend them as part of their employment. Galina Kraus, for example, completed her MBA while serving as administrative coordinator and followed up with a course of study in graphic design software. In spring 2012, Galina attended a one-day seminar on communication skills for professionals and supervisors; in summer 2013, she took a two-day seminar on Excel; and in summer 2014, she attended a one-day seminar on managing multiple projects and priorities. SoA Career and Outreach Coordinator Catherine Roussel, AIA is the school’s IDP education coordinator and attends the annual IDP coordinators conference.

SoA administrative leadership is described in section I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance. Descriptions of responsibilities for School of Architecture faculty, administration and staff positions will be available in the team room.

I.2.1.A Faculty & Staff

i. Faculty Matrix: A faculty matrix is provided in section IV.2 covering academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14. An updated faculty matrix for 2014-15 will be available in the team room.

ii. Faculty Resumes: Faculty resumes are provided in section IV.2.

iii. EEO/AA Policies: University policies regarding EEO/AA policies and procedures appear in section I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity. These policies govern faculty, staff, administration, students and other members of the Woodbury community.

iv. Diversity Initiatives
The School of Architecture is excited to be leading the university in moving beyond statements about valuing diversity and into the realm of action. A new Dean’s Advisory Committee was launched in August 2014 to develop a School of Architecture Diversity Plan; members include full time faculty members Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, Hector Perez, Annie Chu, adjunct faculty member Louis Molina, Human Resources Director Natalie Avalos, and Vice President of Student Development Phyllis Cremer. The process and results are expected to serve as a model for a university-wide diversity initiative.

v. Human Resource Development Opportunities
Faculty development opportunities are described in detail in section I.1.3.A Architecture Education and the Academic Community. As noted above, the school covers AIA membership for fulltime faculty, supports LEED certification for faculty, and considers adjunct faculty requests for professional development support on an individual basis as funds are available. The SoA budgets annually for approximately $1500 per fulltime faculty member for travel to and participation in academic and professional conferences and similar opportunities.

The university also offers development opportunities for faculty and staff including an annual health and wellness fair, free weekly yoga classes, a tuition remission program, and an employee assistance program offering support, guidance and resources to help employees and their families meet challenges ranging from childcare and elder care, alcohol and drug abuse, life improvement, grief and loss, identity theft, and counseling needs.

vi. Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Contract Renewal
Policies, procedures and criteria for faculty appointment, contract renewal, and rank advancement may be found in section C of the Faculty Handbook, URL provided in section IV.4. Woodbury University does not have a tenure system; its fulltime faculty become eligible for multi-year contracts based on length of service and rank, as described in the Faculty Handbook.

The Faculty Handbook, Section C, Faculty Personnel Policy describes expectations for faculty development in part as follows, “The university seeks to provide and maintain an environment conducive to professional and personal development for faculty as well as for students. This environment is the major responsibility of the university community whose members encourage each other toward excellence and individuality in teaching performance, professional growth, and service to the university. We have a right, therefore, to expect from each competence, scholarship, and service.” (C.IV.A.)

Faculty in the School of Architecture take seriously their responsibility to progress toward the ideals of the teaching scholar. Within the school, an active debate about constructing one’s own effort toward these ideals keeps us striving for new goals. Architecture faculty are active teaching scholars seeking teaching effectiveness, pursuing and developing professional or scholarly or creative opportunities, and continually demonstrating a serious service commitment to the school, the university and the greater community. Since well before our current accreditation periods, every fulltime faculty member in Architecture who has submitted a contract renewal application has been renewed. Since our last six-year accreditation, eleven faculty members have applied for and received promotion; at this time we have no fulltime faculty who have not received the promotion applied for. Nine architecture faculty have applied for a sabbatical leave, and all have been granted, with 33 approved sabbatical applications submitted in the university overall in those six years.

vii. Visiting Lecturers and Critics
As described in section I.1.3.A Architecture Education and the Academic Community, the school has an annual series of lectures, exhibits and events activating our three sites (Los Angeles, San Diego, and Hollywood) as places for public discourse. We also invite guests to our studios and classrooms as critics for reviews and as topic experts. We make a special effort to have public lecturers spend some time in a relevant studio or classroom for the direct benefit of those students. For example, William Zahner, CEO of Zahner Industries, was invited to lecture in San Diego in spring 2010. Zahner Industries, headquartered in Kansas City, does engineering and fabrication and is known in art and architecture circles for its innovative use of metal. He arrived a few days early and spent a day in the 3B studio helping students work through the use of metal on their projects. When he lectured that week a number of Barrio Logan’s steel fabricators attended. In spring 2013, a team of artists and scientists worked with San Diego students to create an environmental installation on campus called Soil Blind, funded by DNA of Creativity through Urban Succession. The artist member of the team gave a library talk following the installation’s opening. And in fall 2013, Thomas Auer, Managing Partner of Transsolar, a climate engineering firm, was invited by Urban Policy Center co-directors Bill Roschen and Christi Van Cleve to lecture in the SoA public series in Los Angeles. He also spent time in the studio providing feedback to students on their proposals for healthy cities design projects.
A full list of critics and lecturers invited since the 2012 visit may be found in section IV.6.4.

viii. Public Exhibitions
We have four main venues for public exhibits: the Woodbury University Hollywood Outpost (WUHO), the Ahmanson Main Space and the Wedge Gallery on our Los Angeles campus, and the Gallery in San Diego. WUHO is Woodbury University’s center for experimental exhibitions and multi-disciplinary collaborations, and is directed by Associate Dean Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter. Located on the iconic Hollywood Walk of Fame, WUHO is simultaneously an exhibition, event, and lecture platform and a fieldwork outpost. In 2009 at the invitation of then-graduate chair Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, the Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design began sharing the facility. The Los Angeles Forum is one of the most influential architectural organizations in Los Angeles and plays a vital role among architecture organizations nationally and internationally by initiating, presenting, and debating architectural and urban speculations about Los Angeles. Not coincidentally, SoA members currently on its board of directors include full-time faculty Eric Olsen and Matt Gillis and alumna Khristeen Decastro. Dean Norman Millar serves on the advisory board.

The San Diego Gallery serves as a magnet for community discussions of art, architecture, urbanism, politics, development, and border issues. In 2013 the Port Authority of San Diego cancelled its 1% for the Arts Program. In response, we hosted “Public Art Matters” in October 2013, a well-attended exhibit of work from San Diego’s public artists. We continue to host events for Balboa Parks Cultural Partner, Art of Science Learning Incubator for Innovation. In fall 2013 they held a weekend-long workshop to discuss and review all the data their teams had collected from around the city. We hosted all the Barrio Logan planning meetings, three years worth of public meetings on the specific plan update. We continue to make the Gallery available for hosting community meetings so that we remain a vital and valued neighborhood partner.

A full list of public exhibitions since the 2012 visit may be found in section IV.6.4.

ix. Sufficient Faculty Complement
At the time of the 2007 APR the ratio of FTE students to FT faculty in Woodbury’s professional architecture programs was over 50 to 1 (50.6:1). At the time of the 2012 APR for the MArch’s initial accreditation the ratio of FTE students to FT faculty in Woodbury’s professional architecture programs was just under 30 to 1 (29.2:1). The ratio of FTE students to FT faculty for academic year 2013-14 was under 27 to 1 (26.61:1). For Los Angeles programs the ratio was just over 30 to 1 (30.53:1); for San Diego it was 16.4:1. Our goal is that the FTE student to FT faculty ratio should flatten out at between 25 and 30 to 1 or less at both campuses.

In the academic year 2013-14, the university and the deans agreed that deans’ faculty contracts would be “in suspended animation” while deans serve in a cabinet-level administrative position. Thus Dean Norman Millar is no longer counted among the school’s FT faculty, though he may reactivate his faculty status if he wishes to upon leaving the dean position. In 2013-14, the SoA had 18 FT faculty in the professional architecture programs. One of those was a visiting appointment to fill the position that arose through our loss of longtime faculty member Nick Roberts. For 2014-15, there are 18 FT faculty in the professional architecture programs and two FT faculty who serve the programs ½-time each (one split with Interior Architecture, one with Academic Affairs), for a total of 19.

Faculty workload
The workload for fulltime faculty is calculated as 36 units annually, of which two-thirds is devoted to teaching and one-third to university service and scholarly or professional contribution. The normal teaching load for fulltime faculty is 12 units of lecture, or the equivalent, per semester. For the purposes of equivalency, 1 unit of studio equals 1.5 units of lecture, assuming that all studio courses are 2 academic hours per academic unit. Faculty may average the load between fall semester and spring semester to meet their teaching obligations. Summer term may be used to satisfy the teaching load requirements with permission from the dean. Most fulltime architecture faculty teach a 6-unit studio and a 3-unit seminar each semester and can satisfy their load by coming to campus three days per week, thus allowing them adequate time to pursue research, scholarship, and practice to enhance their professional development.
Participating adjunct and adjunct workloads are less than 75% FTE (27 units combined teaching and other responsibilities) in an academic year, excluding summer term employment.

x. Sufficient Staff
We have been steadily building staff support in the School of Architecture since the launch of our MArch program. We now have fourteen fulltime staff members reporting directly to or working on behalf of the SoA. In San Diego, our fulltime staff includes the administrative director, an administrative assistant, an assistant to the chair, an undergraduate admissions officer, a graduate admissions officer, and IT supervisor. In Los Angeles, our fulltime staff includes an administrative coordinator, an administrative assistant, the Making Complex manager (shop master), the PPOHA manager (through October 2014) and a digital fabrication manager. With offices in LA but serving all our programs are the director of Communications, the Career and Outreach coordinator, and a dedicated SoA development officer. We also have several half-time staff members, including support in the LA and San Diego Making Complexes and admissions officers at the LA campus.

We support our staff and supplement our administrative needs with student workers in the Making Complexes, the computer labs, the archive, the galleries, the Communications Office, and in administrative assistance. Faculty research and projects are supported by undergraduate and graduate student research assistantships.

I.2.1.B Students
The SoA demonstrates our commitment to student achievement inside and outside the classroom by providing individual and collective curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities. Our processes for evaluation and admission aim to ensure that the students we enroll have the potential to succeed. The university’s Student Development division provides services to support transforming that potential into actuality.

i. Applicant Evaluation Process
The evaluation processes for placement in the BArch and into the MArch are also described in section II.3 Preparatory and Pre-professional Education.

Generally speaking, for undergraduate admission the university requires a high school diploma or its equivalent; SAT/ACT scores are evaluated, as are statements of purpose and letters of recommendation. If an applicant has taken any college courses or advanced placement (AP) courses, evidence of achievement (transcript or AP scores) is required. While some programs require a portfolio review, the BArch program does not unless the applicant is seeking advanced placement in the core architecture sequence.

For graduate admission, the university requires proof of completion of an undergraduate degree; individual programs then determine their specific admissions criteria. For the MArch, GRE scores are required when the undergraduate gpa is below 3.0. The MArch also requires complete undergraduate transcripts, a resume or c.v., a portfolio of creative work, three letters of recommendation, a statement of purpose in undertaking a graduate architectural education, and an interview with a graduate admissions committee faculty member.

All international students are required to submit the standard application material and the following additional information: a copy of their passport, certified copies of their academic records with English translations, and a certified bank affidavit.

Transcripts for all international students are evaluated by an international evaluation agency such as IERF (International Education Research Foundation). The reports prepared by these agencies provide the U.S. equivalent grade and unit amount based upon contact hours for each course.

International students whose native language is not English are required to demonstrate proficiency via recognized English language test scores. For undergraduate students, the university requires a minimum
TOEFL of 61 internet-based, or the equivalent in IELTS, ITEP or CAE. For graduate students, the minimum TOEFL score is 83 internet-based or its equivalent in other systems.

Application forms for students applying to the BArch and MArch programs are available through the online registration system on the university’s webpage and the school’s webpage.

BArch applicant evaluation process
Students admitted to the university as first-time freshmen nearly always declare a major; many majors require discipline-specific courses in the first year of study. The BArch, for example, requires design studio and design communication in both semesters of the first year. A majority of new Woodbury students enter with some college-level work already completed, through AP classes and exams and/or community college study. Only college courses in which a student has earned C or better are considered for transfer.

University priority application deadlines are March 1 for fall semester enrollment and November 1 for spring enrollment for both freshmen and transfer students. The BArch program strongly encourages freshmen to enter in the fall semester, so that they integrate fully with their cohort and are able to experience the full benefit of the BArch core curriculum sequencing with a full class. BArch freshmen entering in the spring are required to take studio and design communication in the summer so that they can integrate into second year courses for the following fall.

The School of Architecture currently has memoranda of understanding (MOUs, formerly called articulation agreements) for the first two years of the program with two community colleges, Pasadena City College, widely considered the best community college architecture program in Los Angeles county, and Mesa College, the best community college architecture program in San Diego. These MOUs spell out not only the specific architecture courses but also the appropriate general education requirements. Both agreements place a student who has successfully completed all courses, architecture and general education, into the third year of our 5-year program. The MOUs will be made available in the team room. The school is working to formalize additional MOUs with other strong community college architecture programs in the state.

For students who have not completed the articulation sequence at PCC or Mesa or who have studied elsewhere, their pre-Woodbury work is evaluated in the registrar’s office for general education equivalents. The chair and/or coordinator of the BArch program then reviews the transcript for appropriate transfer of architecture-related courses. A portfolio is required for studio credit transfer. The school has found it benefits the student to align GE expectations with architecture requirements; this is at the heart of the integrative learning model the university adopted starting about five years ago. In other words, we do not encourage students either to plow through the studio sequence and save GE for the end or to “get GE out of the way” first, since we do not believe it is in the way and we recognize that it helps students construct a stronger architectural understanding.

MArch applicant evaluation process
Woodbury School of Architecture administrators work closely with the Admissions Office to ensure a thorough graduate admission process. The graduate coordinator and graduate admissions officer meet every other week throughout the year in Los Angeles and in San Diego. These two graduate coordinators and the two graduate admissions officers meet with the dean, associate dean, and chairs to determine admissions deadlines, recruitment targets, initiatives through the School of Architecture Office of Communications, planning and scheduling the annual Open House and other informational meetings for applicants, improving the quality and numbers of student applicants, and improving and clarifying admissions protocols. Members of the graduate admissions committee include Dean Norman Millar, Associate Dean Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, chairs, the graduate coordinators and graduate admissions counselors, and other faculty members who wish to serve.

The MArch priority application deadline is March 1 for fall semester enrollment; students are not normally admitted to the graduate program mid-year. Admission is based on careful review of the applicant’s entire application. The admissions committee has found the statement of intent, portfolio and interview to be of
special value in determining a potential student’s fit with our program and potential for success. Applicants are expected to provide evidence of critical and creative thinking, and for two-year applicants, familiarity with architectural drawing conventions and technically proficient drawings and models. A portfolio rubric is used to evaluate each portfolio in the realms of Criticism/Critical Thinking, Building, Studio/Design, Visualization/Representation and Practice/Professionalism.

The three admissions committee members reviewing a grad application evaluate the educational preparation, letters of recommendation, statement of intent, and portfolio. The committee member interviewing the applicant provides that feedback to the other two. Each applicant receives a score from each committee member (see attached portfolio rubric). The scores are averaged and each applicant is given a final admit score, which helps not only to determine acceptance into the program but also consideration for scholarships, TAships and/or RAships. The chair develops a spreadsheet that compares the admit number, grade point average, degree completed, and other pertinent information to assist the committee in its decision-making. The committee seeks to identify at least 20 students per each incoming cohort, with a target of 16 students enrolling for each of the incoming 2-year and 3-year programs. The maximum cohort size is 20. Late applicants are considered as space permits.

Committee members evaluate each applicant’s undergraduate transcript for a minimum of 45 units of appropriate general studies, evidence of a minimum 40 units of professional coursework for 2-yr students, and to determine placement of students as teaching and research assistants. Since the curriculum in the 2-yr MArch satisfies all NAAB SPC, there is no case in which a student is exempt from demonstrating mastery of an SPC at Woodbury based on their preparatory work.

ii. Student Support Services
The Office of Student Development (OSD) has fourteen fulltime staff members, one half-time staff member, and has over sixty student employees to serve the needs of students, faculty and staff on both campuses. Its mission is “to collaborate with students, faculty, staff and families, in order to facilitate a student’s transformation and enrich their educational experience by embracing their goals, dreams and aspirations.” OSD offers opportunities for engagement in educationally purposeful activities, challenges students to develop academically and personally, provides the support necessary for them to do so, and advocates for their needs.

OSD covers three functional areas; each area has activities, programs, and services that address the co-curricular and curricular focus of the institution.

1. Student Life: Residential life (on and off-campus housing), judicial process, counseling and wellness, health center, fitness center, student leadership and organizations, international student support and compliance, students with disabilities, and medical appeals
2. Academic Support: Academic advising, early alert referrals, peer advisor and mentor (new, current, and international), tutoring, supplemental instruction, and placement exams
3. Career Development: career guidance and internship/work placement

The OSD signature program SOAR (Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration) provides an intense but well-structured supportive process for incoming students to acculturate to Woodbury while completing important steps such as enrollment and registration. OSD also hosts a SOAR event specifically designed for graduate students. SOAR events support School of Architecture-specific orientation needs such as introducing shop safety requirements.

OSD offers several 1-credit and no-credit courses under the departmental code Personal and Professional Development (PPDV). The courses include student leadership, occasional special offerings, and a 10-week orientation class, PPDV 100. All freshmen at the university are strongly encouraged to take PPDV 100 in their first semester. This class is not major specific, and so freshmen from all majors work side by side in a classroom. OSD has worked with the School of Architecture to develop a 1-unit PPDV 200 for BArch transfer students. We have found it helps transfer students better understand studio culture and engage in the pedagogical rigor of architectural education.

School of Architecture Academic Advising
The SoA has a strong tradition of effective academic advising. All fulltime faculty members are required by contract to do academic advising. In the SoA, faculty understand the connection between strong faculty advising and student success.

In the BArch program, students meet with their individual faculty advisors prior to registering for the subsequent semester. The faculty advisor uses the opportunity to ensure that the student is making good academic progress, is on track with the curriculum worksheet, knows where to seek information about IDP, has a plan for doing the required work experience, and is considering how her/his curricular and co-curricular choices ultimately construct the architectural education she/he graduates with. The advisor also asks the student to consider what follows the BArch: practice, internship, graduate school? Advisors note within the advising folder the plans discussed and any difficulties or challenges the student is facing. When more general advising or support is needed, a faculty advisor may recommend that the student speak with an advisor in OSD.

In the MArch program, each grad student is assigned a faculty advisor; again, one-on-one meetings take place each semester. Graduate advising includes discussions about research interests, potential thesis topics and thesis advisors, opportunities for post-graduate practice, in addition to ensuring appropriate academic engagement and progress at the graduate level.

Faculty advisors often serve as references and recommendation letter writers, and help students and alumni expand their professional and academic networks.

Career and Outreach in the School of Architecture
As noted in section I.1.3, the school hired Catherine Roussel, AIA in summer 2012 as our first Career and Outreach coordinator. Catherine serves as our IDP coordinator, directs the school’s architecture and interior architecture career development efforts, seeks and develops curricular and co-curricular opportunities for student professional development, and tracks data related to student and alumni career development and licensure. With a dual report to Dean Norman Millar and the VP for Student Development, Catherine serves as liaison to OSD Career Services. A full report of Catherine’s activities to date and plans for further developing SoA Career and Outreach will be available in the team room.

iii. Off-campus Opportunities
The school facilitates ample student opportunities to participate in field trips and other off-campus activities each semester. The educational value of leaving the classroom, in fact, is one of the foundational tenets of the professional architecture curricula, embodied in our school mission (or ethos), fieldwork. It has been transformative for our students as well as our faculty. Field trips are associated with every design studio and many seminars and electives throughout the curriculum. The SoA has a strong and long-standing summer study-away program for BArch students and requires a summer of fieldwork study for MArch students. Our students have studied with our faculty in New Mexico, Tijuana, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Costa Rica, Paris, Barcelona, Berlin, the Netherlands, New Zealand, China, and India, a non-exhaustive list. We offer a semester in Italy through our Rome Center for Architecture and Culture, founded and led by Professor Paulette Singley, and other opportunities for inter-semester travel and intra-semester travel on an ad hoc but very regular basis. The School of Architecture has active exchange agreements with several international institutions, including the School of Architecture and Design, IE University, in Segovia, Spain, Fachhochschule, University of Applied Sciences in Dusseldorf, Universidad Alfonso X el Sabio, EIU in Segovia, University of Monterrey (UDEM), Woosong University in Korea, among others.

One of the university’s strategic initiatives begun under President Calingo is WISE, the Woodbury Integrated Student Experience. This is a set of five high-impact practices that we would like all our graduates to engage during their Woodbury education. One of these practices is study away. The goal is to provide and support a broad enough array of study-away opportunities that every student can be expected to participate in at least one, even given the challenges of cost, time, and other obligations.

MArch Summer Fieldwork
Fieldwork permeates the curriculum of the Master of Architecture program at Woodbury from the first semester through to graduation. In the summer between their penultimate and final year, all MArch students take a 6-unit fieldwork studio, ARCH 575. The summer fieldwork studio provides each student an opportunity to develop an area of research or scholarship in a setting outside the classroom or studio. For this studio, graduate students choose one of our study-away programs and are expected to initiate research for their graduate thesis under the guidance of a faculty advisor. For the summer of 2014, the students chose among Paris/Switzerland, Netherlands/Berlin, and Mexico City. For the summer of 2015, fieldwork studio options include Tokyo, Budapest/Warsaw/Barcelona, and Brazil. Students unable to travel internationally have the opportunity to take the summer ACE design/build studio. For summer 2014, students worked with an LA City councilmember in Watts on a project to engage the community and create modular street furniture to meet the needs and ideas identified by businesses and design teams.

iv. Organizational and Leadership Opportunities
The school actively supports the development of leadership among our students through an active invitation to participate in shared school governance, funding for our two AIAS chapters, endorsing student initiatives such as the Cal Poly San Luis Obispo Design Village teams, providing research and teaching assistantship opportunities, and supporting architecture student participation in university-wide student government (Associated Students of Woodbury University). Faculty regularly nominate strong students to be peer advisors, mentors and tutors for OSD programs.

Architecture students regularly express interest in leadership aspects of architectural practice, including policy-making, social agendas, sustainability and urban design. Our first post-professional program was Real Estate Development for Architects, offered in San Diego and led by architect-developers Ted Smith and Jonathan Segal, FAIA. We have also developed the Urban Policy Center in Los Angeles, led by Bill Roschen and Christi Van Cleve, offering urban policy courses to students in the professional programs. ALI and the ACE Center also provide both curricular and co-curricular opportunities for students to develop leadership skills.

Every year the school awards one outstanding student in the graduating class with the Alpha Rho Chi medal for leadership. The award alternates between San Diego and Burbank.

Faculty and administrators in the School of Architecture are actively involved in local professional organizations that provide numerous opportunities throughout the year to integrate learning activities with community service and the profession. Through participation in these organizations, students begin to develop a network of professional mentors and community-based contacts. Students actively participate in organizations such as the American Institute of Architecture Students, the Los Angeles, San Fernando Valley, Pasadena-Foothill and San Diego chapters of the AIA, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA), and the Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design.

AIAS
The Woodbury AIAS Los Angeles chapter was revived in 2009 by a member of our first graduate cohort, Michael Rucinski. San Diego has had an AIAS chapter since 2011. Woodbury School of Architecture is now a sponsor school of AIAS and the department has paid graduate and undergraduate student representatives to travel to the AIAS Annual Forum. These trips provide students with the opportunity to learn about some of the big-picture issues facing architectural education and the profession, and to interact with some of today’s leading architects and designers.

Membership in either Woodbury AIAS chapter provides students with access to AIAS organized skills workshops, professional networking opportunities, and interaction with architecture students in other years and programs. AIAS regularly sponsors tours of firms, which consist of office visits and presentations by established professionals that give students a first-hand view of real-life architectural practices. Southern California is home to many recognized architecture firms, and AIAS has in the last few years sponsored visits to firms such as Morphosis, Gruen Associates, Osborn, BplusU, HMC, Gensler and TaalmanKoch, Miller Hull, Rob Quigley, Hanna Gabriel Wells.
Students also may participate with the Woodbury chapter of Freedom by Design, the AIAS community service program that uses the talents of architecture students to resolve accessibility issues while “simultaneously providing students with the real world experience of working with a client, mentorship from an architect and constructor, and an understanding of the practical impact of architecture and design.”

Lecture Series Activities
Woodbury School of Architecture has strong student participation in our annual lecture series and on-campus events both in San Diego and Los Angeles. In Los Angeles, graduate students have prepared questions and done on-camera interviews with our visiting lecturers, which we then post for our community and to our website. Graduate students are also responsible for the filming and editing of these video Q and A’s. The overall direction and choices of visiting lecturers is informed via group discussions and surveys of graduate and undergraduate students. Our students have initiated their own series of discussions titled “Architects Beyond Architecture,” which arises from student interest in alternative career trajectories that start in architectural education and move on to include other media such as film, fashion and food.

Other Student Initiated Events
Students actively organize the Friday Fix @ Six, SoA’s happy hour, and other extra-curricular events. Students from architecture and interior architecture worked with students from the School of Business on sustainability symposia in fall 2011 and 2012.

v. Student Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities
The School of Architecture has close ties to the San Fernando Valley, Pasadena-Foothills, San Diego and Los Angeles AIA chapters. These chapters support scholarships for our students and competitions for local architecture programs. AIA|LA’s prestigious 2x8 competition and exhibition, showcasing exemplary student work from architecture and design institutions throughout California, features Woodbury students from both San Diego and Los Angeles. Annually, the Association for Women in Architecture in Los Angeles awards one or more deserving Woodbury architecture students with scholarships.

Each year, the LA Business Council invites seven schools of architecture and design in the Los Angeles area to send a team of students to charrette for a weekend at Gensler on a special topic (in 2013-14 it was a healthy city proposal within Watts). The winners are selected by a distinguished panel and given the Julius Shulman Emerging Talent Award. Woodbury students have won this award twice in a row.

The department regularly pays for student travel and printing costs to support their participation in these and other scholarships and competitions. In 2014, for example, we nominated BArch students Miriam Jacobsen for the Archiprix International Competition and Lauren Amador for the Academy for Emerging Professionals (AEP) Student Leader Award (AIA CC), and we supported the preparation of their portfolios.

Each year, we hire two or three SoA students to teach our summer program for children, the Art of Architecture.

In the fall 2014, the School of Architecture will be establishing a Woodbury chapter of the Tau Sigma Delta honor society.

Teaching and Research Assistantships
The School of Architecture sees its commitment to mentoring future educators as a vital component of training new professionals. A substantial number of teaching opportunities in studio, lecture and seminar courses are available to qualified and interested MArch candidates. A smaller number of undergraduate teaching assistantships are available to highly qualified BArch students. The identification and placement of qualified graduate students in the TAship program is an integral part of the admissions process and provides much needed financial assistance to graduate students who demonstrate high performance in
the program. In fall 2013, 32 graduate students and 2 undergraduates had TA or RA assignments; in spring 2014, 28 graduate students and 3 undergraduates had such assignments.

TAships provide students unparalleled opportunities to connect with notable faculty, many of whom are leaders in the community and actively engaged in professional organizations. Some examples include courses taught by Helena Jubany, founding member of NAC Architecture and commissioner on the City of Los Angeles Board of Building and Safety; L.A. Planning Commission former president Bill Roschen; and Alan Loomis, Principal Urban Designer for the City of Glendale.

During the 2013-14 academic year, 20 graduate students worked as research assistants for faculty-led research initiatives and worked closely with faculty members, including Peter Arnold and Hadley Arnold for ALI, Emily Bills and Barbara Bestor for the JSI, Jeanine Centuori for the ACE Center, Paulette Singley for the Rome Center for Architecture and Culture, and Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter for WUHO. Students also held RAships with the SoA Office of Communication and the SoA archive.

Gallery Opportunities for Students
Students play essential roles in the SoA galleries. At WUHO, Woodbury’s center for experimental exhibitions and multi-disciplinary collaborations in Hollywood, and at the Gallery in San Diego, students support exhibition curators and may serve as gallery assistants. The Wedge Gallery is available for student-led exhibitions and alumni exhibitions. Friday Fix at Six happy hours are often simultaneous events for student work exhibitions.

Teaching Practicum
The MArch program offers a unique annual teaching practicum that introduces students to current thinking about teaching and learning. Teaching assistants develop methodologies and strategies for teaching architecture in both lecture and studio formats. Weekly class meetings provide a forum for teaching students to articulate their experiences in the classroom and alternate with classroom visits to various studio and lecture courses in the Woodbury School of Architecture and other local architecture programs.

vi. Support for Attendance of Meetings
The School of Architecture supports student travel to the annual AIAS Grassroots Leadership Conference, the AIAS Forum, and AIAS regional meetings. It also supports travel for students to receive external honors such as awards and scholarships.

AIAS
The American Institute of Architecture Students serves multiple functions: as a professional organization, as the official voice of architecture students, and as a venue for student participation in activities within the school at both locations. Our AIAS chapters foster networking opportunities with professionals in the community, and provide a platform for intellectual, professional, and social development among students and their peers. In addition to sponsoring student-organized activities, social and cultural events, participation in various architecture forums, and governance, the student body contributes to the development and implementation of field trips, lectures and other school-wide events, some jointly with faculty and staff.

As the coordinating student organization in the School of Architecture, the AIAS serves to address the needs of the students and promote their welfare. Career and Outreach Coordinator Catherine Roussel, AIA serves as AIAS faculty advisor.

Henry Adams
Every year, two students in each professional program at each location – Barch LA and San Diego, MArch LA and now also San Diego – are awarded the AIA Henry Adams Medal and Certificate. Each year the American Institute of Architects awards an engraved medal and certificate of merit to the top-ranked graduating student in each architecture program accredited by the NAAB. A certificate of merit is awarded to the second-ranking graduating student. These awards are provided as part of the AIA Scholarship Program.
I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance

The School of Architecture is one of four academic divisions (School of Business, School of Media, Culture & Design, and the College of Transdisciplinarity) that along with the Library house the faculty and the programs of Woodbury University. There are two degree-granting programs in Woodbury School of Architecture: architecture, including professional undergraduate and graduate curricula and post-professional graduate curricula, and interior architecture, offering the BFA and the Master of Interior Architecture.

The dean leads the School of Architecture. The school has three chairs: a chair for the architecture programs in Los Angeles, a chair for the architecture programs in San Diego, and a chair for the interior architecture programs. Two coordinators, one graduate and one undergraduate, support the work of the chair in Los Angeles. One graduate coordinator in San Diego supports the work of the chair in San Diego. The school has an associate dean for assessment, accreditation and internal oversight. Within the school, subcommittees and task forces are created as needed to accomplish the work of continual improvement. Each fulltime faculty member is expected to commit to service to the school as well as to the university. Adjunct faculty members may choose to engage in service at either level, but there is no expectation of service.

The deans of each academic division and the university librarian are members of Woodbury University’s president’s cabinet and report directly to the executive vice president and provost, Office of Academic Affairs. The other members of the cabinet include the vice president of Finance and Administration, the vice president of University Advancement, the vice president of Enrollment Management, the chief marketing officer, the associate vice president of Academic Affairs, and the vice president of Student Development. The cabinet also includes the senior executive assistant to the president, who also serves as the secretary to the board of trustees.

The president reports directly to the board of trustees. The university bylaws limit the number of trustees to 30. The board of trustees has several standing committees, including Academic and Student Affairs, Development and Alumni Relations, Finance, Audit, Grounds, and Governance.

Woodbury University is a private, not-for-profit, non-sectarian university.

Opportunities to participate in shared governance

All fulltime faculty members and all adjunct faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching or librarianship are voting members of the Woodbury University Faculty Association (WUFA). Faculty have opportunities to participate in shared governance at the university level through appointed or elected committee work with WUFA. The Faculty Senate recommends specific committee service for each fulltime faculty. Adjunct faculty may request a committee appointment, or may run for election to any WUFA elected committee except Personnel Committee, the membership of which is restricted to faculty who are reviewed by the Personnel Committee. A list of university committees may be found in section IV.6.4.

Curriculum development is the purview of the faculty, but staff and student input is valued and essential to positive results from curriculum change. Biweekly meetings for the School of Architecture Dean’s Advisory Curriculum Committee (also known as the Curriculum Workgroup) are open to all faculty members. Staff and students are invited to SoA faculty meetings to contribute to the discussion. Other opportunities for students and staff to participate in shared governance may be found on university committees, which tend to have representation from more diverse (beyond faculty) constituencies, or presidential advisory committees, and there is a general spirit of positive possibilities and optimism with which Woodbury welcomes initiatives for greater involvement from all members and sectors of its community.

The Woodbury University Staff Association (WUSA) was reestablished in spring 2014. School of Architecture staff members are active participants in WUSA.
The Associated Students of Woodbury University (ASWU) is the student governing body. More information on the hierarchy of on-campus student organizations and policies by which all student organizations must abide may be found in the student handbook, the URL for which is provided in section IV.4.

Courses of study leading to a degree in the School of Architecture

The School of Architecture offers the following courses of study leading to a degree:

- Master of Architecture, a NAAB-accredited 2-yr or 3-yr professional graduate education offered in San Diego and Los Angeles
- Bachelor of Architecture, a NAAB-accredited 5-yr professional undergraduate program offered in San Diego and Los Angeles
- Master of Science in Architecture, a 1-yr/3-semester post-professional degree offered in Los Angeles and San Diego to those already holding a professional degree, with emphasis determined internally to the program. The Los Angeles campus offers an emphasis in Drylands Design and in Urban Policy, while the San Diego campus offers an emphasis in Real Estate Development and in Landscape + Urbanism.
- Bachelor of Fine Arts in interior architecture, a CIDA- and NASAD-accredited 4-yr degree offered in Los Angeles
- Master of Interior Architecture, a 2-yr or 3-yr graduate education offered in Los Angeles

Administrative Structure Diagram

Please see next page for a diagram illustrating the administrative and governance structure for the School of Architecture. Descriptions of each administrative position within the school will be provided in the team room.
I.2.3 Physical Resources

General Description
To meet our goal of providing an excellent architectural education, the School of Architecture takes advantage of facilities with a combined area of approximately 85,600 square feet. Of this total, 25,500 square feet in Los Angeles and all of the 27,000 square feet in San Diego are exclusively for use of the School of Architecture. The Los Angeles facility consists of one- and two-story buildings carefully sited within a 22-acre campus. The BArch and the MArch are offered in both San Diego and Los Angeles.

Physical Resources Los Angeles
Meeting the space needs for the architecture program had become a cause for concern due to a 50% surge in enrollment since the 2002 NAAB visit. Fortunately the university recognized the challenge and embarked upon a major building initiative in 2005. Included in the building initiative for Los Angeles was a plan to add 10,000 square feet for non-architecture design programs, a new 23,000 square foot building for the School of Business adjacent to the central quad, and a new 19,000 square foot studio facility for the School of Architecture. A 340-car parking lot was completed in August 2006 on the upper campus to accommodate parking displaced by the new buildings and the additional parking required by the City of Los Angeles due to added square footage. At the completion of the new buildings in spring 2008, phase 2 of the reallocated space plan began, and the faculty moved out of the upper campus trailers and into the renovated Isaacs Faculty Center, formerly Wilshire Hall. The former Faculty Center was completely renovated by S3 Construction, a design/build firm co-owned by an alumnus of our BArch program, and the Office of Student Development (OSD) consolidated its programs and moved into the new Pop Whitten Student Center in August 2009.

Design Center
The Design Center is a 20,000 sf two-story building that mainly serves animation, graphic design and interior architecture classroom, studio and lab needs. Architecture studios and seminars use its Powell Gallery for occasional reviews and events. In the past, jointly-offered architecture/interior architecture studios occupied one of the design studio spaces. A render farm used by animation and architecture students is located on the second floor.

School of Business Building
The 23,000 sf School of Business building accommodates specific needs of students, faculty, and administration for that school, but also serves the needs of the School of Media, Culture & Design and the School of Architecture. The ground floor houses faculty offices and a dean’s suite for use by the School of Business. A recent renovation added six offices shared by the other schools, including three offices dedicated to the School of Architecture; one for the SoA development officer, and two offices shared by visiting faculty and participating adjunct faculty members. All academic and university programs share the rest of the ground floor, including a videoconference room, an auditorium with a seating capacity of 250, and a two-story lobby-reception atrium, and the entire top floor with eight classrooms (4 at 40-person capacity, 4 at 20). Architecture and animation are among the most frequent users of the auditorium. The videoconference capabilities have increased opportunities for shared instruction and communication with the San Diego facility.

Julius Shulman Architecture Studio Building
The 19,000 sf architecture studio building, completed in February 2008, fully addressed the space concerns caused by our growing enrollment. One hundred dedicated studio spaces per floor are available in the two-story building. Each floor features an open studio environment flanked by a long gallery that serves as pin-up and review space. On each floor, restrooms are located near the elevator lobby. The 2,000 sf double-height Ahmanson Main Space at the west end of the building and the southern terminus of the major north-south campus walkway functions as a space for SoA reviews, exhibitions, events, meetings and lectures, and frequently accommodates university-wide events. A large bi-fold hangar door connects that space to the Architecture Commons, an outdoor room created by the completion of the project. The building houses fourth- and fifth-year BArch studios and all graduate studios.
Isaacs Faculty Center
The Isaacs Faculty Center houses faculty, administrators and support staff for the School of Architecture, the School of Media, Culture & Design and the College of Transdisciplinarity. Fulltime faculty have individual offices in the Isaacs Faculty Center and every faculty office in Isaacs has an operable window. The SoA dean’s office is set up as a combination work space/meeting room, and the large office next to it houses the director of Communications, the Career and Outreach coordinator and PPOHA Graduate Program activity coordinator and curriculum specialist. The administrative coordinator and administrative assistant for the School of Architecture have desks in the main entry hall of Isaacs; work-study students provide additional administrative assistance to the school and occupy a third desk there. There is room to add an additional desk within this area to accommodate an additional administrative support staff for the school. One 175 sf corner office in Isaacs has four desks assigned to adjuncts with special assignments, such as the Arid Lands Institute co-directors and the coordinator of Urban Studies and the Julius Shulman Institute. The courtyard at Isaacs Faculty Center has outdoor seating and tables, and has proven to be a fine space for faculty gatherings. Isaacs has two conference rooms, the Kirkendall and the Nielsen Conference Rooms. The Kirkendall seats 22, and the space is equipped for videoconferencing; the Faculty Senate often meets here. The Nielsen Conference Room seats six and is often used for smaller meetings.

Faculty Annex
Three fulltime faculty members and one participating adjunct faculty member have individual offices in the Faculty Annex.

Pop Whitten Student Center
The Pop Whitten Student Center has housed all programs in the Office of Student Development since its renovation in August 2009. The facility also houses Central Services. Included in the Whitten Center are the offices of the vice president of Student Development and the dean of students, OASIS, the Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the Writing Center, Health Services, and the Counseling Center.

Naidorf Hall Design Studios
Dedicated architecture studios in Los Angeles are located in A102, A104 and A106 of Naidorf Hall in the architecture complex, accommodating first-, second-, and third-year BArch studios, up to six sections of 14-16 students each. All of our studio spaces are wired for the Internet and have fresh air, heating and air conditioning, and a reasonable amount of natural light provided by windows and skylights. Restrooms are appropriately sited close to studio, and there is adequate lighting at night to provide a safe environment for our students.

Jury Rooms and Exhibition Spaces
The Wedge Gallery (A100), located at the entry of the architecture complex, provides a venue for exhibitions, reviews, and informal pin-ups during studio hours. Architecture studios may also sign up to use the long galleries in the JSI studio building and the Ahmanson Main Space for pin-ups and reviews. During studio hours, room A101 is not scheduled for other classes and provides overflow space for pin-ups or reviews on a sign-up basis for exclusive use by architecture. Also available on a sign-up basis during studio hours are the Cabrini Meeting Room (C10) and the Design Center Powell Gallery, which are used by architecture, graphic design, and interior architecture. Movable rolling panels were recently constructed to increase pin-up space to accommodate all design studios.

Library
The Woodbury University Library includes collections that serve all of the departments in the institution. The School of Architecture’s dedicated librarians, Barret Havens in Los Angeles and Cathryn Copper in San Diego, actively communicate with SoA faculty to ensure continuing services. They work closely with the chairs and designated faculty members Ewan Branda and Jose Parral to update and improve holdings, including magazines and electronic catalogs. The library is integral to all the programs and supports the learning and research activities in the SoA.
Computer Labs
There are eight computer labs in Los Angeles and one in San Diego. A render farm was added in the labs in the Design Center, and IT continues to expand capacity and internet bandwidth to accommodate not only Los Angeles rendering needs (animation and architecture) but also the rendering needs of architecture students in San Diego. Woodbury University compares very favorably in facilities to peer institutions.

The Making Complex
Shop Space: We increased shop space in spring 2009 on the Los Angeles campus by annexing an adjacent 450 sf former classroom. The 2650 sf wood and metal shops serve all students in the School of Architecture on the Los Angeles campus, including approximately 90 in interior architecture. With PPOHA grant funding, the SoA is currently working on the final expansion of this resource, which will result in an 1,800 sf permanent metal fabrication shop replacing the temporary open air metal fabrication shop, and upgraded air handling, electrical, and safety systems and accessibility improvements. Estimated completion is January 2015. The construction work is being done by St. Amant Constructs, an alumnus-owned design-build company.

Digital Fabrication Lab: With the funds from the PPOHA grant, we enclosed a covered exterior walkway and converted two classrooms near the existing shop into a digital fabrication laboratory. This adjacency to the shop facilitates the integration of fabrication processes. The DFL houses three laser cutters, one 3D printer, and a CNC milling table. The current construction upgrades all of the mechanical systems in that portion of the Making Complex and includes the addition of two kilns, one glass and one ceramic.

Archive Space
We constructed 500 sf of storage space behind the Whitten Student Center to house the SoA’s academic archive. An intelligent supervised cataloging system is currently being developed between Los Angeles and San Diego.

Woodbury University Hollywood Outpost (WUHO)
We intend to maintain our month-to-month lease of a storefront on Hollywood Boulevard, which we call the Woodbury University Hollywood Outpost (WUHO). The mezzanine space houses the offices of the Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urbanism. The WUHO event-programming schedule involves faculty and students and includes recent exhibitions such as “Un-privileged Views” co-curated by Eric Olsen and University of Michigan faculty member Keith Mitnick, a Kickstarter-funded “Deborah Sussman Loves LA,” and the JSI-sponsored exhibits of photography by Pedro Guerrero, Catherine Opie, and Grant Mudford.

Physical Resources San Diego
All programs are housed in a single-story 27,000 sf building in Barrio Logan, southeast of downtown San Diego adjacent to the working port. The facility capitalizes on the benign climate for fresh air and natural light. The intensely occupied spaces, studios, classrooms, Computer Lab and Library are conditioned by displacement ventilation. Staff offices are provided with heating and cooling. A 1,200 sf lecture hall doubles as a physics lab space and additional crit space.

The Barrio Logan facility has 9,000 sf of dedicated studio space divided into three areas; five individual faculty offices of 100 square feet each; two 275 sf shared faculty offices; a 2,000 sf Making Complex; a library and lounge area. An exterior courtyard is used for meetings and informal gatherings.

The Making Complex includes a 1,200 sf shop, an 800 sf digital fabrication laboratory and 1,200 sf of exterior work area. The PPOHA funded renovation of the air handling and mechanical systems in the shop, a ceramic kiln, metal break and dust collection system, and the equipping/retrofitting of the DFL (one CNC mill, one laser cutter, and four 3d printers). It also funded renovation of the library and the construction of four physics carts for a mobile physics lab, including all of the scientific equipment and tools.
University Information Technology Resources

Technology is a shared resource, and the university continuously strives to maintain technology resources at a level demanded by the professions. In the SoA, technology, including the more specialized elements, is available to members of other departments. Technology is viewed as an instrument that supports the various media and design disciplines and not as a discipline of its own. All information technology is supported and maintained by the Information Technology Department (IT). All fulltime faculty members are provided with a university laptop or desktop computer, either a Dell or an Apple. While IT has stronger support for the Microsoft operating system, there is a dedicated support person for Mac OS. IT installs appropriate software on faculty computers based on individual faculty requirements, and supports those who require software in their courses.

The School of Architecture coordinates the computer labs in the Los Angeles architecture complex and in San Diego to accommodate class schedules and open lab time. The computer labs are available as open labs when not in use for classes. Student lab techs are present during all open lab hours. The A103 and A110-111 labs are open on average 105 hours per week, with extended hours during midterms and finals. The three computer labs dedicated to the SoA, located in A103, A111, and M202, as well as the laser-cutting lab in D3, include 62 computer stations, three printers, four plotters, two scanners, one film scanner and one laser cutter. Additional equipment includes projectors and speakers. Software supported in these labs includes AutoCAD Architecture, 3ds max design, Revit Architecture, Photoshop, Illustrator, InDesign, After Effects, Premiere, Maxwell, Rhino, V-Ray for Rhino, Grasshopper, Flamingo, ArcGIS, t-Splines, with additional software being added each semester as required for instructional purposes. Students have access to additional printing through the Miller and Design Center labs, and to document printing in Miller Hall and the Library.

The render farm in the Design Center has one 5TB file server and five render nodes, featuring Qube software, which supports rendering in 3DS Max, Maya, Mental Ray and Rhino.

The School of Architecture has responded to strong student desire for more electives in digital media by adding to the 3-unit elective and 6-unit topic studios we offer (with focuses on Grasshopper, Rhino, Revit, and other programs) and by introducing several one-unit workshops that emphasize acquiring specific software skills. We have offered 1-unit workshops in Advanced Rhino, Digital Fabrication, Grasshopper, BIM, V-Ray and Maxwell rendering workshops. Summer 1-unit workshops provide free refresher courses for all of our alumni and for professionals in the area in Digital Fabrication, BIM and Adobe Suite: portfolio design. The IT Department continues to keep pace with student needs by providing appropriate software on computers in the Architecture labs.

Largely due to the funding provided by the PPOHA grant, Woodbury University has been able to catch up to many of the other architecture programs in Southern California in terms of providing digital fabrication technologies. One focus of the grant was digital fabrication equipment and staffing to operate it; the grant provided funds to staff it for its first years of operation, and the university has now taken over.

Changes to the physical facilities under construction or proposed

In 2010, Woodbury University was awarded another Title V Grant in the amount of $3,189,160 under its “Strengthening Institutions – Hispanic Serving Institutions” program. This has allowed the university to launch new programs in Filmmaking and Game Arts as part of the School of Media, Culture & Design. The grant also supported reconfiguring a mothballed Computer Information Systems program into a Media Technology degree that serves the design, media, and architecture fields by creating graduates who are expert in technology related to those areas.

This Title V grant, along with the PPOHA grant, has had several impacts on changes to physical resources. A 10,000 sf facility for the Filmmaking and Game Arts programs, including a sound stage and a small performance space, was completed in 2012. In 2012, the university leased and renovated over 6,000 square feet of space in the office park adjacent to the campus for use as additional studio space and classrooms.

In addition to the physical improvements, the PPOHA grant has funded a comprehensive OSHA
assessment, comprehensive environmental quality assessment and the rewriting of the Protocol and Procedures for the Making Complex. This improves health and safety welfare practices in the Making Complexes, benefiting the students and staff who use them. This initiative also helps establish standards for the university to follow.

Tech resources
Andrea Dietz, PPOHA activity coordinator and curriculum specialist, worked closely with key faculty members to provide input into the particular needs of the department and oversight of IT’s operations. IT oversees the running of facilities that include computer labs, science labs (Biology and Physics), classrooms with computers arranged for collaboration, the render farm, and the print centers.

Each semester, the architecture faculty on the University Technology Committee solicit input from faculty regarding technological needs of the department. The coordinated list of hardware, software, network, and other IT resource needs are then implemented by IT each semester. In the past few years, the PPOHA and Title V grants have been able to financially support many new technologies that the university had been unable to fund, most significantly the digital fabrication lab. The IT department is extremely responsive to instructional needs specific to the SoA and we work closely together to ensure that we can meet instructional needs within budget.

Wireless networking is available campus-wide at both facilities. All classrooms have access to wireless internet, as well as projectors, electronic lecterns, a PC and a DVD/VHS player.

The university portal provides an online site for students, faculty, staff and administrators to share information. Documents and links regularly posted on the School of Architecture portal include SoA events and the academic calendar, faculty and student information guides, meeting minutes, committee proceedings, the university faculty handbook, scholarships/competitions, faculty job openings nationwide, class rosters and other information.

All faculty are trained in the use of Moodle, an open-source course management system that allows instructors to create online data to supplement their real-time courses. The strength of this system is a focus on interaction and collaborative construction of content, and requires student participation. Features of this platform include assignment submissions, discussion forums, grading, an online calendar and ability to download syllabi, handouts, and readings.

Identification of Significant Problems
We foresee no significant physical resource problems that will impact the operation or services of the School of Architecture.

I.2.4 Financial Resources

The MArch and BArch programs at Woodbury University have access to appropriate levels of institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement as required for a NAAB-accredited program. The university’s commitment to the continuous growth and improvement of the SoA has been manifested in its ample support for the launch of the MArch program and consistent support of the BArch program – its biggest generator of tuition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014-15 Projected Budget Expense</th>
<th>FY 2012-13</th>
<th>Change from previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Office Dept 37</td>
<td>$ 672,420</td>
<td>+$ 171,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BArch LA Dept 15</td>
<td>$1,874,589</td>
<td>+$ 41,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MArch LA Dept 18</td>
<td>$ 692,982</td>
<td>+$ 12,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA IA Dept 33</td>
<td>$ 538,497</td>
<td>+$ 87,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUHO Dept 12</td>
<td>$ 41,525</td>
<td>+$ 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA/SD Shops Dept 47</td>
<td>$ 147,223</td>
<td>+$ 1,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA/SD Digi-Fab Dept 72</td>
<td>$ 155,627</td>
<td>+$ 2,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Admin Dept 14</td>
<td>$ 819,160</td>
<td>+$ 35,298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total projected FY 2014-15 School of Architecture expense budget of $5,973,026 represents a 4.9% increase over the FY 2013-14 budget and amounts to 13.8% of the total projected FY 2014-15 Woodbury expense budget of $43,227,770. In comparison, the School of Business expense budget of $3,707,498 amounts to 8.5% of the projected total budget, the School of Media Culture and Design expense budget of $4,658,711 amounts to 10.7% of the projected total budget, and the College of Transdisciplinarity expense budget of $3,420,017 amounts to 7.9% of the projected total budget.

**FY 2014-15 SoA Projected Revenue**

- Tuition (34.3% of $17,393,196 projected SoA tuition generated) $5,973,026
- Friends of Architecture (this year to date) $1,000
- Julius Shulman Institute Endowment $18,308
- Nielsen Travel Scholarship Endowment $22,327
- Nick Roberts Travel Scholarship Endowment $1,607
- Jeanne Woodbury Scholarship Relief $67,660
- PPOHA MArch Grant (ending Sept 30, 2014) $136,506
- New PPOHA MIA Grant (pending October 1, 2014) $431,058
- Total SoA $6,220,434
- or $6,651,492 (if we get the PPOHA)

**FY 2014-15 Projected Marketing and Enrollment Management Support for SoA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University total</th>
<th>SoA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$1,789,297</td>
<td>$656,782 (37.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>$977,949</td>
<td>$371,620 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>$10,800,000</td>
<td>$4,104,000 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$13,567,246</td>
<td>$5,132,402 (37.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2014-15 Annual University Giving** (to date with direct and indirect benefits for SoA; indirect benefits based upon SoA percentage of total annual university budget).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University total</th>
<th>SoA benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Kirkendall Estate</td>
<td>$1,496,490</td>
<td>$206,516 (13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozella Knox Estate</td>
<td>$272,118</td>
<td>$37,552 (13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14 Total</td>
<td>$1,768,608</td>
<td>$244,068 (13.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Sources**

As indicated above SoA benefits from $67,660 per year in budget relief for institutional aid to our students from the $1.7 million Jeanne R Woodbury Endowment. Combined, the Ken Nielsen Endowment and the Nick Roberts Endowment amount to over $600,000 and yield nearly $24,000 per year in travel funds for SoA students. The Julius Shulman Endowment of over $460,000 yields over $18,000 per year to support operations of the Julius Shulman Institute. The 5-year $2.85 million PPOHA grant to expand our architecture graduate programs is in its final three months and will yield over $136,000 this fiscal year. We hope to receive another 5-year $2.87 million PPOHA grant this month for the expansion of the graduate programs in interior architecture that will benefit the whole SoA. Of the $62,471 in revenue generated at this year’s SoA fundraising nearly 1/3 of it ($19,000) was from SoA and Woodbury faculty and staff, while $5100 was from trustees and the president’s cabinet. Of the over $1.7 million in annual unrestricted university giving so far this year (see Development and Advancement Activities above) about $244,000 benefits the SoA indirectly through budget relief, capital improvements and growing its proportional share of the endowment.

**Two-Year Budget Forecasts**

While we plan for growth in developing our Master Campus Plan, we do not project additional revenues.
ahead of our current fiscal year for budgetary purposes due to lower than expected fall 2014 enrollment numbers. For any new program, we use enrollment projections to estimate the break-even point for the program to succeed – and budget revenue on a conservative enrollment estimate.

During the annual budgeting process, we budget for flat enrollment and account for any tuition rate increase/decrease after enrollment numbers have been confirmed in September. The FY 2014-15 budget above is our pre-fall budget that we submit to our board of trustees for approval. Once actual enrollment is confirmed, we recast our budget to reflect enrollment growth or decline. If we experience actual growth, we fund additional initiatives based on our compiled and prioritized strategic needs list. If enrollment is below expectations as it is this year we may need to reduce budgets accordingly. We submit our post-fall budget to the trustees for approval. Generally, we budget for a 3-5% attrition in enrollment from the fall to spring semester. Once spring enrollment is confirmed, we again determine if there is any surplus or deficit that would require recasting the budget and obtaining trustee approval.

This section contains forecasts for SoA expense budgets for at least two years beyond the current fiscal year based upon projected enrollment growth as well as a cost of living increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>FY 2014-15</th>
<th>FY 2015-16</th>
<th>FY 2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Office</td>
<td>$672,420</td>
<td>$692,593</td>
<td>$713,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BArch LA</td>
<td>$1,874,589</td>
<td>$1,930,826</td>
<td>$1,988,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MArch LA</td>
<td>$692,982</td>
<td>$713,771</td>
<td>$735,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA IA</td>
<td>$538,497</td>
<td>$554,651</td>
<td>$571,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUHO</td>
<td>$41,525</td>
<td>$42,771</td>
<td>$44,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA/SD Shops</td>
<td>$147,223</td>
<td>$151,640</td>
<td>$156,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA/SD Digi-Fab</td>
<td>$155,627</td>
<td>$160,296</td>
<td>$165,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Admin</td>
<td>$819,160</td>
<td>$842,938</td>
<td>$868,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BArch SD</td>
<td>$212,617</td>
<td>$218,996</td>
<td>$225,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRED</td>
<td>$423,547</td>
<td>+$142,626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SoA</td>
<td>$6,117,038</td>
<td>+$810,802 (+15.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our conservative SoA fundraising goal is to increase smaller giving by 15% per year to $71,850 in FY 2014-15, $82,600 in FY 2015-16, and $95,000 in FY 2016-17. We are laying the ground work in several relationships for larger gifts ranging from $0.5 million to $3 million over the next three years.

Comparative Reports Since FY 2012-13

This section contains 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 expenditures, and development activities.

**FY 2012-13 Budget Expense**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>FY 2012-13 Change from previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Office</td>
<td>+$142,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BArch LA</td>
<td>-$332,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MArch LA</td>
<td>+$374,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA IA</td>
<td>+$124,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUHO</td>
<td>+$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA/SD Shops</td>
<td>+$39,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA/SD Digi-Fab</td>
<td>+$217,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Admin</td>
<td>+$27,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BArch SD</td>
<td>+$169,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRED</td>
<td>+$42,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SoA</td>
<td>+$810,802 (+15.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2012-13 SoA Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition (34% of $17,991,290 SoA tuition generated)</td>
<td>$6,117,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Architecture (this year to date)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jeanne Woodbury scholarship relief $ 50,000
PPOHA MArch Grant (ending Sept 30, 2014) $ 546,024
Total SoA $ 6,714,062

FY 2012-13 Marketing and Enrollment Management Support for SoA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University total</th>
<th>SoA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$ 1,580,618</td>
<td>$ 600,634 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>$ 912,267</td>
<td>$ 346,661 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>$10,673,281</td>
<td>$ 4,055,847 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$13,166,166</td>
<td>$ 5,003,142 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2012-13 Annual University Giving (to date with direct and indirect benefits for SoA-indirect benefits based upon SoA percentage of total annual university budget).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University total</th>
<th>SoA benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George E Isaacs building fund</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 6,900 (13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Appetit food service improvements</td>
<td>$ 185,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne R Woodbury Trust endowed scholarship</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamore, Rickey Pometti gift annuity</td>
<td>$ 49,498</td>
<td>$ 6,830 (13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annenberg Foundation ALLI grant</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 40,000 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Gurley Brown Trust unrestricted</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 13,800 (13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elwood, Richard Henry scholarship</td>
<td>$ 40,550</td>
<td>$ 1,235 (13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13 Total</td>
<td>$ 575,048</td>
<td>$ 118,765 (20.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2013-14</th>
<th>Change from previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Office Dept 37</td>
<td>$ 500,970</td>
<td>+$ 77,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BArch LA Dept 15</td>
<td>$1,832,658</td>
<td>+$ 130,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MArch LA Dept 18</td>
<td>$ 680,203</td>
<td>-$ 424,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA IA Dept 33</td>
<td>$ 450,889</td>
<td>-$ 145,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUHO Dept 12</td>
<td>$ 41,482</td>
<td>-$ 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA/SD Shops Dept 47</td>
<td>$ 145,237</td>
<td>-$ 36,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA/SD Digi-Fab Dept 72</td>
<td>$ 153,335</td>
<td>-$ 64,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Admin Dept 14</td>
<td>$ 783,862</td>
<td>+$ 33,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BArch SD Dept 13</td>
<td>$ 800,742</td>
<td>-$ 39,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRED Dept 34</td>
<td>$ 210,032</td>
<td>-$ 48,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSArch L+U Dept 93</td>
<td>$ 94,588</td>
<td>+$ 94,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SoA</td>
<td>$5,693,998</td>
<td>-$ 423,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2013-14 SoA Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition (33% of $17,254,539 SoA tuition generated)</td>
<td>$ 5,693,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Architecture</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nielsen Travel Scholarship endowment</td>
<td>$ 22,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Woodbury scholarship relief</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPOHA MArch Grant</td>
<td>$ 546,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SoA</td>
<td>$6,313,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2013-14 Marketing and Enrollment Management Support for SoA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University total</th>
<th>SoA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$ 1,779,606</td>
<td>$ 676,250 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>$ 961,888</td>
<td>$ 365,510 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>$10,818,155</td>
<td>$ 4,110,899 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$13,559,629</td>
<td>$ 5,152,659 (38.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2013-14 Annual University Giving (to date with direct and indirect benefits for SoA-indirect benefits based upon SoA percentage of total annual university budget).
Expenditure per Student by Professional Program

This section contains data on annual expenditure and total capital investment per full-time-equivalent student, both undergraduate and graduate, compared to the expenditures and investments by other professional degree programs in the institution from FY 2011-12 through FY 2013-14. Please note that at the time of APR submittal, we are a few days short of reporting projected expenditures for FY 2014-15. The Expenditure per Student by Professional Program Table is at the end of this section.

Since the last APR submitted in spring of 2012, the expenditure per student in all NAAB programs has been steady, increasing by 0.2% from $8,333 /FTE student in FY 2011-12 to $8,351 per FTE student in FY 2013-14.

In FY 2011-12 (the time of the last APR) there were 60 FTE students in the MArch program in LA, compared to 73 FTE students in 2013-14. The expenditure per FTE student in the LA MArch program has settled from $12,181/ FTE student in FY 2011-12 to $10,671/ FTE student in FY 2013-14, which we think is an indication that the program is running more efficiently.

It should be noted that with 371 FTE students in FY 2013-14 (down from 411 FTE students in FY 2011-12) the BArch cohort in Los Angeles is still four times larger than any other undergraduate cohort except the Bachelor of Business Administration cohort, with 196 FTE students. We believe the LA BArch cohort is more efficient than any undergraduate cohort mainly because of its large size but we are happy to report a 4.6% increase in its expenditure per student from $5,906/ FTE student in FY2011-12 to $6,181/FTE student in FY 2013-14.

The expenditure per student in the San Diego BArch program is difficult to compare to any other Woodbury programs including the architecture programs in LA because it includes administrative and facilities-related costs including all non-faculty personnel, security, computer labs, etc. This is compounded by the fact that due to the downturn in the economy the enrollment in that program has fallen from 83.4 FTE students in 2011-12 to 75.5 FTE students last year. However by including the new 19 FTE MArch students in San Diego in 2013-14, there was still a 7.6% increase in expenditure per FTE student in San Diego since the last visit from $17,530 in FY 2011-12 to $18,876 in FY 2013-14.

Institutional Financial Issues

Endowment

At the time of the last APR in spring of 2012, the total university endowment was valued at $15.6 million. Currently the endowment is valued at $18.61 million, which is up 19% in 2.5 years. Of the current university endowment, 15% or $2.76 million is restricted to support SoA operations.

Enrollment

Enrollment is down across all units of the university except the School of Media, Culture & Design, which has added new programs in filmmaking, game art and design, media technology, and media for social justice. Since 2010 total enrollment for MCD is up 46% (11% not counting the new programs), while total
enrollment is down 26% in the School of Business, 13% in the College of Transdisciplinarity, and 12% in the School of Architecture.

At this writing, one day before the fall 2014 add/drop deadline, this year appears to be one of the worst in recent history for new enrollment across professional programs in SoA except the MArch program in San Diego, which is even with last year. The LA BArch program appears to be down 29%, the BArch in San Diego appears to be down 47%, and the MArch program in LA appears to be down 16%.

The university administration takes these developments seriously and seeks to ensure that we will move beyond this enrollment downturn. We have a new chief marketing officer who has just overseen the launch of a new university web site including an updated SoA site that we are confident will be more successful in outreach. We are currently in an active search for a new vice president of enrollment management, and we have developed a greater understanding of the importance of retention and support for our current students.

**Funding Increases/Reductions**

With lower than projected fall 2014 enrollment, the university is facing a revenue shortfall of as much as $1.78 million. All division managers have been asked to look at budgeted one-time operating expenditures that can be delayed and the funding put back on the table. After the September 8, 2014 add/drop deadline and the final FTE student numbers are in, all university divisions may be asked to reduce certain operating budgets by up to 10%. These include travel, training and development, meeting and entertainment, public relations, publications and printing, and consulting.

**Changes in Funding Models for Faculty, Instruction, Overhead or Facilities**

There have been no changes for funding models for faculty, instruction, overhead or facilities since the last accreditation visit in fall of 2012.

There are no other financial issues that the program or institution is currently facing.
### Annual Budget Amounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>FY 2014-15</th>
<th>% chg. since FY 2011-12</th>
<th>FY 2013-14</th>
<th>% chg. since FY 2012-13</th>
<th>FY 2012-13</th>
<th>% chg. since FY 2011-12</th>
<th>FY 2011-12</th>
<th>% chg. since FY 2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Arch LA</td>
<td>$2,337,227</td>
<td>-3.80%</td>
<td>$2,293,770</td>
<td>-5.60%</td>
<td>$2,149,249</td>
<td>-11.50%</td>
<td>$2,429,503</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Arch SD (+ MArch from 2013-14)</td>
<td>$1,484,312</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>$1,425,194</td>
<td>-2.50%</td>
<td>$1,304,181</td>
<td>-10.70%</td>
<td>$1,462,050</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Architecture</td>
<td>$637,633</td>
<td>34.50%</td>
<td>$588,597</td>
<td>24.10%</td>
<td>$597,954</td>
<td>26.10%</td>
<td>$474,180</td>
<td>-18.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>$670,520</td>
<td>29.20%</td>
<td>$654,670</td>
<td>26.10%</td>
<td>$515,810</td>
<td>-0.60%</td>
<td>$518,882</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation</td>
<td>$455,475</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>$415,410</td>
<td>-25.00%</td>
<td>$519,647</td>
<td>-6.00%</td>
<td>$553,339</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>$739,380</td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td>$414,690</td>
<td>-28.00%</td>
<td>$566,877</td>
<td>-2.10%</td>
<td>$579,223</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>$1,038,000</td>
<td>34.40%</td>
<td>$909,071</td>
<td>17.70%</td>
<td>$804,631</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
<td>$772,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Arch</td>
<td>$792,118</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>$779,011</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>$713,661</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>$730,879</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.RED (Real Est Dev for Architects)</td>
<td>$212,617</td>
<td>-1.30%</td>
<td>$210,032</td>
<td>-2.50%</td>
<td>$258,518</td>
<td>19.90%</td>
<td>$215,550</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA (Business Administration)</td>
<td>$711,442</td>
<td>-12.30%</td>
<td>$696,908</td>
<td>-14.10%</td>
<td>$807,562</td>
<td>-0.50%</td>
<td>$811,753</td>
<td>-1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL (Organizational Leadership)</td>
<td>$437,978</td>
<td>29.90%</td>
<td>$425,514</td>
<td>26.10%</td>
<td>$415,244</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
<td>$337,202</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined SoA Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All NAAB programs</td>
<td>$4,613,657</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>$4,497,975</td>
<td>-2.70%</td>
<td>$4,167,091</td>
<td>-9.80%</td>
<td>$4,622,432</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTE Including Summer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Arch LA</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>371.1</td>
<td>-9.80%</td>
<td>411.3</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Arch SD</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>-9.40%</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>-0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Architecture</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>-9.40%</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>-8.00%</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>20.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>-5.00%</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>396.2</td>
<td>53.80%</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>31.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Arch</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>21.66%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Arch SD</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.RED (Real Est Dev for Architects)</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.90%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-8.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MArch SD</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.40%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-8.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA (Business Administration)</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>-16.00%</td>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>-40.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL (Organizational Leadership)</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>-25.90%</td>
<td>115.9</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined SoA Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All NAAB programs</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>538.6</td>
<td>-2.90%</td>
<td>554.7</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget / FTE Including Summer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Arch LA</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$4,181</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>$5,908</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Arch SD</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$18,876</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>$15,865</td>
<td>-9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Architecture</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$7,869</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>$7,228</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$8,907</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>$8,700</td>
<td>-2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$6,788</td>
<td>-11.00%</td>
<td>$8,664</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$4,329</td>
<td>-45.10%</td>
<td>$8,781</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$4,633</td>
<td>-23.40%</td>
<td>$6,855</td>
<td>-28.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Arch LA</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$10,671</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>$12,181</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Arch SD</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$14,174</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>$13,063</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARED (Real Est Dev for Architects)</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$5,788</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>$5,663</td>
<td>65.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL (Organizational Leadership)</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$5,114</td>
<td>70.30%</td>
<td>$3,581</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined SoA Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All NAAB programs</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>not avail</td>
<td>$8,351</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>$8,333</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I.2.5 Information Resources

Library and information resources available to Woodbury University’s architecture programs are best described by addressing the Los Angeles and San Diego facilities individually.

Woodbury Los Angeles
The library at Woodbury University Los Angeles is a single facility serving all students, faculty, and staff, and supporting all majors and areas of study. The library facility is near the center of the campus complex, visible and easily accessible. Collections, functions, and services are consolidated under a single administration. All resources and collections are housed in the library or the off-site storage facility; there is no separate architecture library. The existing collection is generally sufficient to support the research and curricular needs of the Woodbury community, and does not rely substantially on other libraries.

Woodbury San Diego
The library at Woodbury University San Diego is a 1092 sf area housed in the sole building that comprises the campus. It is visible and easily accessible. The San Diego students are fortunate to be served by both the Los Angeles and San Diego libraries. They have access to the Los Angeles collection through interlibrary loan and the reference services through online chat, email, or telephone. Since 2010, when the first librarian at the San Diego campus was hired, there has been an increased collaboration between the two facilities. Likewise, the San Diego library has a greater capacity to serve faculty and in-depth study than it has in the past.

Mission Statement, Woodbury University Library
The Library is dedicated to enriching the life of the Woodbury community through the expansion of knowledge and creativity. We seek to build and preserve resource collections that meet current and future curriculum, research, intellectual, creative and professional needs of the University. In pursuit of this mission the Library strives for excellence in the quality of programs, services and resources.

Goals
• Collect, organize, preserve, and provide access to the record of human knowledge in an expanding range of print and digital media. Represent both discipline-focused and transdisciplinary information resources of quality in support of all areas of study and research.
• Further the evolution and development of library staff, programs and resources in anticipation of and responsive to trends and advances in library practices and technology.
• Teach information literacy as the foundation of communication in the academic environment and beyond. The ability to find, evaluate and use information effectively and ethically provides students with the means to communicate their visions.
• Provide an online environment that makes the discovery of and access to library collections and programs transparent, and that streamlines and enhances the user experience.
• Promote the intellectual development of library users while advocating for academic integrity through the communication of economic, legal and social issues surrounding the access and ethical use of information in all formats.
• Optimize the use of library space to provide a variety of study, research, and cultural opportunities that enrich users’ experiences and position the Library as the intellectual center of the campus.

Educational Goal
• Provide learning opportunities and support in an environment that encourages the creative pursuit of knowledge.

Student Learning Outcomes
• The ability to develop and implement an effective research strategy, and interpret and synthesize the results for the creation of a unique product.
• Awareness of the difference between scholarly and popular resource materials, their functions as vehicles for the communication of ideas, and the appropriate uses of various types of information.
• Locate and recognize diverse perspectives and other viewpoints, respecting the importance of alternative ways of thinking in the advancement of scholarship.
• Use information ethically, respecting copyright and avoiding plagiarism.
• Develop the lifelong skills necessary to locate, access, and critically evaluate reputable information in all materials and formats.

The library’s mission and goals support the goals of the School of Architecture by providing access to current and retrospective resource materials that enable researchers to investigate the social, urban, economic, environmental, technological, and formal dimensions of architecture; by providing professional research librarians to assist students and faculty; and by providing formal education in the foundational aspects of information literacy.

Library collections
The library collection is actively managed to ensure that it supports the mission, goals, and curriculum of the architecture programs and the university at large. The subject coverage is monitored to ensure adequate breadth and depth. The library has a detailed collection development policy, revised and expanded in 2010, using collection levels 0-5 as described by ARL/RLG (Association of Research Libraries/Research Libraries Group). Architecture materials are collected at level 3, Study or Instructional support. In addition there is a special concentration on materials with a regional focus, materials associated with locales and issues of Woodbury’s international study programs, and materials to support architecture’s professional and post-professional focuses.

The majority of print and electronic materials in support of the architecture curricula and programs are identified and selected for purchase by two fulltime librarians, both of whom have architecture as their subject specialties. The University Librarian makes all final decisions regarding materials purchases for both the Los Angeles and San Diego campuses.

During academic year 2013-14, Woodbury Library migrated its holdings and user data from SIRSI to a new library management system called Worldshare Management System (WMS). Through WMS, the records searchable via our online public access catalog have been expanded to include periodical articles that are available electronically through the various academic databases to which the library subscribes.

BOOKS
Woodbury Los Angeles
The number of print volumes held at the Woodbury Los Angeles facility is 59,521. Of these, 9270 are in the LC NA call number range; 12,079 additional volumes directly support study in architecture. Deeper retrospective holdings are less comprehensive, as architecture was not actively collected until 1984. The library provides access to 38,421 ebooks; 223 of these are in the LC NA call number range, and 5047 additional volumes directly support study in architecture.

Reference materials in print format are housed on open shelves near the front entrance and are easily accessible. Key reference materials are systematically updated as new editions become available. Electronic format and access are purchased if appropriate to either supplement or replace print format.

The acquisitions and cataloging processes are efficient and quick. New materials are generally available for public use within one week of their receipt.

Woodbury San Diego
Currently 5769 volumes are held at the San Diego campus. Of these 4140 are in the LC NA call number range; 969 additional volumes directly support study in architecture. The library provides access to 38,421 ebooks; 223 of these are in the LC NA call number range, and 5047 additional volumes directly support study in architecture.
Key reference materials are updated as new ones become available. Reference materials are shelved with the circulating collection. If online electronic format and access are purchased for the Los Angeles collection, it is available to students in San Diego as well.

A collection analysis was completed in 2012 and updated in 2014. In brief, the report identified the major areas of interest (domestic architecture, cities and city planning, and drawing, design and details), more items related to the San Diego region should be purchased, and the library needs to significantly grow its collection in order to fully support graduate programs. The 2014 update showed that the average publication date of the collection is 1989, which indicates the collection is more recent and relevant than in 2012 when the average publication date was 1975. It also reflects a major collection-weeding that took place in 2013.

Materials for the San Diego campus are purchased, cataloged and processed by the Los Angeles staff and delivered to San Diego. The workflow is expected to change in fall 2014.

SERIALS
Woodbury Los Angeles
The serials collection at Woodbury Los Angeles is sufficient in coverage and scope to support the needs of students and faculty. Retrospective collections do not generally date before 1985 as architecture was not actively collected until 1984. The library has 222 current print serials title subscriptions in total. 61 of these are architecture titles, and an additional 13 support research and study in architecture.

The library has numerous full-text journal databases amounting to more than 42,000 full-text periodicals online. Key periodical indexes include Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals, Architectural Index, ArtSource, DAAI, Wilson Omnifile Fulltext Select, and ProQuest Research Library.

Woodbury San Diego
The library has 39 current print serials title subscriptions in total. 35 of these are architecture titles, and an additional 4 support research and study in architecture. For the most part retrospective coverage does not date before 2000. Generally, title runs dating before 2010 are not complete. Retrospective holes in the collection are filled as material becomes available.

The San Diego students and faculty have the same access to full-text journal databases as those in Los Angeles.

VISUAL, ELECTRONIC, AND NON-BOOK RESOURCES
Woodbury Los Angeles
The audio/visual collection consists of 2749 DVDs and VHS tapes. This number has declined significantly due to a 2008 project evaluating VHS tapes for quality, discarding those that had deteriorated beyond usefulness. 14.3% of the entire current collection of audio/visual materials supports the curriculum and interests of architecture students and faculty. Materials in VHS format are systematically being replaced by DVD if usage patterns suggest that need. A small percentage of the materials budget is dedicated to upgrades in format.

The library maintains subscriptions to a variety of electronic databases that provide access to images, articles, abstracts, and other digital content. The following databases contain material that directly supports the School of Architecture:
  - Architectural Index
  - ArtSource
  - ARTStor (over 1.5 million images related to arts, architecture, humanities, and sciences)
  - Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals
  - Credo Reference
  - DAAI: Design and Applied Arts Index
  - JSTOR
  - Lexis-Nexis Academic
  - Oxford Art Online
The library subscribes to RefWorks, a web-based bibliography and database manager that allows researchers to set up individual accounts to collect bibliographic citations electronically and produce bibliographies in multiple formats, including MLA and APA.

**Woodbury San Diego**
The audio/visual collection at the San Diego campus is limited: total of 75 items. The annual library survey shows that library users would like this area developed more. The San Diego library will continue to grow the audio/visual collection to support student interests.

The library circulates iPads, Flip Video Cameras, a GoPro, a digital camera, and professional lighting equipment, all of which are well used by the student population.

The San Diego library has amassed a small materials collection, some 150 samples that offer students hands-on experience with innovative, sustainable, and traditional materials. The collection provides San Diego students with a practical resource for research on the dynamics and characteristics of the current material-driven built environment. The materials are kept in a highly visible location and are available for circulation.

Students and faculty at the San Diego campus have equal access to the electronic databases listed above.

**CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION**

**Woodbury Los Angeles**
Materials are repaired or replaced as necessary. The library owns very few rare or delicate items. They are maintained in archival quality storage boxes but the facility itself does not provide archival storage conditions relative to temperature and humidity.

**Woodbury San Diego**
Materials are repaired or replaced as necessary. The San Diego library houses no rare or delicate items that require archival storage conditions.

**LIBRARY SERVICES AND PROGRAMS**

**Woodbury Los Angeles**
A fulltime architecture librarian works at the Los Angeles campus library. This position is also responsible for library outreach programs and serves as the library liaison to the San Diego campus. A part-time librarian position serving the San Diego campus was filled in fall 2010 and was made fulltime in fall 2012.

**Woodbury Los Angeles**
**Reference and research services**
A professional librarian is available on site for research and reference assistance during all hours that the library is open. The library also operates an electronic chat reference service during all hours of operation. Researchers may make appointments with subject specialist librarians for in-depth research assistance, including the architecture subject specialist librarian.

The general reference staff is consistently rated highly in the library’s annual survey of students and faculty. The library subscribes to Libguides, a web-based platform that facilitates the creation of online research guides. Woodbury librarians have created dozens of subject-specific and course-specific guides, which are available 24/7 and are updated regularly. The list of research guides includes guides specific to architecture and interior architecture subjects.

**Information literacy**
Information literacy is well integrated into the curriculum, including the architecture curriculum. Prior to graduation, all undergraduates, regardless of major, must satisfy an information literacy competency
requirement. This is usually accomplished through the successful completion of a Library and Information science (LSCI) course. At the Los Angeles campus, three different course options are available:
LSCI 105: Information Theory and Practice
LSCI 106: Information Sources in Architecture and Interior Architecture
LSCI 205: Information in the Disciplines

All courses are taught by faculty librarians, and cover research skills, effective use of library and global research resources, ethical use of information, and information literacy standards as defined by the Association of College and Research Libraries. These three courses are a part of Woodbury’s General Education requirements. Each takes a slightly different approach to meeting the same set of learning objectives.

The library’s assessment plan includes the assessment of information literacy across the curriculum to determine whether knowledge and skills gained in LSCI courses are being transferred and retained for use in other courses. Results of this assessment enable the library to adjust and enhance information literacy programs to provide a firm foundation and reinforcement at key points in the majors’ courses of study.

Additional course-related bibliographic instruction is provided by librarian subject specialists, and is available to any instructor for any class, including architecture classes engaged in research at both the graduate and undergraduate level.

Current awareness
The library’s website is maintained by the Los Angeles librarians, who control content and structure. The library regularly includes announcements on the library home page. The library has a New Books display shelving area, including seating. There is a bulletin board/white board for library and campus postings and the library updates its constituents regularly via social media such as Facebook and Instagram.

Access to collections
The library collection is cataloged and organized according to the Library of Congress Classification System. The library catalog provides public access to records for all items owned by the library, including the materials housed at the San Diego library. New materials are generally available for public use within one week of their receipt. Returned materials are generally re-shelved within 24 hours.

The library building is open 86 hours per week (extended to 93 hr/wk during studio and lecture finals). According to the annual survey of library users, a significant majority of students and faculty agree that the library’s open hours meet their needs. Course reserves are available during all library open hours, though this collection now consists of mostly monographs, reference texts, and DVDs. Articles and book selections are available electronically via instructors’ Moodle pages. Policies are posted on the library’s website, and are reviewed regularly.

The library’s online catalog and subscription databases are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Off-campus/remote access to the library’s online catalog and subscription databases is available through a proxy server 24/7. The number of network ports is sufficient to handle the traffic.

Cooperative agreements
- InterLibrary Loan service through OCLC is provided to faculty, students, and staff free of charge. Access to information about the holdings of other libraries around the world is available through our new online public access catalog.
- Students, faculty and staff residing in the state of California are eligible for library privileges at Glendale and Pasadena public libraries, including the Brand Library and Art Center.
- Students, faculty and staff residing in Los Angeles County are eligible for library privileges at any of the 85 branches of the LA County Library system.
- Students, faculty, and staff residing in the Burbank area are eligible for library privileges at Burbank Public Libraries.
Woodbury faculty and qualified researchers have reciprocal borrowing privileges at the 111 institutions belonging to SCELC (Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium), as well as at UCLA and CSUN.

Woodbury San Diego
Reference and research services
The San Diego librarian is available approximately 25 hours per week for drop-in or scheduled one-on-one consultations with students and faculty. These services are also available by chat, email, or telephone with the Los Angeles librarians. The Woodbury University library website directs users to general resources as well as to subject-specific, course-related research guides that are in an ongoing state of evolution, updating, and improvement.

Information literacy
Information literacy is well integrated into the architecture curriculum. Much of the instruction is done through the LSCI course and course-integrated instruction sessions.

The LSCI course taught in San Diego that fulfills the information literacy competency requirement is LSCI 106: Information Sources in Architecture. The competencies taught in this course have been selectively drawn from the Association for College and Research Libraries Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education and the Art Libraries Society of North America Information Competencies for Students in Design Disciplines guidelines. Furthermore, it helps develop NAAB Performance Criteria A.1 Communication Skills, A.2 Design Thinking Skills, and A.6 Investigative Skills. The focus of the course is on research skills, effective use of library and global research resources, ethical use of information, and information literacy standards in relation to the field of architecture.

The San Diego librarian collaborates with instructional faculty to provide course-integrated instruction. These faculty-initiated library sessions range from basic bibliographic instruction and library orientation for general courses to customized research guidance for specific class assignments.

Current awareness
The San Diego librarian maintains the San Diego page of the library website that includes basic information about the collection and operating hours. New books are on display and promoted in the announcements on the audio-video monitor in the library. The librarian regularly apprises faculty and students of new articles and books related to their individual interests. In summer 2014 a whiteboard was added to the library to encourage input from students regarding additions to the collection or general library improvements.

Access to collections
The library collection is cataloged and organized according to the Library of Congress Classification System. The library catalog provides public access to records for all items owned by the library, including the materials housed at the San Diego library facility. When using the library catalog to search, patrons may limit the results to items held at the San Diego location.

The library is open 58 hours per week (on average 8.25 hours per day) when classes are in session. The annual library survey suggests that patrons would like the library to be open more. Adding additional support staff to the San Diego library would increase open hours.

The library’s online catalog and subscription databases are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Off-campus/remote access to the library’s online catalog and subscription databases is available through a proxy server 24/7. The number of network ports is sufficient to handle the traffic.

Cooperative agreements
- Students at the San Diego campus have full borrowing privileges at the San Diego Mesa College Library, which is approximately 10 miles distant.
- Students, faculty and staff residing in the state of California are eligible for library privileges at all San Diego Public Library locations, and all San Diego County Library branches. A San Diego
County Library card allows free access to books at UCSD, SDSU, CSU San Marcos, and the County Public Library.

- InterLibrary Loan service through OCLC is provided to faculty, students, and staff free of charge by the San Diego library. Access to information about the holdings of other institutions is provided through OCLC WorldCat local.
- There is a tentative agreement with New School of Architecture and Design in San Diego, CA to establish a reciprocal borrowing program.
- Woodbury faculty and qualified researchers have reciprocal borrowing privileges at the 92 institutions belonging to SCELC (Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium).

**ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

The university librarian reports to the provost. Librarians are members of the faculty and participate fully in faculty governance and committees. There are numerous opportunities to interact with the teaching faculty through committee work and outreach activities.

Library Organizational Chart:

---

**Professional expertise**

The Los Angeles library has 4 fulltime and 0.7 FTE part-time librarians, all of whom have MLS/MLIS degrees from ALA accredited institutions. The San Diego library has 1 fulltime librarian; she has an MLS/MLIS degree from an ALA accredited institution. Position descriptions and reallocation of responsibilities are reviewed annually to ensure alignment with the library and institution’s missions and goals. There are sufficient librarians and degreed professionals with subject expertise in architecture and closely related fields to adequately meet all of the needs of the architecture programs at both campuses.

**Support staff**

The Los Angeles library is fortunate to have a well-educated and experienced support staff. 4.6 paraprofessional staff and 1.9 FTE student assistants work in the Los Angeles library. A high school diploma and some college experience are required for entry-level staff. Written job descriptions are reviewed annually.

Support staff for the San Diego library consists of 5 part-time student assistants each working 6-10 hours a week. As the San Diego library continues to extend its services more skilled support staff will be needed.

**Compensation**

Staff salaries are commensurate with those of other staff at Woodbury with similar training and experience. There is some financial support for faculty librarians and library staff to take advantage of
professional development opportunities. At least one outside workshop is brought to the Los Angeles campus each year for the ongoing development of library staff. Leave with pay is available to all library faculty staff for attendance at professional conferences and workshops.

LIBRARY FACILITIES

Woodbury Los Angeles
Space
The library provides an attractive, welcoming, barrier-free environment for its users. There are approximately 146 seats in public areas. A large majority of students and faculty agree that the library environment is comfortable. The current arrangement of the library interior provides few areas conducive to group study. An interior courtyard provides additional seating areas and tables for group study.

Environmental factors and security
Each exit door is alarmed, and there is a fire detection system installed in the library. All materials are tagged with security strips, and there is a security gate at the front entrance. Environmental controls are adequate for a general collection. An upgrade to the electrical system was completed in 2007. Written emergency procedures and a disaster plan are in place. Two faculty librarians and one library staff member have completed Community Emergency Response Team training (CERT) provided by the Burbank Fire Department, and regular emergency drills are held.

Equipment
The shelf space in the library is at maximum capacity. If the library is to keep up with the demands of the rapidly growing architecture programs, new solutions to our space issues will need to be developed.

Library users report that there is sufficient equipment for their needs in the form of photocopiers, printers, and scanners. The library has 4 desktop PC computer workstations and 2 Macs near the reference desk, 16 desktop PC computer workstations and 1 Mac in a lab setting, and 1 Mac with high resolution scanner in the photocopy room. 3 PC laptops are available for circulation to students, staff, and faculty. All staff members have their own computers. All computers are upgraded approximately every 3 years. Wireless network access is available throughout the library facility, and access is reliable. Down time is quite rare.

Woodbury San Diego
Space
The library provides an attractive, welcoming, barrier-free environment for its users with an open and airy feeling. The library is suitably located within the sole campus building; this location assures that patrons have quick access to information resources. Existing shelf space allows for the growth of the collection. There are approximately 15 seats in a group setting and 7 carrels for individual study. The library also serves as a temporary exhibition space for student and faculty work. The annual library survey shows that students are pleased with the space; one comment stated, “I always feel like I am in the most welcoming part of the school here. This is an amazing space.”

Environmental factors and security
Access to the library requires an active key fob. All materials are equipped with security tags, and there is a security gate at the front entrance. Lighting and climate control are sufficient. Written emergency procedures and a disaster plan are in the development phase.

Equipment
The circulation area has one desktop computer, one iPad, and one scanner. A second iPad is located in the stacks to facilitate searching the catalog. There is one 24” Mac Pro equipped with Final Cut Pro software and four 24” iMacs located in the study carrels. A 60” flat screen video monitor is located in the lounge area for announcements, instruction, and entertainment. Additional printers and scanners are located a short distance from the library. Wireless network access is available throughout the library.

The librarian has a separate office attached to the circulation area and is equipped with a Macbook Pro.
BUDGET, ADMINISTRATION, AND OPERATIONS

Woodbury Los Angeles

Funds
Library funding is provided primarily through institutional allocation. The library invests more than $235,000 annually in direct acquisitions and access to electronic materials for both the Los Angeles and San Diego campuses. The library materials budget has been stable over time. The university librarian draws up and defends the library budget and has authority for budget expenditures. Funds are sufficient to maintain the current level of collections and services. Over the years the library’s budget has increased sufficiently to keep pace with annual increases in serials and database subscription rates.

Efficiency of operations and services
The library operates efficiently and provides good service, as evidenced in the library’s annual survey of students and faculty.

Participation of faculty and students
The library implements an annual survey of students and faculty to evaluate services and resources. Results and comments are used to inform or revise services and programs. They are also used as evidence of demand to justify budgetary resource requests.

It is the policy of the library to purchase all faculty and student requests for materials that support curricular and research needs, within reason and budget. Electronic forms to suggest materials for purchase are available on the library’s website. Librarians actively solicit faculty input for materials to support the curriculum and programs.

Through the annual campus campaign, faculty and staff may make contributions to enhance the library’s collections.

Woodbury San Diego

Funds
Library funding is provided primarily through institutional allocation. The library invests more than $235,000 annually in direct acquisitions and access to electronic materials for both the Los Angeles and San Diego campuses. The library book budget has been stable over time and a 20% increase was secured for San Diego in fall 2013. The amount allocated for books is equal to that of the Los Angeles campus; it is sufficient to acquire newly released materials and some retrospective materials, but is not sufficient to build an independent collection to the level required for graduate research.

Funding for the library serials budget is provided primarily through institutional allocation, and is included in the budget for the San Diego campus. The library serials budget has been stable over time, but has not increased sufficiently to keep pace with annual inflation increases.

Efficiency of operations and services
Appropriate progress is being made to make the library more self-sufficient. These measures will help the library operate more efficiently and provide the best service.

Participation of faculty and students
It is the policy of the library to purchase all faculty and student requests for materials that support curricular and research needs, within reason and budget. Requests are made directly to the librarian or via the whiteboard in the library. The librarian actively solicits faculty input for materials to support the curriculum and programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call Number Range</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>BOOKS</th>
<th>EBOOKS****</th>
<th>VIDEOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call Number</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>Industries, land use, labor</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>Communities, classes, races</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Visual arts, art history</td>
<td>3,235</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Architecture, Interior Architecture</td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>4,140</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Drawing, Design, Illustration</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Printmaking, woodcuts</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Decorative Arts (includes furniture, textile arts, woodwork, metalwork)</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Plant culture</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>238</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>Energy, energy conservation &amp; alternatives</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK4000-TK4999</td>
<td>Electrical/Lighting Design</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS1 - TS154.9999</td>
<td>Industrial Design</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total NA</td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>4,140</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total all other areas</td>
<td>12,079</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>5,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL***</td>
<td>21,349</td>
<td>5,109</td>
<td>5,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Videos classed in NC are all animation
** includes items in support of architecture program but not classed in the table descriptions
*** total items as of 8/29/2014
****ebook holdings as of April 2014 (all other columns reflect August 2014 holdings)
I.3 Institutional Characteristics

I.3.1 Statistical Reports

Woodbury School of Architecture embraces social equity and diversity in all its programs.

Program Student Characteristics

The chart below presents student demographics showing race/ethnicity and gender, when students choose to provide this information. The data in the first two charts reflect the BArch students enrolled in spring 2008 (time of the previous BArch accreditation visit), and compare these qualities with those of BArch students enrolled in spring 2014 as well as with the entire undergraduate student body at those two points. The data in the second two charts reflect the MArch students enrolled in fall 2012 (time of the previous MArch accreditation visit) and compare these qualities with those of MArch students enrolled in spring 2014 as well as with the entire graduate student body at those two points. (Note: data are taken from the registrar’s enrollment report at time of add/drop date of respective academic term.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARCHITECTURE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Male Total</td>
<td>Female Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident alien</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Male Total</td>
<td>Female Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident alien</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARCHITECTURE GRADUATE STUDENTS</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Male Total</td>
<td>Female Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The charts below show the qualifications (represented by cumulative high school GPA) of the BArch students enrolling in fall 2006 and in fall 2013, and compare them with all undergraduate students at Woodbury enrolling during the same time periods. Also included are charts showing SAT scores for incoming BArch students and compares them with SAT scores for all undergraduate Woodbury students.

II. Qualifications of Students Admitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT:</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile ACT score</td>
<td>no ACT</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile ACT score</td>
<td>no ACT</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile ACT score</td>
<td>no ACT</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL GPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile freshmen-high-school GPA</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile freshmen-high-school GPA</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile freshmen-high-school GPA</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ALL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

#### II. Qualifications of Students Admitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile SAT score</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile ACT score</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile ACT score</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile ACT score</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH SCHOOL GPA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile freshmen-high-school GPA</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile freshmen-high-school GPA</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile freshmen-high-school GPA</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The charts below show the qualifications (represented by cumulative undergraduate GPA) of the MArch students enrolling in fall 2011 and in fall 2013, and compare them with all graduate students at Woodbury enrolling during the same time periods.

### ARCHITECTURE GRADUATE STUDENTS

#### II. Qualifications of Students Admitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate GPA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile cumulative undergraduate GPA</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile cumulative undergraduate GPA</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile cumulative undergraduate GPA</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ALL GRADUATE STUDENTS

#### II. Qualifications of Students Admitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate GPA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile cumulative undergraduate GPA</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile cumulative undergraduate GPA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile cumulative undergraduate GPA</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The charts below show time to graduation for BArch students who enrolled as first-time freshmen in F04, F05, F06, F07, F08 and F09 at 100% normal time (5 years) and 150% normal time (7.5 years) from initial term of matriculation. The comparison chart shows time to graduation for all undergraduate students who...
enrolled as first-time freshmen during the same time period at 100% normal time (4 years) and 150% normal time (6 years) from initial term of matriculation.

ARCHITECTURE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% graduation rate</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150% graduation rate</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% graduation rate</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150% graduation rate</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below shows time to graduation for MArch students who enrolled F09, F10, F11 and F12, at 100% normal time (2 years for the 2-year program or 3 years for the 3-year program) and 150% normal time (3 years for the 2-year program or 4.5 years for the 3-year program). At the time this report was written, we have had only two 3-year graduate cohorts complete the program.

ARCHITECTURE GRADUATE STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 year program 100% graduation rate</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year program 150% graduation rate</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year 100% graduation rate</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year 150% graduation rate</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Faculty Characteristics

a. The chart below presents FT faculty demographics showing race/ethnicity and gender. The data reflect the FT architecture faculty in fall 2014, and compare these qualities with those of FT architecture faculty in fall 2010 as well as with the entire body of FT university faculty at those two points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. The number of FT faculty promoted in 2009-10 through 2014-15 is represented here, both within the architecture faculty and within the entire body of FT university faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARCH</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Associate</td>
<td>→ Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Woodbury does not have tenure, so we have no data to present here.

c. The table below shows the number of core architecture faculty, which includes fulltime, visiting professor and professors of practice, maintaining licenses in fall 2010 through fall 2014, and where they are licensed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT Architecture Faculty</th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>F11</th>
<th>F12</th>
<th>F13</th>
<th>F14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Inactive LA</td>
<td>Inactive LA</td>
<td>Inactive LA</td>
<td>Inactive LA</td>
<td>Inactive LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>CA, NY, RI</td>
<td>CA, NY, RI</td>
<td>CA, NY, RI</td>
<td>CA, NY, RI</td>
<td>CA, NY, RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Inactive Quebec</td>
<td>Inactive Quebec</td>
<td>Inactive Quebec</td>
<td>Active Quebec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>CA, NY</td>
<td>CA, NY</td>
<td>CA, NY</td>
<td>CA, NY</td>
<td>CA, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>CA, HI, WA</td>
<td>CA, HI, WA</td>
<td>CA, HI, WA</td>
<td>Non-faculty</td>
<td>Non-faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>CA, UK</td>
<td>CA, UK</td>
<td>CA, UK</td>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>Inactive MN</td>
<td>Inactive MN</td>
<td>Inactive MN</td>
<td>Inactive MN</td>
<td>Inactive MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Inactive CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>CA, NY</td>
<td>CA, NY</td>
<td>CA, NY</td>
<td>CA, Inactive NY</td>
<td>CA, Inactive NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>CA, Inactive NY</td>
<td>CA, Inactive NY</td>
<td>CA, Inactive NY</td>
<td>CA, Inactive NY</td>
<td>CA, Inactive NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>Not in FT position</td>
<td>Not in FT position</td>
<td>CA, UT, WY</td>
<td>CA, UT, WY</td>
<td>Not in FT position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18 1-yr visiting</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>CA, GA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F19</td>
<td>Not in FT position</td>
<td>licensed contractor</td>
<td>licensed contractor</td>
<td>licensed contractor</td>
<td>licensed contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.3.2 Annual Reports
Since 2008, Woodbury School of Architecture has submitted its annual reports to the NAAB electronically. They may be found on our website at: http://architecture.woodbury.edu/accreditation-documents/
Prior to 2009, there were no annual reports for the MArch program, as it did not yet exist. The Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report for our BArch program, submitted in 2011, as well as letters from NAAB regarding our Request for Initial Accreditation for the MArch program, may be found at architecture.woodbury.edu/accreditation-documents/.

Woodbury School of Architecture certifies that all the statistical data it submits to NAAB, including those submitted through the Annual Report Submission system since the last site visit, have been verified by the institution and are consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

Bruce Feinstein, Institutional Researcher  September 5, 2014

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials
The matrix for all instructional faculty who have taught in the professional programs in 2012-13 and 2013-14 may be found in section IV.2, followed immediately by the faculty resumes.

I.4 Policy Review
Policies will be provided in the team room, as required in the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation. These documents will include:

- Studio culture policy
- Self-Assessment policies and objectives, including the internal program review policy
- Personnel policies from Section C of the Faculty Handbook
- Student-to-faculty ratios for all components of the curriculum
- Square feet per student for space designated for studio-based learning
- Square feet per faculty member for space designated for support of all faculty activities and responsibilities
- Admissions requirements
- Advising policies
- Policies on use and integration of digital media in the architecture curriculum
- Academic integrity policy
- Policies on library and information resources collection development
- Description of information literacy program and how it is integrated with the curriculum

Other policies and documentation will be provided as deemed necessary and as requested by the visiting team.
II.1 Student Performance Criteria

II.1.1 Overview of Curricular Goals
The professional programs in the School of Architecture have evolved through an educational philosophy that architectural education is transformative for all who participate, students and faculty alike. Continual transformation is only possible when one intentionally seeks out new opportunities, contexts, and challenges; analyzes and synthesizes from them; and creatively responds by proposing that something be different. That “something” could be the environment, the urban fabric, an approach to building, a way of dwelling or growing or thinking. This is fieldwork, the ethos of the Woodbury School of Architecture.

Fieldwork provides the catalyst for transformation by immersion in a place. Fieldwork encourages the exploration of environment as ever unfamiliar and revelatory. All situations demand the sort of intensive investigation that only curiosity can inspire. The practitioner must be critical, observant, empirical, visionary, fully immersed – and curious.

Fieldwork is a state of mind, a consideration of the world as workshop. It forms the conceptual foundation of our architecture programs, as faculty and students alike explore ideas and terrains through the messy practice of constructing and deconstructing knowledge, pursued rigorously and engendering discovery from the mixing of disciplines and scales of study.

The professional architecture programs provide an education through which students demonstrate achievement in the performance criteria established by the NAAB; an education with a uniquely Woodbury lens on the five perspectives; and an education that allows faculty to review, revise and adapt the curriculum as we and our students progress. We have envisioned the curricular foundation through five realms of study: Studio, Criticism, Building, Visualization and Practice. We are working to develop these realms as a vertical and horizontal structure upon which each student can build his or her education and future practice.

In the first year of undergraduate work, students work directly within three of the five realms: Studio, Criticism and Visualization. In their second year, they begin coursework in the Building sequence and Practice and continue to develop their design, visualization and critical thinking skills in Studio and Criticism. The first two years provide an immersion into the culture of architecture and of architectural investigation, and an introduction to the NAAB realms of student performance. Through this sequence, our students begin to understand the five perspectives of architectural education.

Undergraduate transfer students enter into the first, second or third year of the design studio sequence. Transfer credit is evaluated on a case-by-case basis through a thorough review of an applicant’s admissions material, including transcripts and a letter of intent. A portfolio is required for requested placement in any studio beyond 1A, except for those students meeting SoA articulation agreements with specific community college programs. All NAAB student performance criteria are demonstrated in core courses that begin in the third year of the five-year curriculum, so transfer students will demonstrate all SPCs while studying here.

Graduate students without a pre-professional architecture degree enter into the first level of each of the four central realms in the fall: Studio 1, Criticism 1, Visualization 1, and Building 1, followed in the spring semester by the second level of each (Studio 2, Crit 2, et cetera). This year provides an immersion into the culture of architecture and of architectural investigation, and an introduction to the NAAB realms of student performance, and they begin to understand the five perspectives of architectural education.

Graduate students with a pre-professional architecture degree or an equivalent education enter into the third level of three realms in the fall: Studio 3, Building 3, Visualization 3. Importantly, they join the incoming 3-yr students in Crit 1, to develop a shared understanding of the fieldwork ethos and of the studying and designing experiences at the heart of the SoA’s learning culture.
All NAAB student performance criteria are demonstrated in core graduate courses that begin at the third level, except for understanding cultural diversity (A.10), which is demonstrated in Criticism 1, the common course for all incoming MArch students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
<th>Fourth Year</th>
<th>Fifth Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Studio 1A: Principles, Processes, Bodies and Objects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Communication 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Studio 1B: Natural Tendancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Communication 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Architecture 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Studio 2A: Program and Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Studio 2B: Site Orders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Architecture 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Practice 1: Documentation and Codes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Studio 3A: House and Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Studio 3B: Structures, Systems, Space and Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Studio 4B: Urban Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Studio 5A: Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Practice 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Studio 5B: Degree Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Practice 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Performance Criteria</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
<th>Fourth Year</th>
<th>Fifth Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Thinking Skills</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Communication Skills</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Documentation</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative Skills</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Design Skills</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Precedents</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordering Systems Skills</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Traditions &amp; Global Culture</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Design</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Design</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Safety</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Design</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Considerations</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Systems</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Systems</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Envelope Systems</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Service Systems</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials and Assemblies</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Behavior</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Role in Architecture</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Management</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Professional Judgment</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Social Responsibility</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Professional Judgment</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Social Responsibility</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **Light Green** indicates the level of accomplishment for each course.
- **Dark Green** indicates the level of accomplishment for each skill.
- **Orange** indicates the level of accomplishment for each performance criterion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Performance Criteria</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Communication Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Design Thinking Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Visual Communication Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Technical Documentation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Investigative Skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fundamental Design Skills</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Use of Precedents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ordering Systems Skills</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Historical Traditions &amp; Global Culture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Applied Research</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pre-Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Accessibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sustainability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Site Design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Life Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Comprehensive Design</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Financial Considerations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Environmental Systems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Structural Systems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Building Envelope Systems</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Building Service Systems</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Building Materials and Assemblies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
- **Understanding**
- **Ability**
II.2 Curricular Framework

II.2.1 Regional Accreditation
Woodbury University is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Colleges and Schools (WASC). We completed our most recent reaffirmation cycle with our Educational Effectiveness Review in 2010. We filed an interim report in March 2013, reporting on our progress in revising our general education curriculum, developing a robust internal program review process, and implementing better faculty compensation and workload practices. Our next offsite review is scheduled for fall 2017 followed by an accreditation visit in the spring of 2018. The reaffirmation letter is in section IV.6.5.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum
Woodbury School of Architecture offers the following professional architecture degrees:

Bachelor of Architecture
- Minimum 160 credit hours (10 semesters)
- Minimum 97 professional studies credit hours
- Minimum 53 general studies credit hours
- Minimum 10 elective credit hours

Master of Architecture
For those with an accredited or internationally recognized undergraduate degree in an area other than architectural studies:
- Minimum 168 credit hours (undergrad + grad)
  - Minimum undergraduate credit hours: earned degree
  - Minimum 45 general studies credit hours
  - Minimum 93 graduate credit hours (6 semesters + 1 summer)
    - Minimum 81 professional studies credit hours
    - Minimum 12 elective credit hours

For those with an internationally recognized pre-professional degree, or the equivalent:
- Minimum 168 credit hours (undergrad + grad)
  - Minimum undergraduate credit hours: earned degree
  - Minimum 45 general studies credit hours
  - Minimum 40 professional studies credit hours as undergraduate
  - Minimum 63 graduate credit hours (4 semesters + 1 summer)
    - Minimum 51 professional studies credit hours
    - Minimum 12 elective credit hours

The curricular sequencing of the BArch and MArch programs are encoded in the curriculum worksheets attached after the section on special study opportunities and research/practice centers. For undergrads, curriculum worksheets are used to evaluate and record each student’s preparation, including fulfillment of the general studies requirement, and to track her/his progress through the BArch program. For grad students, the worksheet is used to track the student’s progress through the MArch. Advisors to both BArch and MArch students use the worksheets as launching points for discussions of work accomplished, plans for academic progress, recognition of academic achievement, and professional development opportunities such as work experience, internship, and IDP.

Special Study Opportunities
One of the things that make a Woodbury architecture education unique is the number and range of centers and institutes that offer courses in support of their mission. The missions of the institutes align with the five perspectives. Students have the opportunity of selecting from a broad range of institute-related courses, both electives and design studios.

In addition to the core program, the faculty-based initiatives of the Architecture + Civic Engagement Center (ACE), Arid Lands Institute (ALI), Julius Shulman Institute (JSI), Urban Policy Center (UP), and in San Diego Landscape + Urbanism (L+U) expand academic and professional possibilities. Projects
address relevant urban, community, and societal concerns.

For example, the ACE center promotes civic engagement with projects for non-profit groups dedicated to social and environmental justice. Design/build and architectural design projects explore relevant societal issues such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, architecture for disadvantaged communities, and tactical urbanism. Projects typically begin with relationships formed between community-based organizations and groups of students, and are developed further with grants funding.

Students are exposed to the expertise of the institutes through the coursework. The institutes provide emphases for our post-professional students pursuing a 1-year Master of Science in Architecture degree, with a diploma that includes the name of the institute or emphasis.

For the last five years, we have enjoyed the benefits of funded curriculum development through the PPOHA grant. Our students may select their electives and vertical topic studios offerings each semester from offerings in the School of Architecture that emphasize alternative practice, whether water use issues or public policy and planning, that focus on emerging technologies for design and representation, and that address issues of landscape and urbanism.

Beyond the School of Architecture, students may further pursue an interest in alternative practice through pre-MBA electives (which could prepare them for the 1-yr MBA program in the School of Business), or an interest in landscape, urbanism and practice through urban studies and art history seminars offered in the College of Transdisciplinarity, or an interest in emerging technologies and alternative practice through the upper-division seminars and studios offered in the School of Media, Culture & Design.

Students who are interested in an emphasis find support from their advisor and the chair in identifying a sequence of electives that would provide the foundations for expertise in an emphasis.

Extensive optional study-away programs coupled with local community outreach provide opportunities for students to directly engage people and places. Undergraduate students may choose a summer fieldwork studio to fulfill their Studio 4B or Studio 5A course. They may also participate in a semester-long program in Rome with Dr. Paulette Singley, or occasional offerings of study-away trips fall or spring semester or during the winter break. BArch students may also participate in exchange programs in Spain, Germany and Argentina. Graduate students are required to take a summer fieldwork studio.

For the summer fieldwork studio, students typically choose from among the study-away options offered vertically, including upper-division undergrad architecture and interior architecture students and graduate students. After an immersive five weeks of observation, research, and analysis, the graduate students typically return to Los Angeles to work on design and thesis development. Summer fieldwork opportunities have included China, Berlin and Los Angeles (2010); Tahiti, China, Barcelona, New Mexico and Los Angeles (2011), China, Rome, Berlin, Cuba, Mexico City, New Mexico, and Los Angeles (2012) and Korea, Tahiti, Berlin/Netherlands, and Costa Rica (2013). Students who choose to supplement their required fieldwork studio with additional study-away opportunities can readily find them: some traveled to Thailand or Turkey with Fashion Design Instructor Meredith Strauss (2011 and 2012), others to India with Professor Nick Roberts in December 2011 and semester-long programs offered each year by Dr. Paulette Singley, Director of the Rome Center for Architecture and Culture (RCAC).
## 2014-2015 Academic Worksheet

### ARCHITECTURE

#### UNIVERSITY PRINCIPLES

- Academic Quality
- Innovation & Creativity
- Communication
- Transdisciplinarity
- Social Responsibility
- Integrated Student

#### Academic Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>WU</th>
<th>TRANSFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 182</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Design Studio 1A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 114</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Design Communication 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 111</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Academic Writing 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDS 1</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Core</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 149</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Unrestricted Elective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 183</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Design Studio 1B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 334</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>College Algebra</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 249</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Academic Writing 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 112</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Information Theory &amp; Practice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTH 205</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>History of Contemporary Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pre-College Requirement

- MATH 049 Elementary Algebra | 3 |
- WRIT 100 Bridge to Academic Writing | 3 |

#### Integrated Student Requirement

- Co-Curricular Activity | 0 |
- PPOV222 Leadership in Community | 1 |

#### Personal and Professional Development

- PPOV 100 Transition to Woodbury | 1 |
- PPOV 200 Transition to Woodbury | 1 |

#### Minor Requirements

- Minor Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>WU</th>
<th>TRANSFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>WU</th>
<th>TRANSFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 281</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Design Studio 2A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 243</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Materials and Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 267</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>World Architecture 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 251</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Trigonometry/Descri. Geometry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR 209</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Spring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>WU</th>
<th>TRANSFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 283</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Design Studio 2B</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 250</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Professional Practice 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>World Architecture 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 243</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Physics for Architects</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 120</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Public Speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3rd YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>WU</th>
<th>TRANSFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 383</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Design Studio 3A</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 330</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Theory of Architecture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 326</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Structures 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL/CSE</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Ethical Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Social Science Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Spring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>WU</th>
<th>TRANSFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 384</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Design Studio 3B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Portfolio Review</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 2xx</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Portfolio (Recommended)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 327</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Structures 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 425</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Environmental Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4th YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>WU</th>
<th>TRANSFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 487</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Studio 4A: Comprehensive</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 464</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Systems Integration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 366</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Social Science Course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Spring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>WU</th>
<th>TRANSFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 498</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Studio 4B: Urban Design</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 334</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Urban Design Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Integrative Learning Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Seminar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5th YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>WU</th>
<th>TRANSFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 491</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Studio 5A: Topic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 448</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Professional Practice 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Integrative Learning Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Unrestricted Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Spring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>WU</th>
<th>TRANSFER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 492</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Degree Project Studio</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 450</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Professional Practice 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Unrestricted Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Unrestricted Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes

- Freshman students are encouraged to take PPDV 100 or PPDV 200.
- Students must complete 160 hours of work experience with a licensed architect or allied professional.
- Students are encouraged to take PPDV 100 and transfer students, PPOV 200.

---

Note: The above table represents a sample academic worksheet for a specific academic year and program. The course codes and descriptions used may vary from the actual document. The table is designed to provide a clear and structured representation of the course offerings and requirements for each semester.
M.Arch students are expected to be enrolled full-time (12-18 units) each semester, excluding the summer of fieldwork.
name

id# degree earned

area of focus

required general study (non-architecture) units 45
general study units earned

required professional units (minimum) 40
ARCH 544 bldg 1 / materials + methods 3
ARCH 545 bldg 2 / structures 1 3
ARCH 562 vis 1 / design comm 1 3
ARCH 563 vis 2 / design comm 2 3
ARCH 281 design studio 2a 5
ARCH 283 design studio 2b 5
ARCH 383 design studio 3a 6
ARCH 384 design studio 3b 6
ARCH 267 world architecture 1 3
ARCH 268 world architecture 2 3

professional units earned
overall undergraduate units earned

required units as a graduate student 63
minimum total units required 168

M.Arch students are expected to be enrolled full-time (12-18 units) each semester, excluding the summer of fieldwork.
II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

The curriculum for new programs at Woodbury University is subject to a strong internal process of faculty and administrative evaluation. All new programs are approved by the Board of Trustees; our regional accreditor, WASC, has pre-approved new undergraduate programs but reviews all new graduate programs. For example, the MArch program and the earliest version of its proposed curriculum were submitted to and approved by the Educational Planning Committee and the Curriculum Committee (both faculty committees), then approved by Chief Academic Officer and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs Dr. David Rosen and by President Dr. Kenneth Nielsen, and then by the Board of Trustees in the Fall of 2008. WASC approved the new program in March 2009. We submitted our Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation to the NAAB in April 2009; the NAAB accepted it in July 2009, with full accreditation for the MArch program granted in 2012.

The 5-year PPOHA grant we were awarded in October 2009 supported development of both the professional graduate architecture curriculum and the post-professional programs. The PPOHA funded a position for curriculum development, held by Andrea Dietz, long-time adjunct faculty. Andrea gathered faculty for numerous curriculum development sessions, and provided faculty stipends for specific aspects of program development. She also developed and coordinated several graduate faculty retreats for grad curriculum development, moving from the macro to micro scale in determining realms of learning and appropriate sequencing of learning outcomes and SPC demonstration. Then-graduate chair, Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, developed a multi-layered system for MArch curriculum development. The chair, graduate coordinator, and associate dean meet with each faculty member teaching in the current or upcoming semester to review the expectations, sequencing, and learning outcomes for the course. In addition, graduate faculty lunches include the current and future faculty as well as all fulltime faculty, and these serve to provide the curricular and cohort overview that is essential to understanding teaching and learning effectiveness in the graduate program.

As part of an overall School of Architecture assessment plan and long-range strategic plan, a macro-view of student achievement in the professional programs and alumni success post-graduation occurs on an ongoing basis, focused through the five realms and including evaluation of how and where the NAAB perspectives and SPC are engaged. The Career and Outreach coordinator is developing a tracking system particularly of student work experience and alumni success; this information will provide further input for development of the professional programs. Curriculum development, however, is squarely the responsibility of the school’s faculty with the support of its administration. Notably, because the faculty teach across the curricula, things that work in one program tend to migrate into other programs, and weaknesses once identified in a program alert us all to potential gaps in other programs. For example, the intense faculty retreats and multi-layered system for curriculum development that supported our MArch accreditation process has continued and is influencing the way we think about and improve our BArch curriculum.

The process for review and development of the professional curricula is outlined below.

1. Gather and analyze input:
   Student course evaluations
   Faculty reflection
   Assessment of teaching/learning effectiveness at course level by faculty and chairs (including evaluation of student work and individual academic progress)
   Assessment of teaching/learning effectiveness at program level by faculty, chairs, associate dean (including evaluation of work across a cohort and portfolio reviews)
   → Proposed change to improve student learning and/or program outcomes

2. Propose curricular change:
   Initiated in the SoA Curriculum Workgroup
     Proposed by chair, coordinator, associate dean, or faculty member
     Approved by workgroup and sent to SoA faculty
   Approved at SoA faculty meeting
   Approved by WU Curriculum Committee*
Approved by Educational Planning Committee (if necessary)*
Approved in Faculty Senate*
Approval in Academic Affairs
→ Curriculum change appears in next catalog; changes go into effect through program offerings.

3. Evaluate results of change, return to the input part of the cycle.

* Senate, Curriculum Committee and EPC membership includes faculty representation from each school.
The School of Architecture faculty member on each committee both helps the SoA prepare effective and complete proposals and advocates on the committee for SoA proposals when under review.

II.3 Evaluation of Preparatory/Pre-professional Education

The admission process is discussed in detail in section I.2.1 Human Resources. The Woodbury University bylaws assign to the faculty the responsibility of recommending academic requirements for admission and policies relating to assignment of advanced standing to transfer students (Article VIII section 6). The faculty has delegated authority to the registrar’s office to evaluate college transcripts for general university transfer credits. Students must achieve a grade of C or better in a course for it to be considered transferable. See the 2014-15 catalog (URL in section IV.4) under Admissions for details about policies.

BArch admissions: The School of Architecture has no additional requirements for admission. We work with the registrar’s office to ensure that the school approves all transfer credit for architecture major requirements. Although portfolios are not required for admission to the BArch program, they are required for design studio placement of transfer students.

The BArch program is structured so that all SPC are met and demonstrated within the last three years of the program. This ensures that all transfer students take all the courses in which SPC are met while in residency at Woodbury. The curricular matrix in section II.1.2 indicates the courses in which the SPC are met.

BArch transfer evaluation: Admitted transfer students must submit a portfolio in which they demonstrate their proficiency in the five realms: Criticism/Critical Thinking, Visualization/Representation, Building, Studio/Design, and Practice/Professionalism. They are given the rubric by which their portfolio will be evaluated (provided in section IV.1.) Transfer students may be placed into the first, second, or third year of the architecture curriculum. We do not admit students into the second or third year unless they have appropriate achievement both in architecture studies and general education. For advanced standing in the program, the coordinator and/or the chair assess the applicant’s academic achievement via portfolio review, transcript review, and often an interview to determine whether credit can be awarded for SoA course requirements in the first and second year. The recommendations are sent to the registrar’s office, and the completed rubric and placement recommendation becomes part of the student’s academic advising record. Occasionally students will be asked to interview or to submit more evidence. We gladly accommodate all student requests for interview. We have two current memoranda of understanding based on equivalency of learning outcomes with Pasadena City College and San Diego Mesa College.

Woodbury internal “transfer”: Woodbury undergraduates may freely change majors; this is not considered a transfer. When a non-architecture Woodbury student seeks to change majors to architecture, the chair, coordinator, or a senior academic advisor evaluates the student’s academic record. A student from another design major might have sufficient preparation to warrant transferring credit for ARCH 114 Design Communication 1 and, rarely, 211 (DC 2). Occasionally a design student might provide portfolio evidence and academic achievement equivalent to ARCH 182 Design Studio 1. Interior architecture students would have the greatest overlap. The evaluator makes recommendations on architecture/design major equivalencies, and requests the registrar’s office to start a BArch curriculum worksheet for the student. Students who change major might well find they can – and wish to – minor in their former discipline. We do not encourage students to attempt to double-major, though we certainly
support high achievers who insist on doing so.

**MArch admissions and prior education evaluation**: The MArch program, both for 3-yr and for 2-yr students, is structured so that all SPC are met and demonstrated within courses taken by all students. The curricular matrix in section II.1.2 above shows that the only highlighted cell (demonstrated SPC) occurring prior to a level 3 course in its realm’s sequence is in Criticism 1 – but this course is required of all incoming students, whether they are in the 2-yr or 3-yr program.

When an applicant is evaluated for admission, a faculty member of the graduate admissions committee assesses the applicant’s undergraduate transcript to verify that the general studies credit hour requirement has been met (all admits) and that there are adequate professional studies credit hours for 2-yr admits. When the applicant accepts admission, a faculty member of the admissions committee reviews the transcript more thoroughly and indicates how the registrar should record undergraduate fulfillment of general studies (and professional studies for 2-yr students) on the worksheet that forms the contract for one’s professional education and the record of one’s progress through the program. The chair, the graduate coordinator and the student’s graduate faculty advisor have access to this worksheet in the student’s advising folder.

With respect to “internal transfers,” a Woodbury graduate student changing program into the MArch would be considered a new admit and would be evaluated the same as any new applicant.

Since the launch of the MArch five years ago, the applications we receive continue to offer new food for thought. A number of applicants have had some prior graduate architectural studies. In response, the SoA has developed a maximum transfer credit policy for graduate students. First, all transfer work must have been completed at a level that was academically acceptable for graduate students at the granting institution. Second, transfer credits do not take the place of any course in which an SPC is uniquely satisfied. For students entering the 3-yr MArch, no more than 30 graduate credits may be transferred; for those entering the 2-yr MArch, no more than 15. (The policy also states that no more than 6 graduate credits may be transferred for those entering a post-professional program.) Transfer credit requests are evaluated by the SoA graduate admissions committee. Results are communicated to the student and the registrar’s office, and placed in the student’s academic advising record.

**Three-Year MArch Preparatory Education**

The minimum requirement for admission to the 3-yr MArch is a bachelor’s degree in any subject from a regionally accredited institution or a recognized international institution. If the applicant studied any subject other than architecture, s/he will have earned more than 45 credit hours of non-architectural general studies; this is verified by transcript review. There is no other specifically required preparatory coursework for 3-yr students. We value cultural diversity and welcome students from across the world.

**Two-Year MArch Preparatory Education**

The minimum requirement for admission to the 2-yr MArch is a pre-professional bachelor’s degree in architectural studies from a regionally accredited institution or a recognized international institution. Each transcript is reviewed to ensure that the student has completed at least 45 units of general study and at least 40 units of professional architectural coursework. We look for evidence that the applicant has completed at least two visualization courses, two building courses, two architectural history courses, and four design studios. The professional courses that the 2-yr student has completed, including those listed above, are noted on the academic worksheet as part of the admissions process and placed in the student’s advising folder.

**Portfolio Evaluation**

All students applying to the 2-yr or 3-yr MArch program are required to submit a portfolio of creative work. The work can reflect both educational and professional achievements. At the time of admission, three faculty members of the admissions committee carefully evaluate portfolios of both pre-professional and non-pre-professional applicants using a portfolio rubric with the categories of Criticism/Critical Thinking, Studio/Design, Building, Visualization/Representation and Practice/Professionalism.
Applicants to the 3-year program are expected to provide evidence of critical and creative thinking; applicants to the 2-year program are expected to provide evidence of critical and creative thinking plus familiarity with architectural drawing conventions, evidence of design development, and technically proficient drawings and models. Students applying to the 2-yr program with portfolios that do not demonstrate the expected level of proficiency as identified in the portfolio review rubric may be admitted to the 3-yr program.

International Applicants
The SoA takes particular pride in the diversity of its student body. The graduate program follows in the tradition of the undergraduate program with its exceptionally diverse student body. Much of the diversity in the MArch program is due to the high number of international student applicants. International applicants offer unique challenges in evaluating pre-professional education. As with all applicants, the design portfolio, statement of intent and interview are of particular significance.

Groundwork
Groundwork is the first step for entering MArch students to be introduced to the ethos particular to the Woodbury School of Architecture. Groundwork provides an introduction to fieldwork and an appreciation for cultural and global diversity and sets up expectations for graduate-level work at the heart of the education of an architect. It is also an opportunity to introduce the students to the performance criteria established by the NAAB, and to the five realms of the School of Architecture: Criticism (critical thinking), Visualization (representation), Design, Building, and Practice (professionalism). Groundwork sets the foundation for our students’ success in the MArch program.

II.4 Public Information

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, Woodbury School of Architecture includes in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5. This information is also posted on the SoA website under the description of each of these programs: BArch (professional and accredited), MArch (professional and accredited), and MSArch (post-professional and not accredited).

The current wording from the website (http://architecture.woodbury.edu/accreditation/) and catalog is as follows:

NAAB
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.

Woodbury University School of Architecture offers the following NAAB-accredited degree programs:
B. Arch. (160 undergraduate credits)
M. Arch. (pre-professional degree + 63 graduate credits)
M. Arch. (non-pre-professional degree + 93 credits)
Next accreditation visit for all programs: 2015
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.

Woodbury University School of Architecture offers the following NAAB-accredited degree programs:

B. Arch. (160 undergraduate credits)
Offered at both the Los Angeles and San Diego campuses. Next accreditation visit for the B.Arch. programs is 2015.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, Woodbury School of Architecture makes available on its website in pdf format the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and the most current NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (2011). Links to these pdfs are found at http://architecture.woodbury.edu/accreditation/.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, Woodbury School of Architecture provides the following links and resources at our website, http://architecture.woodbury.edu/accreditation/

The Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture
The American Institute of Architects
The American Institute of Architecture Students
ARCHCareers
The National Architectural Accrediting Board
The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards
The Emerging Professional’s Companion
The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs & VTRs

In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, Woodbury School of Architecture makes available to the public its reports to, responses from, and correspondence with the NAAB on its website. Annual reports with narratives from 2008 through the present, NAAB responses to the annual reports when available, decision letters from NAAB, APRs for the BArch 2007, MArch candidacy 2009, MArch initial accreditation 2012, all professional programs (this report) 2014, Visiting Team Reports from 2008, 2010, and 2012, and MArch NAAB Accreditation Letter (2013) are available at: http://architecture.woodbury.edu/accreditation-documents/

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to
parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/postsecondary education. Woodbury School of Architecture makes this information available to the public via a link on our website’s accreditation page at http://architecture.woodbury.edu/accreditation/.
Part Three (III): Progress Since the Last Site Visit

III.1 Summary of Responses to the Team Findings

III.1.1 Responses to Conditions Not Met

Progress in the BArch since the 2008 Visiting Team Report

Our 2011 focused evaluation demonstrated that we met all the conditions that were not met in spring 2008, including Human Resources and Financial Resources.

BArch SPCs not met (from 2008 BArch VTR)

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

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

Response from the Program (2014)
In fall 2008, the faculty reorganized the BArch curriculum so that ARCH 464 Systems Integration is a co-requisite with ARCH 487 Comprehensive Design Studio. The students demonstrate ability of this SPC across these two classes. Because the MArch program also needed to strengthen its comprehensive design, we began to implement a comprehensive design portfolio review for the graduate program in the spring of 2012 and in the undergraduate program in the spring of 2014. These portfolios are reviewed by the faculty teaching comprehensive design studios and systems integration seminars. Our comprehensive design portfolio rubric uses the description of the comprehensive design SPC from the NAAB 2009 Conditions for Accreditation. Students who do not pass the comprehensive design portfolio are required to produce a comprehensive design project in a subsequent studio. They are also required to resubmit the portfolio for approval following the completion of this subsequent studio.

The comprehensive design portfolio rubric is in section IV.1.

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

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

Response from the Program (2014)
Students are required in the systems integration seminar to produce an accessibility plan for the co-requisite comprehensive design studio project. We expect achievement that aligns with the definition of
Accessibility according to the NAAB 2009 Conditions.

“Building Systems Integration
Ability to assess, select and conceptually integrate structural systems, building envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design.

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

Response from the Program (2014)
As noted above, the faculty reorganized the BArch curriculum in fall 2008 so that ARCH 464 Systems Integration is a co-requisite with ARCH 487 Comprehensive Design Studio. Ability in Building Systems Integration is also demonstrated in the comprehensive design portfolio. Since criterion 13.23 Building Systems Integration from the NAAB 2004 Conditions has been restructured, students are expected to demonstrate achievement that aligns with the Realm B criteria from the NAAB 2009 Conditions.

Progress in the MArch since the 2012 Visiting Team Report
Responding to the 2012 MAarch Initial Accreditation VTR

In the 2012 VTR from the MAarch Initial Accreditation visit, all conditions were met except for three SPCs.
A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture
B.2 Accessibility
C1 Collaboration

MAarch SPCs Not Met (from 2012 VTR)
“A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.

“2012 Team Assessment: There is insufficient evidence of student exposure to “examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres.” Arch 556 Criticism 3: Architecture from Modern (1945 – now) is primarily focused on canonical Western modern theory and “high design,” with forays to Algiers via Corb, Brazilia, and Tokyo via the Capsule Hotel, and post-colonial theory. Arch 575 Fieldwork: Research & Design provides the opportunity for students to study one particular place and culture, but because students may elect to work in LA, Berlin, China, Tahiti, or other program locations, this course cannot fulfill SPC A.9 for every student. Crit 2 (required only for 3 yr. students) has a reading on the Taj Mahal, Katsura Villa, and the Shanghai Expo Pavilions, but again nothing vernacular.”

Response from the Program (2014)
We have refocused the ARCH 554 Criticism 1 learning experiences and assignments to ensure that all MAarch students gain an understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.
Evidence of understanding traditions of the four hemispheres is demonstrated in Crit 1. Each student further engages this learning outcome in their Comprehensive Design Studio / Building 4 semester. They select from the divergent canons and traditions at least one case study analyzing a vernacular building system as a required course assignment that is included in the comprehensive design portfolio.

“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.

“2012 Team Assessment: Many student design projects do not demonstrate the ability as described above. For instance, several projects from MArch 589 Total Building Studio do not show handicapped toilet stalls, several have ramps that do not meet the slope and landing requirements, and site accessibility issues are not accommodated (e.g., no handicap parking spaces, etc.).”

Response from the Program (2014)
Students in the Building 4 seminar are required to produce an accessibility plan for their required comprehensive design portfolio as discussed above.

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

“2012 Team Assessment: Presently, there is evidence of collaboration among architecture students; however, there is little to no evidence that multidisciplinary collaboration is happening or available to students. This multidisciplinary collaboration is necessary for students to understand the coordination needed to combine all the components together for a complete project.”

Response from the Program (2014)
As a required component of the Comprehensive Design Studio / Building 4 semester, a minimum of three consultants from non-architectural disciplines (for example, structural engineer, MEP engineer, landscape consultant) act as collaborators to form multi-disciplinary teams with the students on their design projects. Additionally, in the Building 4 seminar, students are required to model their design projects using BIM software. This demonstrates coordination of the components that form a complete project, and manifests in the required BIM model what they have learned from their multi-disciplinary teams.

Students continue to collaborate with each other throughout the curriculum, especially in Studio 3 and Fieldwork.

III.1.2 Responses to Causes of Concern

Causes of Concern from the 2008 BArch VTR

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

Response from the Program (2014)
With the PPOHA grant we have developed a Making Complex in both locations that is on a par with, or
exceeds, that of our peers. The university and the $2.8 million PPOHA grant have together supplied abundant resources to ameliorate this cause of concern. The School of Architecture has devoted human resources to this concern and we now have an expert staff overseeing the fabrication and digital technologies that permeate our culture.

“B. Students admire the faculty and understandably view them as role models. In many cases, upon graduation, they will immediately move into the workforce and licensure is a vital asset. There is a concern this important step in the affirmation of the student’s abilities is not consistently reinforced by the faculty. Licensure should be a clear prospect for all Woodbury alumni.”

Response from the Program (2014)
The PPOHA grant also established a Career and Outreach Coordinator position. This position is filled by Catherine Roussel, AIA, and has become permanently integrated into the School of Architecture budget. The coordinator’s responsibilities include development of the work experience program, IDP coordination, teaching the required graduate practice class, and tracking alumni licensure status, among others. A comprehensive report from her office will be available in the team room.

Causes of Concern from the 2012 MArch VTR

“A. Future Perspectives
The rapid growth of the School of Architecture creates exciting opportunities but also poses challenges at several levels. As the size of the architecture faculty increases and new types of positions emerge, such as the professor in practice, extra care must be taken to address shared governance issues. For instance, the success of the new MArch program will require that long-term faculty are engaged in graduate program decisions and changes that impact the entire school. The new Dean’s Advisory Committees are a positive development, but these focused committees cannot replace full faculty meetings where all departmental issues are debated openly. Increased student numbers are putting a strain on existing human resources and facilities, such as administrative assistants, classroom space, and shop / fabrication facilities.”

Response from the Program (2014)
Human resources that were stretched thin have been strengthened, for example through the addition of multiple staff positions, and our growth has leveled off, further reducing the strain on resources. We have had multiple and effective all-faculty retreats to address specific issues. The administrative restructuring is an effort to give the faculty a stronger voice, as is the election of a faculty facilitator for faculty meetings. More of the fulltime faculty have served in leadership roles within the school. The Dean’s Advisory Committees have developed procedures to report at full faculty meetings where open debates regularly take place.

“B. Financial
The rapid growth noted above and the higher expectations of a graduate program both generate new demands on current financial resources. For instance, the establishment of the new graduate program will necessitate hiring more experienced adjunct faculty at more competitive salary scales. This concern is exacerbated by the current uncompetitive low compensation paid to adjunct faculty in comparison with local peer institutions. This will need to be addressed in order for the School, and the graduate program in particular, to achieve their full potential. Also the faculty and administration are concerned with continued and adequate funding of the signature summer abroad “Fieldwork” course, which is mandatory for all MArch students.”
Response from the Program (2014)
President Calingo has hired an executive vice president/provost who is devoting a great deal of his time and energy to achieve parity in workload and in compensation for fulltime and adjunct faculty and academic administrators. Study Away is part of the Woodbury Integrated Student Experience (WISE) strategic initiative, so adequate and sustainable funding for all study-away opportunities including fieldwork is a high priority for the university.

C. Student Performance Criteria concerns are addressed above under ‘Conditions Not Met’.

III.2 Summary of Responses to Changes in the NAAB Conditions

Our main response to the changes in the NAAB conditions has been to continue curriculum development exclusively with the new SPC; new syllabi reflect the SPC realms and the School of Architecture five realms (Criticism/Critical Thinking, Studio/Design, Visualization/Representation, Building and Practice/Professionalism). We have also committed to a more formal long-range planning process and are adapting to better and more consistent assessment processes. All of these give us better insight into the five perspectives, which act as holistic lenses through which to view the educational experience we are building.

The faculty are aware that there are changes in the NAAB 2014 Conditions and we will begin considering our responses after the spring 2015 visit.
BArch Core Course Descriptions

ARCH 182 Design Studio 1A: Principles and Processes, Bodies and Objects, 4 units (fall course)
Fundamental principles and processes of two- and three-dimensional design are introduced through the real
scale study of objects and their relationship to the human body. Methods of perception, technique,
composition, critical evaluation and verbal, written and graphic presentation are studied through both
abstract and representational assignments using various means and media. Studio, 8 hr/week. Prereq: none.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A8, A11, C1)

ARCH 14 Design Communications 1, 3 units (fall)
Various drawing skills used in two- and three-dimensional methods and media of representation are
introduced. Methods of perception, technique, composition, critical evaluation and presentation are studied
through representational assignments. Emphasis is placed on orthographic projection and documentation
and constructed hard line drawing techniques. Studio, 6 hr/week. Prereq: none.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A3, A6, A8)

ARCH 183 Design Studio 1B: Natural Tendencies, 4 units (spring)
The relationship of architecture to the body is developed further with an exploration of essential architectural
principles as they relate to a fundamental understanding of natural elements and human tendencies. Projects
introduce scale, enclosure, architectural elements, spatial expression and program as form givers. An
emphasis is placed on section, three-dimensional modeling and orthographic documentation and writing.
Studio, 8 hr/week. Prereq: none.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A8, A9, A11, C2)

ARCH 211 Design Communications 2, 3 units (spring)
Various skills used in two- and three-dimensional methods of representation employing digital media are
introduced, with an emphasis on their use as design tools that merge traditional and electronic techniques.
Studio, 6 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 114.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A3, A4, A6, A8)

ARCH 267 World Architecture 1, 3 units (fall and spring)
History and theory of architecture and design that span a chronological period from prehistory to the
nineteenth century in Western and non-Western societies are surveyed. The course traces history with a
process of focused explorations into diverse cultures, geographies, and places that cut through many layers
of historical time. When considered together, these explorations contribute to an understanding of
architecture as a deeply bound discipline with components that range from the artifacts of everyday life and
ritual, to building traditions and practices, to the larger forces of geography and the design of entire cities.
Lecture, 3 hr/week. Prereq: INDS 10x Interdisciplinary core course.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A1, A5, A9)

ARCH 281 Design Studio 2A: Program and Space, 5 units (fall)
An in-depth analytical study is made of everyday domestic, work and recreational rituals through written
research and case study with an emphasis on spatial accommodation of program through materiality, finish,
structure and form. Projects set in limited contexts emphasize the influence of internally driven relationships,
with a special focus on hybrid programming. Studio, 10 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 182.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, A11, B12, C2)

ARCH 243 Materials and Methods, 3 units (fall)
Each major material - wood, masonry, steel, concrete and glass - is placed within a fundamental context of
physical properties, historical evolution, structural behavior, sustainable design, contemporary methods of
construction and detailing, building envelope systems, and new and future products. Their influence on
design with respect to durability, building cost, life-cycle cost, and scheduling is evaluated. Lecture, 3
hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 182.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A4, A5, B3, B7, B10, B12, C1)
ARCH 283 Design Studio 2B: Site Orders, 5 units (spring)
Natural and urban site orders are explored and analyzed using writing, photography, mapping and sectional studies to develop site planning and building design with a special emphasis given to the relationship between program and external context. Projects focus on influences of adjacencies and environment, through the development of clear systems of movement, space, structure, energy efficiency and daylight. Studio, 10 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 183.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, A11, B4)

ARCH 268 World Architecture 2, 3 units (fall and spring)
Histories and theories of architecture, urbanism, and interiors are surveyed in Western and non-Western societies from 1900 to the present. The focus of this course is on the formal, aesthetic, cultural, and socio-political dimensions of modernism. Different historiographies are developed as various approaches in understanding modern architecture in its varied contexts, including but not limited to Marxist, Feminist, and Psychoanalytic. Lecture, 3 hr/week. Prereq: INDS 10x Interdisciplinary core course.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A1, A5, A9, C6, C8, C9)

ARCH 250 Professional Practice 1: Documentation and Codes, 3 units (spring)
Legal codes and regulations that affect architecture and influence design are reviewed including a study of energy, accessibility, egress and life safety. The development of project documentation based on local codes is studied, with an emphasis on technical documentation, drawing format organization and outline specifications. Lecture, 3 hr/week. Prereqs: ARCH 183, ARCH 211.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A4, B2, C1, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8)

ARCH 383 Design Studio 3A: House and Housing, 6 units (fall)
Through critical analysis and comparison of the historical, contemporary, and multi-cultural evolution of house and housing, the studio addresses form and meaning of the dwelling with a discussion that juxtaposes interior vs. exterior space, public vs. private space, community vs. the individual, and traditional vs. non-traditional families. The studio focus is divided between the single-family dwelling and multiple-unit housing typologies. The course includes a sustainable materials and systems component that includes lectures and written research assignments. Studio, 12 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 281.
SPC demonstrated: A3, A7 (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A5, A10, A11, B2, B3, C2)

ARCH 326 Structures 1, 3 units (fall spring summer)
Fundamental architectural structures, forces, force systems and resultants are introduced. Concepts of forces and stresses on trusses, beams, columns, and statically determinate structures are presented. Topics include equilibrium, behavior of structures subject to vertical and lateral forces, and strength properties. Structural analysis and design as it relates to wood structures is introduced. Lecture, 3 hr/week. Prereqs: MATH 202 or MATH 251 (trigonometry), and a trig-based physics course.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: B9)

ARCH 330 Theory of Architecture, 3 units (fall and spring)
The concepts, philosophies, ideologies, models, and polemics that have influenced or been the genesis of architectural expression and form are surveyed and analyzed. Lecture/seminar, 3 hr/week. Prereqs: ARCH 268, WRIT 112 Academic Writing 2.
SPC demonstrated: A9 (SPC engaged: A1, A7, A10, C2, C6, C9)

ARCH 384 Design Studio 3B: Structure, Systems, Space and Form, 6 units (spring)
Structure, technology, building systems and codes are explored as design determinants, space makers, and form givers in this synthesis studio. Building typologies, long span structural systems, environmental systems and electronic media are analyzed as they relate to design development. The studio has a portfolio development component that includes lectures and assignments. Studio, 12 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 283.
SPC demonstrated: A2, A6, C1 (SPC engaged: A1, A3, A5, A7, A11, B1, B2, B5, B8, B9)

ARCH 327 Structures 2, 4 units (fall spring summer)
Structural analysis and design is studied with respect to wood and steel structures including tension, compression, flexural members, columns, connections and seismic design. Fundamental concepts of
reinforced concrete design are studied emphasizing the ultimate strength method. Lecture, 4 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 326. SPC demonstrated: B9

ARCH 425 Environmental Systems, 3 units (spring)
Human comfort, climate analysis, passive and active systems, heating and cooling, daylighting and acoustics are reviewed. The survey, with a special emphasis on sustainable design, provides an understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building systems including heating, cooling and ventilation systems; electrical and plumbing distribution systems; lighting, acoustical, energy, waste, fire protection, security and hazardous material systems. Lecture, 3 hr/week. Prereqs: trig-based physics, ARCH 281. SPC demonstrated: B3, B8 (SPC engaged: A5, A7, A11)

ARCH 487 Design Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design, 6 units (fall and spring)
Students produce a comprehensive architectural project based upon a building program and site that includes the development of programmed space demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections, building assemblies and the principles of sustainability. The studio is open to 4th and 5th year students. The last half of the semester will be devoted to design development. Studio, 12 hr/week. Prereqs: ARCH 384, ARCH 326, ARCH 425. Coreq: ARCH 464. SPC demonstrated: A4, A6, B2, B3, B6 (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A5, A8, A9, A11, B1, B3, B4, B8, B9, C1)

ARCH 464 Systems Integration, 3 units (fall and spring)
The interrelationships of the properties of materials, structures, environmental systems, building envelope systems, construction technology, building cost control, and life-cycle costs as they influence design-development and decision-making are examined. A comprehensive and integrative process is presented. Lecture, 3 hr/week. Prereqs: ARCH 243, ARCH 326, 425. Coreq: ARCH 487. SPC demonstrated: B2, B5, B6, B10, B11, B12 (SPC engaged: A2, A4, A5, A9, A3, A4, A7, A8, A9)

ARCH 489 Design Studio 4B: Urban Design, 6 units (fall and spring)
This course focuses the architect’s leadership role in their community on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics through the study of urban design techniques and practices related to architecture and urbanism. A broad array of urban theories, tactics and strategies, building and space types, landscape and infrastructure design, and politics and policy making are explored through the dialectic between the private and public realms of the diverse urban culture. The studio is open to 4th and 5th year students. Studio, 12 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 384. SPC demonstrated: A10, B4, C2 (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A5, A7, A8, A11, B2, C1, C6)

ARCH 334 Urban Design Theory, 3 units (spring)
Cultural, sociological, contextual and formal issues of urbanism and their influence on the contemporary design of cities are studied. The course investigates the relationship between architecture, landscape architecture and urban planning. Emphasis is placed on processes of visual analysis, the role of nature and society, public and private space, human behavior and the physical environment, human diversity, and regulation and public policy. Lecture, 3 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 330. SPC demonstrated: A5, A8 (SPC engaged: A1, A7, A9, A10, C2, C6, C9)

ARCH 491 Design Studio 5A: Topics, 6 units (fall and spring)
The studio intent is to explore and test architectural design as it relates to one or more special contemporary issues. The studio is open to both 4th and 5th year students. An equivalent summer studio may be substituted. Studio, 12 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 384. SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A5, A7, A11, C1)

ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues, 3 units (fall and spring)
Theories and debates that animate recent contemporary architectural practice and discourse are examined with special emphasis placed on the impacts of context, technology, sustainability, alternative practices, sociology and philosophy. The issues are concurrently tested in ARCH 487 and ARCH 491 studios. Lecture/seminar, 3 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 330.
ARCH 448 Professional Practice 2, 3 units (fall)
Theory and techniques for analyzing and integrating design methodologies, client or user needs, and site conditions into criteria for preparing for an architectural project are studied. The theoretical and practical context for the degree project is researched and developed. Along with the completion of a substantiated written position of intent, a project site is selected, program written and design methodology articulated. Lecture, 3 hr/week. Prereqs: ARCH 250, ARCH 330.

SPC demonstrated: A1, B1 (SPC engaged: A5, A7, A10, B4, B6, B9)

ARCH 492 Design Studio 5B Degree Project, 6 units (spring)
Students must demonstrate the application of theoretical research and positioning, plus the ability to integrate site, program and other design issues in a self-initiated architectural design project through a rigorous level of work which is clearly resolved, demonstrating a high degree of critical thinking, skill and craft. Studio, 12 hr/week. Prereqs: ARCH 448, ARCH 491.

SPC demonstrated: A11 (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A5, A7, A10, B1, B4, B6, C3, C8, C9)

ARCH 450 - Professional Practice 3, 3 units (spring)
Design delivery and project and firm management are studied, including understanding the client role in architecture, program preparation, an analysis of documents, services, professional contracts and fees, project budget and cost estimating, global markets, and professional ethics. Lecture, 3 hr/week. Prereqs: ARCH 366, ARCH 448.

SPC demonstrated: B7, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8 (SPC engaged: C9)
MArch Core Course Descriptions

ARCH 583 Studio 1: Spaces within Spaces, 6 units (fall)
The foundation graduate studio prompts a phenomenological understanding of architectural space through multiple media and scales. Students explore the manipulation of two and three dimensions through drawing, material exploration, and modeling. Studio, 12 hr/week. Prereq: graduate standing.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A6, A8, B2)

ARCH 544 Building 1: Matter and Making, 3 units (fall)
Students engage in hands-on examination of the major material types through application considerations, historical evolution, and physical properties of building composition. Studio, 6 hr/week. Prereq: none.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A4, B3, B12)

ARCH 554 Criticism 1: Fieldwork Los Angeles, 3 units (fall)
Using Los Angeles as a living laboratory, students connect making to thinking in an investigation of the relationship between architecture, landscape architecture, and urban planning. Major ideas in urban design theory are introduced experientially. Seminar with fieldtrips, 4 hr/week. Prereq: none.
SPC demonstrated: A9, A10 (SPC engaged: A1, C2, C7, C8, C9)

ARCH 562 Visualization 1: Making Technique, 3 units (fall)
Students are inducted into the cultural and traditional conventions of architectural representation. The course operates as a workshop providing the analog and digital communication standards and making techniques for documenting, drawing, and modeling design ideas. Studio, 6 hr/week. Prereq: none.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A3, A8)

ARCH 584 Studio 2: Living Organizations, 6 units (spring)
Students expose increasing complexity in architectural space through mining the conceptual organizing logics through the cumulative exploration of relationships. Programming, contextual and environmental prompts, regulating principles, circulation and urban networks, and systems of assembly become formative drivers through an investigation of housing (habits, habitats, and inhabitations). Studio, 12 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 583 Studio 1.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A6, A7, A8, B2, C1, C2)

ARCH 545 Building 2: Structural Concepts, 3 units (spring)
An understanding of the relationships between gravity and structure is facilitated through the informed and intuitive testing of building units and formal typologies. Studio, 6 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 544 Building 1.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A4, B9, B12)

ARCH 555 Criticism 2: Architecture to Modern, 3 units (spring)
Students embark on a historical exploration of cultural, societal, and philosophical traditions as filed through architectural therapy and manifest in the built environment. The interdependencies of ideology and inhabitation are revealed through global architectural and written case studies from pre-history through 1945. Seminar, 3 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 554 Crit 1.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A1, A9, A10)

ARCH 563 Visualization 2: Analytical Constructions, 3 units (spring)
Architectural representation is composed as spatial enabler and interpreter that establishes and conveys perspective. Engagement occurs through two- and three-dimensional analog and digital hardware and software. Studio, 6 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 562 Vis 1.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A3, A8)

ARCH 587 Studio 3: Infrastructures, 6 units (fall)
Architectural representation is composed as spatial enabler and interpreter that establishes and conveys perspective. Engagement occurs through two- and three-dimensional analog and digital hardware and software. Studio, 6 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 562 Vis 1.
SPC demonstrated: A3, A6, A8, B4 (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A5, A7, B1, B2, B3, B5, C1, C2, C3, C9)
ARCH 546 Building 3: Advanced Structures, 3 units (fall)
Architectural concepts and their structural implications are advanced through case study analysis and performative modeling. A body of research grows through consideration of the unique contributions of concrete and masonry, metal and steel, skin and tensile, and timber and wood composite systems. Studio, 6 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 545 Building 2.
SPC demonstrated: B9 (SPC engaged: A4, B12)

ARCH 564 Visualization 3: Advanced Drawing, 3 units (fall)
Students are exposed to the aesthetic and philosophical objectives of drawing and modeling. The complexities of dependency between architectural conceptualization and representation are analyzed through a study of changing techniques within mixed media. Studio, 6 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 563 Vis 2.
SPC demonstrated: A3, A8

ARCH 589 Studio 4: The Total Building, 6 units (spring)
Students are challenged to synthesize architectural considerations, from the conceptual to the tangible, in the comprehensive design of a building. The studio project grows from a strong theoretical base into a response to the complexities of program and site. Accessibility, environmental performance, and life safety are addressed. Emphasis is placed on the integration of building systems with envelope and structure. Material selection is guided by both climate and context and is sensitive to resource conservation. Studio, 12 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 587 Studio 3. Coreq: ARCH 547 Building 4.
SPC demonstrated: A2, A4, A5, B2, B3, B4, B5, B6, B8, B9, C1 (SPC engaged: A1, A3, A6, A7, A8, A9, A11, B10, C2)

ARCH 547 Building 4: Environmental Systems Integration, 3 units (spring)
Students learn an integrated approach to managing structural and environmental performance and human comfort. The approach to ambient control includes active and passive options, vernacular models, and considerations of climate and materiality. Discussion integrates the functionality, phenomenological effect, and resource impact of system selection. Studio, 6 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 546 Building 3. Coreq: ARCH 589 Studio 4.
SPC demonstrated: A4, A7, B2, B3, B5, B6, B8, B10, B11, B12 (SPC engaged: A9, A11, C2, C6)

ARCH 556 Criticism 3: Architecture from Modern, 3 units (spring)
Students delve into contemporary cultural, societal, and philosophical trends as filtered through architectural theory and manifest in the built environment. The interdependencies of ideology and inhabitation are revealed through global architectural and written case studies between 1945 and now. Seminar, 3 hr/week. Prereqs: ARCH 554 Crit 1, ARCH 555 Crit 2.
SPC demonstrated: A9 (SPC engaged: A1, A10)

ARCH 575 Fieldwork: Research and Design, 6 units (summer)
Students elect a fieldwork station from among regional concentrations and study away exposures as a platform for thesis research. Their research bridges the analytical work of the core sequence with the synthetic work of the final year. Students initiate a design project and extended investigation proposal. Studio, 15 hr/week summer term. Prereq: ARCH 589 Studio 4.
SPC demonstrated: A5 (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A6, A7, A9, A10, B2, C1, C2, C9)

ARCH 691 Studio 5: Topics/Focus, 6 units (fall)
Students study a contemporary architectural design topic through a vertical option studio or specialize through the selection of a focus studio. Topics vary and focuses correspond to the post-professional tracks. Studio, 12 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 575 Fieldwork.
SPC demonstrated: none (SPC engaged: A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, A11, B2)

ARCH 620 Practice 1: Contemporary Architecture Profession, 3 units (fall)
The role of administration, code, contracts, documents, licensure, management, and policy in alternative and standard practices are delineated as an elaboration of the ethical, financial, and legal responsibilities of the architect. Seminar, 3 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 564 Vis 3.
SPC demonstrated: B7, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9 (SPC engaged: A5, B1, B2, B5, C1, C2)
ARCH 648 Criticism 4: Architecture Research Salon, 3 units (fall)
A research seminar treated as a design ideas salon introduces contemporary architectural questions and establishes the practical and theoretical context of the thesis project. Students incorporate the issues presented into a research platform and methodology, and prepare a thesis proposal. The thesis proposal demonstrates mastery in School of Architecture tracks in Critical Thinking, Design, Building, Representation and Professionalism through multiple media, including but not limited to writing, oral presentation, and graphic presentation. Seminar, 3 hr/week. Prereq: ARCH 556 Crit 3.
SPC demonstrated: A1, A7, A11, B1, C2, C8, C9 (SPC engaged: A5, C1, C3, C6)

ARCH 692 Graduate Thesis Studio, 6 units (spring)
The culmination of the graduate professional program, students pursue a self-directed thesis in collaboration with a faculty advisor. Studio, 12 hr/week. Prereqs: ARCH 691 Studio 5, ARCH 648 Crit 4.
Woodbury School of Architecture  Undergraduate Transfer Student Portfolio Rubric

Student name: 
Reviewed by: 
Placement: 
Date: 

To transfer into a 2nd year studio, the portfolio must demonstrate satisfactory achievement in at least 50% of the criteria in 4 of the 5 categories.

To transfer into a 3rd year studio, the portfolio must demonstrate substantial achievement of a significant percentage (90%) across all categories.

1. **Critical Thinking** – the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple cultural and theoretical contexts;
   - Writing gives access to the ideas that the student has developed in his/her project
   - Relationships between 2d, 3d and textual information
   - Acknowledgement of precedents where applicable

2. **Design** – the inventive and reflective conception, development, and production of architecture;
   - Understanding of how program affects form and space
   - Understanding of circulation systems including stairways, ramps, and elevators
   - Contextual response (site and context information)

3. **Building** – the technical aspects, systems, and materials and their role in the implementation of design;
   - Evidence of a beginning understanding of gravity and structure
   - Evidence of distinction among materials
   - Technically correct plans and sections
   - Indication of differential wall and roof assemblies, enclosures, and openings

4. **Representation** – the wide range of media used to communicate design ideas including writing, speaking, drawing, and model making;
   - Range of media includes hand drawing, computer drawing and physical and digital models (sketches, photographs). Familiarity with AutoCAD, 3dStudioMAX, Rhino or an equivalent object-oriented software (not SketchUp) and mastery of architectural drawing conventions: line-weight, orthographic projection, perspective, sketching techniques, diagramming
   - Written descriptions are clear and grammatically correct

5. **Professionalism** – the ability to manage, argue, and act legally, ethically, and critically in society and the environment.
   - Evidence that architecture responds to human issues and is not just formal manipulation
   - Overall quality of portfolio as a representation of educational achievements

COMMENTS (including recommended course credit):
### WOODBURY UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

**GRADUATE APPLICATION PORTFOLIO AND PERSONAL STATEMENT RUBRIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by:</td>
<td>Recommended Placement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>3-year MArch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What we are looking for in a 3-year portfolio is documentation of a history of dedication to personal development and evidence of critical and creative thinking.

**A background of notable effort towards a defined pursuit.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio shows no evidence of a considered interest in and passion for architecture and design. Work included in portfolio is under-developed and does not demonstrate a design sensibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio includes some evidence of a considered interest in architecture and design. Work presented is at a satisfactory level but could use additional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio shows clear evidence of a considered interest in and passion for architecture and design. Evidence of past accomplishments and contributions in a wide range of projects is present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple cultural and theoretical contexts.

**Critical Thinking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio work and personal statement is inarticulate, badly written and/or textual information.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio work and personal statement provide some evidence that the student has analyzed and created new relationships between various modes of information. There is some evidence of concept development through a design process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio work and personal statement provides evidence that the student has analyzed and created new relationships between an idea and its representation. There is evidence of concept development through a design process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What we are looking for in a 2-year portfolio is critical and creative thinking plus evidence of design development, technically proficient drawings and models, familiarity with architectural drawing conventions, and a high level of professionalism. To be considered for the 2-year program, students must have successfully completed a four year pre-professional architecture or environmental design program including Physics, two Structures and two Building Systems and/or Material Science courses (see 2-year worksheet for a complete list of pre-requisites).

**The inventive and reflective conception, development, and production of architecture.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio work demonstrates no understanding of spatial resolution (no understanding of types of spaces and how program affects space and circulation), no formal resolutions (no evidence of program affecting form or geometry) and no contextual response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio work demonstrates an adequate understanding of spatial resolution (different types of spaces and how program affects space and circulation), marginally developed formal resolutions (geometry and how program affects form) and limited contextual response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio work demonstrates spatial resolution (understands types of spaces, including levels and double-heights and how program affects space, circulation), formal resolutions (geometry and how program affects form) and contextual response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The technical aspects, systems, and materials and their role in the implementation of design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio includes no plans or sections and/or no evidence of an understanding of gravity or simple environmental principles. Drawings show no evidence of distinction among materials and no indication of differential wall and roof assemblies and openings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio includes simple plans AND sections and some evidence of an understanding of gravity and environmental principles. Drawings show little evidence of distinction among materials and little indication of differential wall and roof assemblies and openings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio includes technically correct plans AND sections and evidence of an understanding of gravity, structure, and environmental systems. Drawings show evidence of distinction among materials and indication of differential wall and roof assemblies and openings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The wide range of media used to communicate design ideas including writing, speaking, drawing, and model making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence of a design process and only a single form of representation. Drawings and/or models are badly crafted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design process is revealed through a limited range of media that include at least two various techniques (hand drawings, computer drawing and physical and digital models). There is some evidence of a personal language of representation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design process is revealed through a range of media including hand drawing, computer drawing and physical and digital models (sketches, photographs). There is evidence of a personal and compelling language of representation and care in craft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The ability to manage, argue, and act legally, ethically, and critically in society and the environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designs are simply formal manipulations with no evidence that architecture responds to human issues. The portfolio as a representation of educational achievements is unclear, text is badly written or nonexistent and portfolio shows no personal imprimatur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio shows some evidence that architecture responds to human issues and is not just formal manipulations. The portfolio as a representation of educational achievements is clear but uninspired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio shows evidence that architecture responds to human issues and is not just formal manipulations. The portfolio as a representation of educational achievements is clear, well-crafted, and beautifully designed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What we are looking for in portfolios for post-professional (1-year) applicants is all of the above plus a research agenda.

**A clear research agenda will guide the student in course selection and alignment with faculty and institutes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Agenda</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No research agenda is evident. There is no evidence of methodological initiative or intent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research agenda is evident but underdeveloped. There is some evidence of methodological initiative or intent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research agenda is clear and well written. There is ample evidence of methodological initiative or intent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments (including pre-fall preparation requirements):

**Total Score:** 111

9/7/14
**Graduate Comprehensive Design Portfolio Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Un satisfactory</th>
<th>Professionally Competent</th>
<th>Professionally Innovative</th>
<th>Critically Generative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Design</strong></td>
<td>Portfolio does not include any comprehensive design projects.</td>
<td>Portfolio includes at least one project that satisfies some/most of the categories that define a comprehensive project.</td>
<td>Portfolio includes at least one project that satisfies ALL categories of comprehensivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 1</td>
<td>Score: 2</td>
<td>Score: 3</td>
<td>Score: 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student’s capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following:**


**Design Thinking Skills**
- Portfolio work demonstrates no design concept, no understanding of spatial resolution (no understanding of types of spaces and how program affects space and circulation), no formal resolutions (no evidence of program affecting form or geometry) and no contextual response.

**Technical Documentation**
- Portfolio work demonstrates little understanding of the technical representation of building design (details, wall sections, material assembly diagrams). Technical drawings and models are non-existent, poorly crafted, and / or do not demonstrate design intent.

**Investigative Skills**
- Weak research agenda and little evidence of relevant references. There is little or no evidence of methodological initiative or intent.

**Ordering Systems Skills**
- Portfolio work demonstrates no understanding of the fundamentals of ordering systems nor how they might help organize and systematize 2D and 3D design.
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| **Historical Traditions & Global Culture** | Portfolio work shows little to no evidence of understanding of differing world human issues and cultural traditions. | Portfolio work shows some evidence of understanding of differing world human issues and cultural traditions. Portfolio incorporates some research from cultures in other parts of the world, even if the application of that research is unclear or weak. | Portfolio work shows clear evidence of understanding of differing world human issues and cultural traditions. Portfolio incorporates research from cultures in other parts of the world, and the application of that research is clear and strong. | Portfolio work incorporates strategies for addressing differing world human issues and cultural traditions. Portfolio incorporates research from cultures in other parts of the world, and the application of that research is clear and strong. Projects display critical attitude for how world cultural traditions can push architecture into new modes of contemporary practice. |
| **Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical (including mobility), sensory, and cognitive disabilities.** | Designs show no evidence of accommodation of users with physical, sensory or cognitive disabilities. | Portfolio shows some evidence of accommodation of users with physical, sensory or cognitive disabilities. | Portfolio shows clear accommodation of the spatial needs of users with physical, sensory or cognitive disabilities. | Portfolio uses spatial and circulation needs of users with physical, sensory or cognitive disabilities as an advantage and opportunity to push the project into new realms of critical practice. |
| **Sustainability** | Portfolio work shows no evidence of sustainable practices nor materials. There is no evidence of recognition of the environmental impact of architecture. | Portfolio work shows some evidence of the incorporation of sustainable practices and/or materials into designs. There is some evidence of recognition of the environmental impact of architecture. | Portfolio work incorporates sustainable practices and/or materials into designs. There is clear evidence of recognition of the environmental impact of architecture. | Portfolio work clearly incorporates sustainable practices and materials into designs. There is clear evidence of recognition of the environmental impact of architecture, and student has diagrammed how the design takes part in this life cycle. |
| **Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.** | Designs show little or no response to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation or context. | Designs show some evidence of considerations of site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation or context. These characteristics are identified and diagrammed, but not used to further the design nor representation. | Designs show clear evidence of considerations of site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation or context. These characteristics are identified and diagrammed. | Design work takes advantage of to push design in a critically relevant and innovative direction. Relevant characteristics / opportunities are identified, diagrammed, and used to further the design and its representation. |
| **Life Safety** | Designs show little to no evidence of the basic principles of life-safety systems. | Designs show some evidence of the basic principles of life-safety systems with adequate incorporation of egress considerations. | Portfolio work shows clear evidence of the basic principles of life-safety systems and clear systems of egress. Life safety strategies are diagrammed and demonstrate innovation and creativity. | Portfolio work shows clear evidence of the basic principles of life-safety systems and clear systems of egress. There has been an attempt to innovate how architectural life safety operates, and find a way it can respond more innovatively to contemporary design. Life safety strategies are diagrammed. |
| **Environmental Systems** | Portfolio shows little to no evidence of environmental systems considerations nor environmental comfort for users. | Portfolio shows some evidence of environmental systems considerations and has taken into account, to some extent, the environmental comfort for users. | Portfolio shows clear evidence of environmental systems considerations and has taken into account the environmental comfort for users. | Portfolio shows at least one project in which environmental systems are not only incorporated, but taken advantage of to critically develop the project into new realms of practice. |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designs show no evidence of an understanding of structural behavior and many projects included in portfolio are structurally inadequate.</td>
<td>Designs show some evidence of an understanding of gravitationalal and lateral structural behavior and the contemporary applications therein.</td>
<td>Designs show understanding of gravitational and lateral structural behavior and the contemporary applications therein.</td>
<td>Designs show clear understanding of gravitational and lateral structural behavior and the contemporary applications therein. Inventive or innovative structural solutions are evident, and technical models and diagrams of structural systems are well developed and well-tested.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Envelope Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designs show no evidence of an understanding in appropriate application of building envelope systems nor how they might implicate ideas of performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, etc.</td>
<td>Designs show some evidence of an understanding in appropriate application of building envelope systems. Designs attempt to use building envelopes to further ideas of performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, etc.</td>
<td>Designs show clear evidence of an understanding of appropriate application of building envelope systems. Designs present innovative ideas of performance, aesthetics, etc as they relate to building envelopes.</td>
<td>Designs show advanced understanding building envelope systems and use this knowledge to innovate designs that are critically relevant to contemporary architectural discourse. Designs present innovative ideas of performance, aesthetics, etc as they relate to building envelopes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Service Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designs show little to no evidence of the incorporation of appropriate building service systems.</td>
<td>Designs show adequate evidence that appropriate building service systems have been considered and incorporated.</td>
<td>Designs show clear evidence of appropriate building service system integration and innovative use and/or design.</td>
<td>At least one project in portfolio uses building service system integration as a design opportunity. There is a clear strategy of innovative design in building service systems and the potential they have on space-making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Materials and Assemblies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designs show little to no evidence of research or selection of materials and products in relation to inherent characteristics and performance, and how those serve design.</td>
<td>Designs show satisfactory evidence of research and selection of materials and products that adequately serve design by their inherent characteristics and performance.</td>
<td>Designs show clear evidence of research and selection of materials that drive and innovate design, and reinforce the larger concept.</td>
<td>Designs show extensive evidence of research of materials that drive and innovate design, and reinforce the larger concept. Scale mock-ups using selected materials and craft techniques are included and have a clear relationship to process and development of design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments (including pre-fall preparation requirements):**

- **Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designs show little to no evidence of research or selection of materials and products in relation to inherent characteristics and performance, and how those serve design.</td>
<td>Designs show satisfactory evidence of research and selection of materials and products that adequately serve design by their inherent characteristics and performance.</td>
<td>Designs show clear evidence of research and selection of materials that drive and innovate design, and reinforce the larger concept.</td>
<td>Designs show extensive evidence of research of materials that drive and innovate design, and reinforce the larger concept. Scale mock-ups using selected materials and craft techniques are included and have a clear relationship to process and development of design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Casey</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazebrook, Scott</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortmeyer, Russell</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freidberg, Eva, PhD</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daines, Matthew</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementi, Frank, AIA, AIGA</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknam, Monica</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratton, Benjamin</td>
<td>Participating Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomhower, Matthew</td>
<td>Participating Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byers, Kristine</td>
<td>Certified Architect, LEED-accredited principal, Adjunct Faculty, Co-Director of Engineering, Sustainability Specialist, Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freymuth, Bruce</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declo, Michael</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietz, Andrea</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bányász, Bojána</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills, Emily, PhD</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Casey</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazebrook, Scott</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortmeyer, Russell</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freidberg, Eva, PhD</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daines, Matthew</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementi, Frank, AIA, AIGA</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknam, Monica</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratton, Benjamin</td>
<td>Participating Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomhower, Matthew</td>
<td>Participating Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byers, Kristine</td>
<td>Certified Architect, LEED-accredited principal, Adjunct Faculty, Co-Director of Engineering, Sustainability Specialist, Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freymuth, Bruce</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declo, Michael</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietz, Andrea</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bányász, Bojána</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills, Emily, PhD</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Summary of expertise, recent research, or experience (see also CV)</td>
<td>F 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANG, Abdalla</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Architect, Educator, Engineer, at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, specializing in sustainable and resilient design, urban planning, and community development.</td>
<td>ARCH 468/469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILTON, Peter</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Professor of Architecture, specializing in sustainable design and construction, renewable energy systems, and energy-efficient buildings.</td>
<td>ARCH 4736/4737/4738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEPEDA, Alvaro</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Architect, Urbanist, Author, and Educator, specializing in urban design and planning, with expertise in sustainable development and urban revitalization.</td>
<td>ARCH 487/488/489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hadley Arnold
Co-Director, Arid Lands Institute
Participating Adjunct Instructor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Fall 2014  URBS 312  Infrastructural City: Water Infrastructure and Urban Form
Fall 2012  URBS 312  Infrastructural City: Water Infrastructure and Urban Form

Educational Credentials
Certificate  Theological Studies, Sewanee, the University of South
MArch  Southern California Institute of Architecture (professional)
BA  Harvard College, Cambridge, MA

Teaching Experience
2008-present  Arid Lands Institute, Founding Co-Director
2001-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture
2000-2001  University of California Los Angeles, Visiting Instructor
1994-1995  Southern California Institute of Architecture, Visiting Instructor

Professional Experience
1998-present  Office of Hadley and Peter Arnold, LLC
1987-1999  Independent editor, Monacelli Press, Artemis Verlag, Getty Center publications
1994-1995  Director, SCI-Arc Foundation Office

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014  Transboundary Watershed Management faculty workshop with Arava Institute, Ben Gurion University.
2012  “Planning + Design Assistance for Water- and Energy-Smart Communities,” HUD Office of University Partnerships, 3-year funded research, 2009-2012.
2011  “Land as Lab,” Keynote, Land Heritage Institute, San Antonio.
2011  “The Logics of Water,” at Out of Water conference, University of Toronto, Daniels Faculty.
2010  “Teaching Water,” Water in the West NSF SENCER Conference, Woodbury University.

Other Accomplishments
2013  AIA_Los Angeles Chapter, Presidential Honoree for Community Contribution with Peter Arnold.
2013  Metabolic Studio Aqueduct Centenary grantee
2012  Conference Organizer, Retrofitting the West: Adaptation by Design, March.
2011  Exhibition Curator, Drylands Design: Visionary Architecture for an Age of Change, A+D Museum.
2004  Architecture + Water , LEF Foundation Grant
2000  Fellow, Bagliasco Foundation, Villa Liguria Study Center for the Arts+Humanities
1999  Water and the West, Graham Foundation Grant
Peter Arnold  
Research Director, Arid Lands Institute  
Participating Adjunct Instructor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)


Fall 2012  GR/UG ARCH 680 / 491, “Where is it? Let's (re)Use It”: Large-Scale Urban Simulation and Geospatial Modeling for the Strategic Reassessing and Uncovering of Urban Stormwater Resources.

Educational Credentials

1994  MArch Southern California Institute of Architecture  
1990  B.A. Environmental Design (minor in Engineering Physics), University of Colorado

Teaching Experience

2002-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture  
2008-present  Woodbury University Institute for Transdisciplinary Studies  
Fall 2001  University of California Los Angeles, Graduate School of Architecture + Urban Design Instructor

Professional Experience

2008-present  Arid Lands Institute, Research Director and Co-Founder.  
1998-present  Office of Hadley + Peter Arnold LLC, Principal  

Selected Publications and Recent Research

(ftp://ftp.nmenv.state.nm.us/upload/12-H Workplan - Embudo Creek WPB.pdf)


Other Accomplishments

2014  City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Stormwater Capture Master Plan, Technical Advisory Board.

2013  AIA, Los Angeles Chapter, Presidential Honoree for Community Contribution with Hadley Arnold.

2012  LA Regional Collaborative for Climate Action and Sustainability, Member.
Robbie Bennett, Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012- 2014)
Spring 2011  ARCH 211  Design Communication II
Fall 2011  ARCH  Digital Workshop
Spring 2012  ARCH 211  Design Communication II

Educational Credentials
Bachelor of Arts – Audio & Acoustics Columbia College
MArch, Newschool of Architecture and Design.

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University

Professional Experience
2012  The Bradley Projects/The Bradley Development Group – San Diego, CA
2012  Bennett Design|Build
2012  The Brown Studio – San Diego, CA
2013  Longo Park Design Workshop - Chicago, IL
2014  359 Design – Aspen/Denver, CO

Selected Publications and Recent Research
San Diego Shape shifters - City Beat
Automated Metal Fabrication Processes for Façade Systems (Longo Park Design Workshop & MG Mcgrath)
Animations & Visualizations

Other Accomplishments
2013 Orchid – Interior Design (collaboration with Sideyard Projects)
2013 Chicago AIA small Projects Award (Longo Park Design Workshop)
Shawn Benson, Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Summer 2013    ARCH 2740DU          Digital Fabrication Workshop
Fall 2013      ARCH 2740DT          Digital Fabrication Workshop 1
                ARCH 2740DU          Digital Fabrication Workshop 2

Educational Credentials
BA Mng Org Communications, PLNU
MArch, New School of Architecture and Design
MRED Woodbury University

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University 2013-14

Professional Experience
SIDERYARD, Principal Designer, [8/2012 – Present]
NATHAN LEE COLKITT ARCHITECTS, Associate Designer, [10/2011 – 8/2012]

Selected Publications and Recent Research
Riviera Magazine, Coming Up Orchids, Coffee & Tea Collective • [2013]
Black and Orange, The Joy of Coffee, Coffee & Tea Collective • [2013]
Time Magazine, In San Diego, A Craft-Beer Scene Emerges, Bottlecraft • [2012]
New York Times, Top 45 Places to Travel in 2012, Bottlecraft • [2012]
West Coaster, Well Crafted, Bottlecraft • [2012]

Professional Membership
NCARB

Other Accomplishments
Orchid Award for Interior Design, Coffee & Tea Collective • [2013]
Stan Bertheaud
Professor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
- Spring 2012 UG ARCH 283 Studio 2B: Site Orders
- Fall 2012 UG ARCH487/491 Studio 4A/5A: Topics
- Spring 2013 UG ARCH 384 Studio 3B: Structure, Systems, Space and Form
- Fall 2013 UG ARCH 182 Studio 1A: Principles and Processes, Bodies and Objects
- Spring 2014 UG ARCH 489 Studio 4B: Urbanism
- Fall 2014 UG ARCH 282 Studio 2A: Program and Space

Educational Credentials
- Post-Graduate Study USC School of Cinema and Television
- MArch North Carolina State University
- BArch Louisiana State University

Teaching Experience
- Woodbury University School of Architecture
- Auburn University School of Architecture, Paul Rudolph Visiting Professorship (1 year term)
- University of New Mexico School of Architecture (summer graduate studio)
- Tulane University School of Architecture
- Mississippi State University School of Architecture
- North Carolina State University (teaching assistant)
- Orange Coast College (community college)
- Mesa College (community college)

Professional Experience
- Current Consultant (Architecture, Interiors and Construction)
- Current Screenwriter and Producer
- Recent Oceanside City Planning Commissioner
- Past Architect / Architectural Designer

Licenses/Registration
- 1982 REGISTERED ARCHITECT / State of Louisiana (License # 3134 - currently inactive)

Selected Publications / Credits and Recent Research
- "The TV Set", Illustrated article/interview in the Dutch design magazine "MARK", issue 28, 2010
- "Created by" & "Consulting Producer": "Architecture School" (co-creator with Michael Selditch)
- IDA (International Documentary Association) award for "Best Limited Series, Documentary 2009"
- "Screenplay by": "South of Heaven, West of Hell" feature film (co-written with Dwight Yoakam)
- "Screenplay by": "Painted Hero" feature film (co-written with Terry Benedict)

Other Accomplishments
- Advisory Board Member (all current)
  - Mesa Community College, San Diego, CA
  - Orange County Community College, Costa Mesa, CA
  - Mt. SAC Community College, Pomona, CA
Barbara Bestor, AIA
Julius Shulman Distinguished Professor of Practice

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
- Fall 2012  GR  ARCH 648  Criticism 4: Arch Research Salon
- Spring 2013  GR  ARCH 692  Graduate Thesis Studio
- Fall 2013  GR  ARCH 648  Criticism 4: Arch Research Salon
- Spring 2014  GR  ARCH 692  Graduate Thesis Studio

Educational Credentials
- MArch  Southern California Institute of Architecture, Los Angeles, CA (professional)
- BA  Visual & Environmental Studies, Magna Cum Laude, Harvard College, Cambridge, MA

Teaching Experience
- 2012-present  Woodbury University Graduate School of Architecture, Julius Shulman Distinguished Professor of Practice
- 2009-2011  Woodbury University Graduate School of Architecture, Chair
- 2002  Southern California Institute of Architecture, Adjunct Professor
- 2001  Harvard Graduate School of Design, Adjunct Professor
- 1996-2000  Southern California Institute of Architecture, Adjunct Professor
- 1993-1996  UCLA School of Architecture, Adjunct Professor

Professional Experience
- 1995-present  Bestor Architecture, Principal Architect
- 2011-present  Executive Director, Julius Shulman Institute
- 1996-2001  Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design, board member, vice president

Licenses/Registration
- Current Registration in California
  1999  State of New York
  1998  State of Rhode Island

Selected Publications and Recent Research
- 2014  “Beats By Dre’s Splashy New Headquarters,” in Fast Co Design
- 2014  “Grand Canyon,” in C Magazine, Toro Canyon House
- 2014  “Residential Development in Los Angeles Aims to Create a Micro-Neighborhood,” in Architectural Record, Blackbirds
- 2014  TEDx Women Santa Monica Museum of Art
- 2012  My So Cal History, in KCET Artbound
- 2009  “Living West,” in New Residential Architecture in Southern California, Sam Lubell

Professional Membership
- American Institute of Architects
- Association of Women in Architecture
- Silverlake Chamber of Commerce

Other Accomplishments
- 2014  Deborah Sussman Loves LA, Woodbury WUHO Gallery
- 2013  Catherine Opie, Woodbury WUHO Gallery
- 2011  Disco Silencio, Installation at Southern California Institute of Architecture
- 2009  Southern California Institute of Architecture Distinguished Alumni Award
- 2007  AIA restaurant Design Award, for excellence in restaurant design, Intelligentsia Coffee
- 2007  Flexible installation gallery/24 hour Department Store, Paper Magazine LA Project Space
Emily Bills
Participating Adjunct, College of Transdisciplinarity
Managing Director, Julius Shulman Institute

Courses Taught
URBS 301 Urban Theory, spring 2012 & 2013
URBS 302 Current Issues, “The Insecure Metropolis,” spring 2012
URBS 303 Food and the City, “Are You Going to Eat That?,” spring 2013 & 2014 (2 sections each term, Burbank and San Diego, offered online)
URBS 100 Introduction to Urban Studies, fall 2014 (offered online)

Educational Credentials
2006 PhD, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University
2000 MA, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University
1996 BA, University of California, Berkeley

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University, College of Transdisciplinarity, Participating Adjunct and Program Coordinator, 2006-present
The New School, The New School for Public Engagement, Part Time Assistant Professor, 2002-present
University of Southern California, Instructor, 2006-2007
Chapman University, Visiting Professor, 2009
Colorado College, Visiting Professor, 2005
New York University, Preceptor and Teaching Fellow, 2000-2002

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014 Research and book proposal, The Telephone Shapes Los Angeles
2014 Research and book proposal, Marvin Rand, ed. Emily Bills, Sam Lubell, PierLuigi Serriano.
2012 Exhibition, Pedro E. Guerrero: Photographs of Modern Life, co-curator
2012 “Pedro E. Guerrero: Frank Lloyd Wright’s photographer, in focus,” Interview with Craig Nakano, Los Angeles Times, March 29, 2012
2011 Exhibition, Richard Barnes: (Un)natural Spaces, co-curator.

Professional Membership
The Society of Architectural Historians, Southern California Chapter
College Art Association
Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 12/13/14  UG  ARCH 492  Degree Project
Summer 12/13  UG  ARCH 493.2  4th Year Open Studio: LA Fieldwork
Fall 2012/13/14  UG  ARCH 448  Professional Practice II: Research
Fall 2012  UG  ARCH 383  Design Studio 3A: House and Housing
Spring 2013  GR  ARCH 563  Visualization 2: Analytical Construction
Spring 2013  GR  ARCH 5728  Advanced Visualization: Birds and Cities
Summer 2014  UG  ARCH 4758  Foreign Study Studio: Paris/Switzerland
Summer 2014  UG  ARCH  Foreign Study Studio: Berlin

Educational Credentials
1998  MFA, Royal College of Art, London, UK
1995  M Arch, Bartlett School of Architecture, University College London, London, UK
1992  BSc Honors Degree in Architecture, Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL, London, UK

Teaching Experience
2012-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture - Professor of Practice
2010-2012  Woodbury University School of Architecture - Adjunct Instructor
2011  Department of Engineering and Architecture, University of Salerno, Italy - Visiting Lecturer
2009-2010  McIntire Dept. of Art and Architecture School, University of Virginia, VA - Artist in Residence; Interdisciplinary Design Studio project
2008  State University of Novosibirsk Department of Architecture, Siberia, Russia - Visiting Lecturer
2002  University of Wyoming School of Art - Visiting Lecturer
1998-1999  Schools of Sculpture, Painting and Intermedia, Kingston University, UK - Stanley Picker Fellowship
1995-1996  Bartlett School of Architecture, University College London, London, UK - Unit Tutor

Professional Experience
2007-present  Feral Office Architects, Principal
2001-2007  Gehry & Partners LLP, Los Angeles, CA, Design Architect

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014  California City Project – Research through Design Project, Maxine Frankel Award
2012  The Nature of Los Angeles: AIRBORNE LA; curator of panel discussion and event
2010  Fallow City, Prototypes for Detroit: Installation, Design Research Laboratory and Residency at University of Virginia, VA;
2010  Collective Power Structures, Moscow Architecture Biennale, Russia: project exhibition and lecture

Other Accomplishments
2014  Paper presentation at Mediated City Conference, Los Angeles
2014  Honorable Mention, “Fairy Tales”- Architectural Storytelling Competition
2014  Finalist, Office US Principal, Venice Biennale, US Pavilion
2013  Architect in Residence, WUHO, Hollywood, Los Angeles
2010  Nomination: Iakov Chernikov International Prize, Moscow, Russia
2009  “Detroit after the Crisis” Archis/NAI Interventions and Think Tank invited participant, Warren, MI
2009  “Cautionary Tales, Feral Structures” – exhibition and curatorial project, Arena 1 Gallery, Santa Monica Studios, US
Matthew Boomhower, Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 2012  ARCH 250  Professional Practice: Documentation
ARCH 450  Professional Practice III: Documents
Spring 2013  ARCH 450  Professional Practice III: Documents
Spring 2014  ARCH 450  Professional Practice III: Documents

Educational Credentials
Juris Doctor, California Western School of Law
BArch, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Spring 2002 – Spring 2014 AR450  Professional Practice III: Documents
Spring 2007 – Spring 2012 AR250  Professional Practice I: Documentation
AR 281  Design Studio 2A, 1 semester
AR180  Design Studio 1A, 1 semester
Woodbury University, Guest Lecturer
Spring 2001  AR450  Professional Practice III: Documents

Newschool of Architecture, San Diego, Lecturer
Winter 2000  Construction Documents & Formats

University of Tennessee, School of Architecture, Guest Lecturer
Spring 1999  Written Construction Documents

Professional Experience
2002 – Present  Southern Cross Property Consultants  President/Principal
1999 – 2002  Nielsen Dillingham Builders  Preconstruction Management
1997 – 1999  Joseph Construction Company  Design/Build Project Manager

Licenses/Registration
Architect, State of California C-30712
Post Disaster Safety Assessment (ATC-20)
Certified Construction Contract Administrator (CCCA)

Selected Publications and Recent Research
May 2014  “Unpaid Internships – Maybe not Illegal, Possibly Immoral, but Certainly Unwise” California Western School of Law
April 2014  “Bids & Contracts for Construction Services”, with Howard Sildorf, Community Association Institute, San Diego

Professional Membership
Construction Specifications Institute
San Diego County Bar Association
Building Industry Association

Other Accomplishments
2013  Carl Hauck Award for Historic Preservation, Mission Hills Heritage Organization (Mission Hills UMC Exterior Restoration)
Philipp Bosshart, Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2012  ARCH 183  Design Studio 1B: Natural Tendencies
Summer 2012  ARCH 4930  Fourth Year Open Studio
             ARCH 4932  Fourth Year Open Studio
Fall 2012   ARCH 114  Design Communication I
Spring 2013  ARCH 183  Design Studio 1B: Natural Tendencies
Fall 2013   ARCH 583  Graduate Design Studio 1: Spaces within Spaces
Spring 2014  ARCH 545  Building 2: Structural Concepts

Educational Credentials
2008  MRED, Real Estate and Development, Woodbury University
2004  MArch, Southern California Institute of Architecture
1999  BA in Interior Design and Furniture, San Diego State University

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct and Participating Adjunct 2004-present

Professional Experience
2010- present: Principal of independent Design Studio; blau

Licenses/Registration
N/A _ 3 ARE exams left

Selected Publications and Recent Research
Co-curator of ‘Optional Features’ product and furniture design.
Exhibited in San Diego and Los Angeles

Professional Membership
N/A

Other Accomplishments
Several Design commissions in the works ranging in scale from: Self financed development, New 3BR house, Remodel, Addition and furniture design.
Ewan Branda, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Architecture

Courses Taught 2012-2014
Spring 2012-14 UG ARCH 492 Degree Project, Spring
Spring 2012 GR ARCH 5702 Contemporary Issues: Spaces and Interfaces
ARCH 575 Graduate Fieldwork Studio
ARCH 5751 Fieldwork Berlin, China, Rome and Paris, Cuba
UG ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues: Practice and Theory
Fall 2012/13 UG ARCH 448 Professional Practice II: Research
Fall 2012 UG ARCH 330 Theory of Architecture,
Summer 2013 GR ARCH 575 Fieldwork Rome, Korea, Tahiti, Los Angeles
Fall 2013 GR ARCH 589/691 Comprehensive Design/Advanced Topic Studio
UG ARCH 487 Studio 4A: Comprehensive Studio

Educational Credentials
2012 PhD in Architecture, University of California Los Angeles
1998 MSArch in Design and Computation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
1989 BArch, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada (professional)
1986 BES, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Teaching Experience
2009-present Woodbury University School of Architecture, full-time faculty
2008-2009 UCLA Department of Architecture and Urban Design: Teaching Fellow
1999-2006 Art Center College of Design: Adjunct Faculty
1991-1993 McGill University School of Architecture: Adjunct studio instructor

Professional Experience
2003-present Co-author, NETLab Toolkit (netlabtoolkit.org)
2000-present Technical Director, Electronic Book Review (electronicbookreview.com)
2003-2008 Research Fellow, UCLA Experiential Technologies Center
1993-1996 Staff Architect, Saia Barbarese architectes, Montréal
1989-1993 Architectural Designer, Saucier + Perrotte architectes, Montréal
1988-1989 Architectural Designer, Peter Rose architect, Montréal

Licenses/Registration
Ordre des architectes du Québec, Canada, 1994-1997

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2008 “Giant Robots and Lazy Rivers,” in Thought Matters II. Los Angeles: UCLA School of Architecture

Other Accomplishments
2012 PhD Dissertation with Distinction, UCLA Architecture & Urban Design
2008-2011 Board Member, Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design
2008 Scott Opler Fellowship for Emerging Scholars, Society of Architectural Historians
2006, 2008 Edgardo Contini Award, UCLA Department of Architecture and Urban Design
2007 Collegium of University Teaching Fellows award, UCLA
2006 Graduate Research Mentorship award, UCLA
2003 Chancellor’s Fellowship, UCLA, for top entering doctoral student in each dept.
1994 Distinction, Ordre des architectes du Québec, exceptional performance in exams
Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 2012
ARCH 211    Design Communication 2
ARCH 2715   Portfolio Discourse
ARCH 6709   Rendering

Summer 2012
ARCH 2741   Portfolio +
ARCH 6741   Portfolio +

Fall 2012
ARCH 114    Design Communication 1
ARCH 2741   Portfolio +
ARCH 448    Professional Practice II: Research
ARCH 564    Visualization 3: Advanced Drawing
ARCH 6742   Groundwork: Visualization

Spring 2013
ARCH 211    Design Communication 2
ARCH 2743   Portfolio Discourse
ARCH 2744   Digital Structures
ARCH 492    Degree Project
ARCH 6744   Digital Structures

Summer 2013
ARCH 114    Design Communication 1
ARCH 211    Design Communication 2
ARCH 6742   Rendering

Fall 2013
ARCH 211    Design Communication 2
ARCH 2742   Rendering
ARCH 564    Visualization 3

Educational Credentials
M.S. AAD Columbia University (post-professional)
BArch University of Oregon

Teaching Experience
2011-2013 Woodbury University School of Architecture
2013 Pasadena City College
2014- University of Oregon

Professional Experience
2012-2013 64North Architecture, Los Angeles, Designer
2010-2011 Michael Maltzan Architecture, Los Angeles, Designer
2008-2010 agps architecture, Los Angeles / Zurich, Junior Designer
2007-2008 SLAB Architecture, New York City, Junior Designer

Licenses/Registration
AREs Completed 12/2013. Seeking Initial Licensure in Oregon.

Other Accomplishments
2007 Columbia GSAPP Visual Studies Award for Advanced Use of Computing in Architecture
James Bucknam, LEED AP
Adjunct Instructor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2012  ARCH 2715  Portfolio: Critical Visual Discourse
Fall 2012   ARCH 114  Design Communication I
Spring 2013  ARCH 2743  Portfolio: Critical Visual Discourse
       ARCH 492  Degree Project
Summer 2013
Fall 2013   ARCH 2715  Portfolio: Critical Visual Discourse
       ARCH 383  Design Studio 3A: House and Housing
       ARCH 114  Design Communication 1
Spring 2014  ARCH 183  Design Studio 1B: Natural Tendencies

Educational Credentials
2001  BA Architecture, Woodbury University

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct instructor 2009-present
University of California Irvine, Samueli School of Engineering, Affiliate, Degree Project 2011-present

Professional Experience
2008-present  Narrative Architecture + Advertising, Owner
2009-present  PJHM Architects, Project Manager
2007-2009  Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Architects, LLP, Senior Project Designer
2001-2007  NAC/Jubany Architecture, Senior Project Designer
2000-2001  SZI Architects, Amsterdam, Netherlands
1999-2000  Norman Millar Architects, Intern

Professional Membership
LEED Accredited Professional
IFP Independent Filmmaker Project
South Pasadena Arts Council Member

Other Accomplishments
2013  AIA/OC Citation Award, Patrick Henry Performing Arts Center
2013  Grand Prize, L.A. Architecture Awards, ZGF, Conrad N Hilton Foundation Headquarters
2012  The Nan Rae Gallery, Alumni Exhibition
2012  Sparc Duron Gallery, Group Exhibition
Kristine Byers, Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2012 ARCH 283 Studio 2B
Spring 2013 ARCH 250 Professional Practice: Documentation
Spring 2014 ARCH 250 Professional Practice: Documentation

Educational Credentials
BS Architecture, University of Arizona

Teaching Experience
2012 – present Woodbury University Adjunct Faculty
2014 SDSU - CON E 420: Environmentally Conscious Construction

Professional Experience
2012 - present President Kristi Byers, Architect APC

Licenses/Registration
State of California Licensed Architect
LEED AP, BD&C

Selected Publications
2014 “Urban Outfitter”, Riviera Magazine Feature
2014 “San Diego Architect Says the Future is in Sustainability”, San Diego Daily Transcript Feature Article

Professional Membership
American Institute of Architects
United States Green Building Council

Other Accomplishments
2014 American Institute of Architects San Diego Chapter
2014 Young Architect of the Year
2013 State of California Emergency Management Agency (CAL-EMA)
Certified Post-Disaster Safety Assessment Provider (SAP)
2012 American Institute of Architects California Council, Advocacy Advisory Committee Member
2012 American Institute of Architects California Council, Board Member
2012 American Institute of Architects San Diego Chapter, Immediate Past President
Jeanine Gail Centuori, AIA  
Professor, Director of Architecture + Civic Engagement Center

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 2012  UG  ARCH 491  ACE Studio Design Studio 5A
Summer 2012  UG  ARCH 4990  Darfur Rehabilitation Project Academy
Fall 2012  GR  ARCH 691  Studio 5: Focus/Topic
          UG  ARCH 487  Studio 4A: ACE Studio Comprehensive
          ARCH 491  Studio 5A: ACE Studio Contemporary Topics
Summer 2013  GR  ARCH 5731  Field work ACE
          UG  ARCH 4931  4th Year Open Studio: ACE
Fall 2013  GR  ARCH 691  Studio 5: Focus/Topic
          UG  ARCH 487  Studio 4A: ACE Studio Comprehensive
          ARCH 491  Studio 5A: ACE Studio Contemporary Topics
Spring 2014  GR  ARCH 691  Studio 4: The Total Building
          UG  ARCH 487  Studio 4A: ACE Studio Comprehensive
          ARCH 491  Studio 5A: ACE Studio Contemporary Topics

Educational Credentials
MArch  Cranbrook Academy of Art (post-professional)
BArch  The Cooper Union, graduated second in class

Teaching Experience
2011-2014  Woodbury University School of Architecture, BArch Los Angeles Chair
2003-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Professor
1999-2003  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Associate Professor
1998-99  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Assistant Professor
2011-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Director of ACE Center
1991-1998  Kent State University, Assistant Professor
1990  University of Michigan, Adjunct Professor

Professional Experience
2000-present  UrbanRock Design, Principal and founder
1983- 1986  Toshiko Mori Architect, Design Assistant

Licenses/Registration
California Architecture License # C-28180
New York Architecture License # 024135.
LEED Accredited Professional, US Green Building Council

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014  “Seed to Skillet: Woodbury Architecture Students Build Spaces to Grow” by Liz Ohanesian, Arbout
2014  “Cabin Project” The 1% AIA Strategic Alliances, Case Study, published online by Public Architecture and the AIA
2013  “Boxer Rebellion: A New Generation of Architects Makes Affordable Buildings with Cardboard Boxes and Trash, by Alan Huffman, Newsweek
2013  “In Los Angeles, Architects Find That Disadvantaged People Like Nice Buildings, Too,” by Alan Huffman, International Business Times
2010-2011  ADA Interventions toward A Universal Specificity, Funded Research by the National Endowment for the Arts
2011  "Conditional Reflections" project in Modern in Denver, Fall 2011
2012  AIA San Fernando Valley Chapter Citation Award in “Small Projects” for “Access Landscape,” Master Plan for Tierra del Sol campus, Sunland, CA
2009  AIA CA Award in “Small Projects” for “Conditional Reflections”
Jacob T. Chan
Adjunct Instructor

Courses Taught (Spring 1999 - Spring 2014)
ARCH 425 Environmental Systems, Spring

Educational Credentials
1980 B. S. Electrical Engineering, University of Southampton, England
1984 Post Graduate Management Studies, Polytechnic of Central London, England

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct Instructor 1999 - present
UCLA Department of Architecture, Adjunct Instructor 2013

Professional Experience
2008-present Glumac, Managing Principal
2002-2008 MDC Engineers, Principal
1980-2002 Ove Arup & Partners, Principal

Licenses/Registration
Current P. E. registration in California, Arizona, New Jersey, New York, Texas, Wisconsin

Professional Membership
Accredited Tier Designer (ATD)
Living Building Challenge Ambassador
Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED AP)
Certified Power Quality (CPQ)
American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEE)
Institution of Electrical Engineers (IEE)
Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)
European Engineer, Europe Member
Royal Chartered Engineer, UK
Annie Chu, AIA, IIDA
Professor

Courses Taught
ARCH 3751 Urban Environment: China, Summer 2012
ARCH 4751 Foreign Study Studio: China, Summer 2012
ARCH 5752 Fieldwork: China, Summer 2012
ARCH 4758 Urban Environment: Paris, Switzerland, Summer 2014

Educational Credentials
1989 MSArch, Architecture & Building Design, Columbia University, New York (post-professional)
1983 BArch, Southern California Institute of Architecture, Los Angeles

Teaching Experience
2010-present Woodbury University School of Architecture, Dept. of Interior Architecture
2008-2010 University of Southern California School of Architecture, Graduate + Undergraduate Lecturer
2006 Arizona State University, Graduate Visiting Studio Instructor
1996-2005 Art Center College of Design, Graduate + Undergraduate Studio Instructor
1993 & 1995 Southern California Institute of Architecture, Graduate + Vertical Studio Instructor
1991-1992 University of California Los Angeles, Graduate Studio Instructor
1990 University of Texas Austin, Undergraduate Studio Instructor
1989 Parsons School of Design, Undergraduate Studio Instructor
1989 New York Institute of Technology, Undergraduate Studio Instructor

Professional Experience
1996-present Chu + Gooding Architects, Principal
1993-1996 Israel Callas Chu Shortridge design associates, Principal
1990-1996 Franklin D. Israel design associates, Senior Associate
1984-1990 Tod Williams Billie Tsien Associates, Associate – Senior Associate

Licenses/Registration
Current registration in California, NCARB; prior registration New York, Kentucky, NCIDQ

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2010 “The Language of Design” in Design Bureau, Jan-Feb 2012
2009 “AIA Interiors and AIA Knowledge Net” in Office Insight, issue Sep 13

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Architects, International Interior Design Association

Other Accomplishments
2014 IIDA Southern California Chapter Annual Leaders Breakfast Honoree
2014 Editorial Board Member, Contract
2013 Exhibit Design- A. Quincy Jones: Building for Better Living, Hammer Museum, Los Angeles
2013-present Mayor’s Design Advisory Panel, City of Los Angeles
2012 Work titled Dyad included in Wunderkammer exhibition –Venice Architecture Biennale
2012 National AIA Institute Honor Awards Jury – Architecture & 25 Year Award
2010-2013 Cultural Affairs Commissioner, City of Los Angeles
2007-present National AIA Interior Architecture Committee / Advisory Group (Chair 2010)
2007-2013 Editorial Board member, arcCA Architecture California Journal
Frank Clementi, AIA
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught
ARCH 283 Undergraduate Design Studio, Spring 2012
ARCH 692 Graduate Degree Project, Spring 2014

Educational Credentials
1986 BArch, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture, Adjunct Faculty, 2010-Present
Bellevue College, Instructor, 2012
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Visiting Lecturer, 2011
University of Southern California, Adjunct Instructor, 2008-2009
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, Studio Instructor, 2000, 2014
Art Center College of Design, Studio Instructor, 1991-2009
Otis Parsons School of Design, Instructor, 1989

Professional Experience
1991-Present, RIOS CLEMENTI HALE STUDIOS, Los Angeles, CA
1986-1991 Hodgetts + Fung, Santa Monica, CA
1984-1986 Studio Matteo Thun, Milano, IT
1981-1983 Dave Szany and Associates, AIA, Arcadia, CA
1978-1983 Pizza Hut, El Monte, CA

Licenses/Registration
Current registration in California

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014 “Connecting the Lots” in Los Angeles Times, May 5th, 2014
“L.A.’s "People St." initiative puts public place-making into the public’s hands” in archinect.com, February 14th, 2014
“Best of 2013” in ArchRecord.com, January 3rd, 2014
“Top Interiors” in Archpaper.com, January 3rd, 2014
“Beam Me Up” in Dwell, May 1st, 2013
“Green Style: Smith Clementi Residence” in la biblioteca dell’ interior design, April 1st, 2013
“Knock on Wood” in Metropolitan Home, May 30th, 2013
2011 “Frank Clementi: The Edible House” in Architect’s Sketchbook, ed: Will Jones, Metropolis Books

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Architects
American Institute of Graphic Artists
The Mayor’s Design Advisory Panel, Los Angeles
Oscar Corletto  
Making Complex Shopmaster, Los Angeles  
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

- **Fall 2012**  
  - UG ARCH 2744 Object Making  
  - GR ARCH 544 Building 1: Matter and Making  
  - ARCH 6744 Object Making

- **Spring 2013**  
  - GR ARCH 544 Independent Studies

- **Summer 2013**  
  - Project Grad Summer Program

- **Fall 2013**  
  - UG ARCH 002 Design Build Studio, Taking the Reins, ACE Center

- **Spring 2014**  
  - UG ARCH 002 Design Build Studio, Taking the Reins, ACE Center

- **Summer 2014**  
  - UG ARCH 002 Design Build Studio, WATTS Corridor, ACE Center  
  - GR ARCH 002 Design Build Studio, WATTS Corridor, ACE Center

Educational Credentials

- 2011 BArch, Woodbury University

Teaching Experience

- 2012 - present Woodbury University, Making Complex Shopmaster  
- 2012 - present Woodbury University, Adjunct Faculty

Professional Experience

- 2011-2013 St.Amant Constructs, Construction Foreman  
- 2012-Present Woodbury University, Shopmaster, Adjunct Professor  
- 2013-Present LA Fabrica, Designer/Fabricator

Licenses/Registration

Selected Publications and Recent Research

- 2014 Los Angeles Times, Home and Garden, ACE Center builds an environment for learning at Taking the Reins
- 2014 Curbed LA, Clever Goat pen, Produce Stand, and More to Arrive on the LA river
- 2013 Pilcrow 004, Jason King & Oscar Corletto

Professional Membership

Other Accomplishments
Matthew T. Daines
Adjunct Instructor

Courses Taught (Spring 2012 - Spring 2014)
ARCH 268  World Architecture II, Undergraduate, Semester Fall 2012
ARCH 268  World Architecture II, Undergraduate, Semester Spring 2013
ARCH 268  World Architecture II, Undergraduate, Semester Fall 2013
ARCH 330  Theory of Architecture, Undergraduate, Semester Fall 2013
ARCH 268  World Architecture II, Undergraduate, Semester Spring 2014
ARCH 330  Theory of Architecture, Undergraduate, Semester Spring 2013
ARCH 268  World Architecture II, Undergraduate, Semester Summer 2014
ARCH 268  World Architecture II, Undergraduate, Semester Fall 2014

Educational Credentials
2010  MArcH, Southern California Institute of Architecture
2005  BFA, Graphic Design: Caine School of the Arts, Utah State University

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct Instructor 2012-present
Pasadena City College: Adjunct Instructor 2013-present
Art in Context Lecture Series, Bower’s Museum: Visiting Lecturer 2014

Professional Experience
2013-present  Afton Klein Group, Principal
2011-2013  Jones Partners Architects, Designer
2010  Michael Folonis Architects, Designer
2009  Michael Maltzan Architects, Intern
2008  WROAD Architects, Intern

Licenses/Registration
NA

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2010  "Logo Lounge Master Library Volume 1", Rockport Publishing, MA
2009  "Logo Lounge Book 4", Rockport Publishing, MA

Professional Membership
NA
Wanda Dalla Costa, AIA
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Fall 2013  UG  ARCH 182  Studio 1A
Fall 2014  UG  ARCH 182  Studio 1A

Educational Credentials
Master of Design Research  SCI-Arc (Southern California Institute of Architecture)
Masters of Architecture  University of Calgary
Bachelor of Arts  University of Alberta

Teaching Experience
2013 - present  Woodbury University, Adjunct Faculty

Professional Experience
2010 - present  Dalla Costa Design Group, Principal / Owner

Licenses/Registration
California  Registered Architect
Alberta  Registered Architect

Professional Membership
American Institute of Architects (AIA)
Alberta Association of Architects (AAA)
Mitchell De Jarnett, Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
- Fall 2013 UG ARCH 448 Professional Practice 2: Degree Project Prep
- Spring 2014 UG ARCH 492 Degree Project

Educational Credentials
- U.C.L.A. Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning, Los Angeles, Ca, M-Arch
- CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH, Long Beach, Ca., BA Fine Arts

Teaching Experience
- CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA: Part-time instructor coordinating and teaching core design studios and digital media seminars 2013 – Present
- Woodbury University, Adjunct Faculty 2013
- CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA: assistant professor- full time instructor coordinating and teaching core design studios and digital media seminars, ACSA Councilor, NAAB Accreditation co-coordinator various committee assignments 2005 – 2009
- SCI ARC: full time instructor - graduate and undergraduate studios / digital media seminar courses, 1995-2005
- OTIS COLLEGE OF ART AND DESIGN: design studio instructor 1998 - 2001
- U.C.L.A. Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning: Lecturer teaching Vertical Studio, Winter 1996

Professional Experience
- 2014 founded AYYUCE_*_DE JARNETT Los Angeles CA
- 2012 Senior Design Consultant at Studio Mumbai Architects, Mumbai, India- collaborated on the design of two high rise office buildings in the Zhendong financial district in Zhenzhou, China. Master-planned by Arata Isozaki, other firms involved in the project including Asymptote, Eduardo Souto de Moura, & Sanaa.
- 2009 to 2012 Senior Project Designer HMC Architects, Irvine, Office – lead designer in the Irvine office of HMC. Directed master-planning and building design for community college campuses, K-12 schools and civic projects.
- 2001 to present founded LAMdJ LLC with Lita Albuquerque 639 S. Spring St. Los Angeles, Ca. 90014
- 2002 to 2005 founded KdJ with Christoph Kapeller 639 S. Spring St. Los Angeles, Ca. 90014

Licenses/Registration
- Not registered

Selected Publications and Recent Research
- HARBOUR CHRONICLES: A LIFE IN SURBOARD CULTURE –coordinated fundraising for, edited, and contributed 4 articles to this 144 page hardcover catalogue to accompany the exhibit that I co-curated with Greg Escalante at the Frank M. Doyle Arts Pavilion at Orange Coast College in Costa Mesa, California. 2010
- LOS ANGELES MAGAZINE AUGUST 2007 -BEST OF LA- “Fortress of Solitude, the Best Small Building in Decades – in All Its Inaccessible Glory” by Greg Goldin - featured review of my design, with Christoph Kapeller for a private library in Hancock Park -2007
- LITA ALBUQUERQUE AND MITCHELL DE JARNETT, AS ABOVE, SO BELOW. Santa Fullerton, California, Main Art Gallery, California State University Fullerton, Grand Central Press 2005

Professional Membership
- GRAND CENTRAL ART FORUM, Board of Directors, Grand Central Art Center, Santa Ana, California, elected Secretary 2000 – present

Other Accomplishments
- AIA OC DESIGN AWARD – Middle School Enclave, Costa Mesa High School – with HMC Architects - 2011
Daniela Deutsch,
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012 – 2014)
Spring 2013 ARCH 425 Environmental Systems
Fall 2013 ARCH 464 Systems Integration
    ARCH 487 Design Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design
Spring 2014 ARCH 425 Environmental Systems

Educational Credentials
MArch, Technical University of Darmstadt Germany

Teaching Experience (2012 – 2014)
Adjunct Faculty at Woodbury University, San Diego
Adjunct Faculty at Newschool of Architecture and Design, San Diego

Professional Experience (2012 – 2014)
Exitecture Architects - Principal
Westfield Design - Project Designer

Professional Membership
International Living Future Institute – member since Spring 2014

Other Accomplishments
- Living Building Challenge Ambassador – Standard 3.0 (since Summer 2014)

- Participation with Woodbury students in the 2013 Summer School ‘active buildings – active cities’ at Technical University of Darmstadt, Germany.

The summer school of 2013 was the first in a series of summer schools in which the many facets of sustainable architecture were handled and taught. In the program, the potentials of a building envelope were examined not only within the building itself but in its surrounding neighborhood. Students learned from renowned experts in the field of sustainability and went on field trips that illustrated new sustainable trends in urban and building developments.
Andrea Hunter Dietz  
Assistant Graduate Chair for PPOHA Activity and Curriculum Coordination  
Adjunct Instructor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Fall 2013-14 ARCH 648 Criticism 4: Arch Research Salon

Educational Credentials
2005 MArch, Rice University, Houston (professional)
2002 Certificate in Architecture, Institute for Social and International Studies, Barcelona
2000 Bachelor of Science in Architecture, University of Virginia, Charlottesville

Teaching Experience
2010-present Woodbury University School of Architecture: Assistant Graduate Chair for PPOHA Activity and Curriculum Coordination and Adjunct Instructor
2010 Southern California Institute of Architecture: Summer Seminar Co-Instructor
2009 Woodbury University School of Architecture: Assistant Undergraduate Chair and Adjunct Instructor
2008 Washington University, St. Louis: Co-Director, San Diego/Tijuana Summer Graduate Studio
2005-08 Woodbury University School of Architecture: Participating Adjunct Faculty
2006 The NewSchool of Architecture and Design: Summer Seminar Instructor
2005 University of Houston College of Architecture: Summer Discovery Architecture Program for High School Students Instructor

Professional Experience
2011-present a-D-hd, Los Angeles, Founder
2008-present The Collaborative Architecture Factory, London, Collaborator
2009 Kyong Park Studio, San Diego, Designer
2005-2008 estudio teddy cruz, San Diego, Designer
2000-2001 Design Corps, Gettysburg, PA, AmeriCorps VISTA Volunteer
1999 The Glave Firm and SMBW Architects, Richmond, VA: Intern

Licenses/Registration
2014 Current Registration Texas #

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2008 “Outpost on the Political Equator,” in Lunch [Volume 3]: Territory. Faculty and Graduate Student Work at the University of Virginia School of Architecture, The University of Virginia School of Architecture Press, Charlottesville

Professional Membership

Other Accomplishments
2010 2D3D: Fast, Cheap and Out of Control drawing exhibition, Woodbury Hollywood Gallery
2010 the PAGe exhibition, Guggenheim Gallery at Chapman University, Orange
2009 Shaken Not Stirred: 15 Architects from SD|TJ exhibition, Spacecraft Gallery, San Diego
2009 Guest Lecturer, University of Louisiana School of Architecture, Lafayette
2008 Installation Co-Designer, Descours, New Orleans
2008 Merit Award, Roanoke Urban Effect Design Competition, Roanoke
2008 Urban Studies Panelist, World Social Science Association Fiftieth Annual Conference, Denver
2002 Community Design Panelist, Structures for Inclusion II, Pennsylvania State University, State College
Mark Ericson  
Associate Professor  
Graduate Coordinator

Courses Taught (Spring 2012 - Spring 2014)

ARCH 182 Undergraduate Studio 1A: Principles and Process, Fall 2012  
ARCH 283 Undergraduate Studio 2B: Site Orders, Spring, 2012, 2013, 2014  
ARCH 2715 Undergraduate Portfolio Workshop, Spring 2012  
ARCH 492 Undergraduate Degree Project Studio, Spring 2012  
ARCH 562 Graduate Visualization 1, Fall, 2012,2013, 2014  
ARCH 5754 Graduate Field Works Studio Rome, Summer 2012  
ARCH 5757 Graduate Field Work Studio Korea, Summer 2013  
ARCH 5726 Graduate + Undergraduate Visualization Elective, Spring 2013  
ARCH 587 Graduate Studio 3: Infrastructure, Fall 2013, 2014  
ARCH 692 Graduate Thesis Studio: Spring, 2013, 2014

Educational Credentials
2006 MArch, Southern California Institute of Architecture  
2001 BA Rutgers College

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Associate Professor 2014  
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Assistant Professor 2011-2014  
University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Fine Arts, Lecturer 2007

Professional Experience
2010 2012 Atlas Ericson Design Build, Principle  
2009-2010 AGPS Architecture, Project Manager/Designer  
2006-2008 Erdy McHenry Architecture, Designer

Licenses/Registration
Licensed Contractor State of California

Selected Publications and Recent Research


Professional Membership
Association of Computer Aided Design in Architecture (ACADIA)  
Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA)
Anthony Fontenot
Associate Professor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2014  GR   ARCH 692   Thesis Studio
             ARCH 584   Studio 2: Living Organizations
Fall 2013   UG   ARCH 330   Theory of Architecture
            ARCH 554   Criticism 1
Spring 2013 GR   ARCH 584   Studio 2: Living Organizations
             UG   ARCH 330   Theory of Architecture
Fall 2012  UG   ARCH 489   Urbanism Studio
            GR   ARCH 554   Criticism 1
Spring 2012 GR   ARCH 692   Thesis Studio
            GR   ARCH 584   Studio 2: Living Organizations

Education
MArch   Southern California Institute of Architecture (post-professional)
BArch   University of Louisiana

Teaching Experience
2011-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture
2004-2005  Tulane University School of Architecture, Visiting Assistant Professor
2000-2004  Tulane University School of Architecture, Adjunct Assistant Professor
1999-2000  Louisiana State University School of Architecture, Visiting Assistant Professor

Professional Experience
1998-present  f-architecture, Principal
1996-1998  Office for Metropolitan Architecture / Rem Koolhaas
1996  Frank O. Gehry & Associates
1994-1996  SpaceLab, Berlin, Germany

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2011  Co-curator for the Gwangju Design Biennale, Gwangju, South Korea
2010  The Mississippi Delta: Constructing with Water was presented as part of Workshopping: An American Model of Architectural Practice in the US Pavilion at the 12th International Architecture Biennale, Venice
2009  “New Orleans: The Emergence of a New Kind of City,” in Pidgin, Princeton University School of Architecture, Spring
2007  “Reinventing New Orleans,” in Domus, no. 905, July/August
2007  “Nueva Orleans al descubierto” [Exposing New Orleans] in Neutra 15 (Seville), September
2007  “Svelando Kabul” [Unveiling Kabul] in Parametro 272, November/December
2006  “Wer Baut Denn Nun Kabul?“ in Kabul/Teheran 1979ff. Filmlandschaften, Städte unter Stress und Migration, eds. Sandra Schäfer, Jochen Becker, Madeleine Bernstorff, Berlin, b_books/metroZones

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Architects, associate
Society of Architectural Historians
American Planning Association
Eva Friedberg,
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Fall 2013 ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues: Practice and Theory

Educational Credentials
Ph.D. University of California Irvine, Visual Studies, emphasis in Critical Theory, 2009
MArts, University of California Irvine, Visual Studies, 2004
BA, University of California Berkeley, 2001

Teaching Experience
NewSchool of Architecture and Design, Masters in Landscape Architecture Program
Spring 2012 Contemporary Landscape History and Theory

Lecturer, University of San Diego
Department of Art, Architecture + Art History
Fall 2012 Introduction to Visual Culture: Perspective and POV
Fall 2012 Introduction to Modern Architecture
Spring 2013 Introduction to Modern Architecture
Spring 2013 Art and Architecture of Los Angeles
Fall 2013 Introduction to Modern Architecture
Fall 2013 History of Landscape Seminar
Winter 2014 Introduction to Visual Culture: Perspective and POV
Spring 2014 Introduction to Modern Architecture

Woodbury University
Spring 2013 URBS 302 Current Issues: Food and the City
Spring 2014 URBS 302 Current Issues: Food and the City

Professional Experience
Business Manager, Evari GIS Consulting, Inc. 2012-Present

Selected Publications and Recent Research

Professional Membership
Society of Architectural Historians, Landscape Chapter
Southern California Art Historians
College Art Association
Matthew Gillis  
Visiting Assistant Professor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2014  
GR ARCH 589 Studio 4: The Total Building  
ARCH 547 Building 4: Environmental Systems Integration  
UG INAR 282 Studio 4: Branding and Identity  
UG ARCH 547 Building 4: Environmental Systems Integration

Fall 2013  
UG INAR 480 Studio 7: Comprehensive Studio Interior Arch  
UG INAR 164 History I: Pre-history – NeoClassicism Interior Arch

Summer 2013  
UG INAR 388 Studio5: Micro-housing Interior Arch

Spring 2013  
GR ARCH 589 Studio 4: The Total Building  
ARCH 547 Building 4: Environmental Systems Integration  
UG/GR ARCH 491 Studio 5: Contemporary Topics

Fall 2012  
UG INAR 480 Studio 7: Comprehensive Studio Interior Arch

Educational Credentials
Master of Architecture  
University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)  
Bachelor of Design in Architecture  
University of Florida

Teaching Experience
2013 – present  
Woodbury University, Visiting Assistant Professor

2003 - 2013  
Woodbury University, Adjunct Instructor

2011-2013  
OTIS College of Art and Design, Senior Lecturer

2009-2013  
SCIArc, Studio & Visual Studies Instructor

Professional Experience
2011- Present  
GILLIS, Principal

2001-2010  
Griffin Enright Architects, Senior Associate

2000-2001  
Coop Himmelb(l)au, Designer

1997-1998  
Dykes-Johnson Architects

Licenses/Registration
N/A

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2013  
Best of Year - Exhibition, Interior Design Magazine, Los Angeles

2013  

2012  
A+3 Architecture Lecture Series, Miami Dade College – “Material Agency”

2012  
Out There Doing It Series, “Forge, Forage, Fabricate” Lecture

2011  
Architizer Design Clinician, Dwell on Design LosAngeles

Professional Membership
Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Design, Board Member, Treasurer 2012 -Present
AIA/ Los Angeles, Associate Member, 2012 – Present
U.S. Green Building Council, Los Angeles Affiliate Member, 2012 -Present

Other Accomplishments
2013  
LA Design Award ST. Thomas the Apostle(STA) School, Griffin Enright Architects

2012  
2x8 AIA/LA Exhibit Design Competition Winner, GILLIS

2012  
LA AIA Next LA Award, Paradox Box, Griffin Enright Architects

2011  
AIA California Council Merit Award, STA School, Griffin Enright Architects

2010  
LABC Architectural Award, STA School, Griffin Enright Architects

2008  
SARA Design Honor Award Point Dume Residence, Griffin Enright Architects

2007  
Long Beach AIA Honor Award, PUSD Education Complex, Griffin Enright Architects
Scott Glazebrook,
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2012 ARCH 425 Environmental Systems
Spring 2013 ARCH 425 Environmental Systems

Educational Credentials
M.Arch, The University of Texas at Austin
B.A. in Liberal Arts and Sciences – Liberal Studies with Three Emphases, San Diego State University
  Emphases: Urban Geography, City Planning, Environmental Design

Professional Experience
Owner and Architect, Open Architecture Workshop, 2007 – 2013
Project Manager / Project Architect, Studio One Eleven at Perkowitz + Ruth Architects, 2013 – 2014
Senior Planner, Civic San Diego, 2014 – present

Licenses/Registration
California Licensed Architect C31006
NCARB Registered Architect 64122

Professional Membership
LEED AP 47290
NCARB

Other Accomplishments
Member, Downtown Community Planning Committee (formerly CCAC), 2012 – 2013
Thurman Grant  
Adjunct Instructor, Interior Architecture Department

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Summer 2012  ARCH 575  Fieldwork Studio: China  
             ARCH 475  Foreign Study Studio: China

Fall 2012    INAR 207  Design Studio 3: IA Elements

Spring 2013  ARIA 2700  Design Communication 3
             ARCH 366  Contemporary Issues: Theory and Practice
             ARCH 491  Design Studio 5A: Rome
             ARCH 489  Design Studio 4B: Urbanism (Rome)

Fall 2013    INAR 207  Design Studio 3: IA Elements

Summer 2014 INAR 282  Studio 4: Branding
             INAR 363  Studio 5: Housing

Fall 2014    ARCH 366  Contemporary Issues: Theory and Practice
             ARCH 491  Design Studio 5A: Rome
             ARCH 489  Design Studio 4B: Urbanism (Rome)
             ARCH 383  Design Studio 3A: House and Housing

Educational Credentials

BArch  University of Southern California School of Architecture

Teaching Experience

2005-present  Woodbury University Interior Architecture Department: Adjunct Faculty

Professional Experience

2005-present  Thurman Grant Architect, Principal
2000-2004    Kovac Architects, Project Manager
1997-1999    Kaplan Chen Kaplan Architects
1996         Belzberg/Wittman Collaborative
1995         Moore Ruble Yudell
1993-1994    Bestor/Millar

Licenses/Registration

Current registration in California, License #C-30285

Other Accomplishments

2014  Pending Publication: Dingbat 2.0, eds: Thurman Grant and Joshua G. Stein
2009-2013 Board of Directors, Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design
           President, 2012-2013
2012    Co-Curator, LA Forum UNFINISHED BUSINESS Exhibition
2011-2013 Co-Coordinator, WEDGE Gallery, Woodbury University School of Architecture
April Greiman, Graphic Designer/Artist
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (Fall 2011 - Spring 2014)
School of Architecture Visiting Critic, Adjunct Faculty

Educational Credentials
1970     BFA, Kansas City Art Institute
1972     Certificate, Kunstgewerbeschule Basel, Switzerland

Honorary Doctorates:
Art Center College of Design, 2012
Lesley University, Boston College of Art, 2003
Academy Art University, San Francisco, 2002
Kansas City Art Institute, 2001

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Associate Professor 2011-present
Southern California Institute of Architecture, Adjunct Instructor 1992-2010
Loyola University, NOLA, Design School Curriculum Advisor, 2012-present
Academy of Arts University, Adjunct Instructor, Graphic Design and Web New Media Schools, 1997-2012
Art Center College of Design, Graduate Advisor and Critic, Adjunct Faculty, 1995-2008
California Institute of the Arts, Visual Communications Program Director, 1982-1984, Adjunct Faculty 1977-1979
University of the Arts, (formerly Philadelphia College of Art,) Assistant Professor, 1972-1976

Professional Experience
1978 - present, April Greiman / Made in Space, Inc
Pentagram, 2000-2002

Selected Publications and Recent Research

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Graphic Arts, Gold Medal 1998, AIGA LA Fellow 2003
The International Women’s Foundation, The Trusteeship, 2010
Alliance Graphique Internationale, Executive Committee Member 1988-1990, Member since 1986
Catherine M. Herbst, AIA
Associate Professor and Undergraduate Chair, San Diego

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2014  UG  ARCH 384  Studio 3B Structures, Systems, Space and Form
Summer 2013  UG  ARCH 375  Foreign Study Studio/Korea

Educational Credentials
2008  MArch, Montana State University (professional)
1985  BArch, Montana State University

Teaching Experience
2011-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Associate Professor
2002-2010  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Assistant Professor

Professional Experience
2001-present  Rinehart Herbst, Principal
1998-2002  Rob Wellington Quigley, FAIA, Project Architect

Licenses/Registration
California Architecture License # C-27295

Selected Publications and Recent Research

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Architects
2013-present  Arid Lands Institute Board of Directors
2008-2012  Regent, California Architectural Foundation

Other Accomplishments
2014  AIA Awards Juror: Raleigh/Durham/ North Carolina
2012  SDAIA: Merit Award, Modest House Silver City New Mexico
2011  CCAIA: Merit Award, San Dieguito River Park Administrative Offices
2011  SDAF Orchid Award, San Dieguito River Park Administrative Offices
2009  SDAF Orchid Award, Woodbury University/Gould Hardware Adaptive Reuse
2008  National Concrete Masonry Association Award for Excellence, Welton Residence
Guillermo Honles, AIA
Adjunct Professor of Architecture

Courses Taught (Spring 2012 - Spring 2014)
ARCH 4931-2  4th & 5th Year Open Studio, Summer 2012, Summer 2013 & Summer 2014

Educational Credentials
1991  March II, University of California Los Angeles
1989  BArch, California Polytechnic University, Pomona
1985  AA Degree, Glendale Community College
1977  Drafting Tech Certificate, University of Houston Downtown College

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct Professor 1992-present
Universidad Centroamericana Jose Simeon Canas, El Salvador: Visiting Professor 1994-present
Universidad Albert Einstein, El Salvador: Visiting Professor 1994-present
Universidad del Moron, Argentina: Visiting Lecturer 2004-present

Professional Experience
1990-present  Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Architectural Group
2004-present  H+Z Architects, Principal
1985-1990  Pete Volbeda and Associates Architect

Licenses/Registration
Current registration in California and Florida

Selected Publications and Recent Research

Guest lecturer and speaker in 24 Universities in 14 Countries in Latin America, Europe and the US.

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Architects
National Organization of Minority Architects
Theresa Hwang  
Adjunct Faculty

**Courses Taught**
- ARCH 491  Design Studio 5A: Transforming Home(lessness)
- ARCH 489/491 Design Studio 4B/5A: Re-imagining Skid Row
- ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues: Process and Impact

**Educational Credentials**
- 2007 March I, Harvard University, Graduate School of Design
- 2001 BS, Johns Hopkins University

**Teaching Experience**
- Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct Professor, 2012-present
- University of Southern California School of Architecture, Co-instructor Spring 2014

**Professional Experience**
- 2009-present Skid Row Housing Trust, Community Designer
- 2007-2009 Design Studio for Social Intervention, Design Principal
- 2006-2007 Pilot Development Partners, Designer

**Licenses/Registration**
- In process for CA, CSE remaining

**Selected Publications and Recent Research**

**Professional Membership**
- Association for Community Design
- USGBC LEEP AP
Miki Iwasaki
Participating Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2012  ARCH 384  Design Studio 3B: Structure, Systems
Fall 2012  ARCH 182  Design Studio 1A: Principles & Processes
         ARCH 243  Materials & Methods
Spring 2013  ARCH 384  Design Studio 3B: Structure, Systems
Fall 2013  ARCH 2744  Drawing and Making

Educational Credentials
MArch,  Harvard Graduate School of Design
BArch  California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Teaching Experience
2008 – present  Woodbury University School of Architecture
               New School of Architecture and Design

Professional Experience
2006-present  mi Workshop

Other Accomplishments
Public Art project with San Diego International Airport. Astragraph 2014.
2013 Creative Catalyst Fund: Individual Artist Fellowship Program;
Eric Johnson,
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Fall 2012
- ARCH 487 Design Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design
- ARCH 491 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics
Fall 2013
- ARCH 243 Materials & Methods
- ARCH 487 Design Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design
- ARCH 491 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics
Spring 2014
- ARCH 492 Degree Project

Educational Credentials
MArch II, Cornell University
BArch, Woodbury University

Teaching Experience
2013-2014 Orange Coast College
2013 New School of Architecture and Design
Spring 2012 Cornell University - Teaching Assistant to Andrew Magré

Professional Experience
2012 Studio Eric Johnson Project Designer
2013 - Present Rinehart-Herbst Designer

Licenses/Registration
LEED AP
Robert Kerr, AIA
Adjunct Professor

Courses Taught (Spring 2012 - Spring 2014)
ARCH 250 Professional Practice 01, Spring 2012, 2013 & 2014

Educational Credentials
1996  MArch, Georgia Institute of Technology (post-professional)
1992  BArch, University of Arkansas

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct Professor 2005-present
Georgian Institute of Technology, School of Architecture, Adjunct Instructor 2000

Professional Experience
2003-present  ROBERT KERR architecture design, Inc., Principal
1999-2000  Koning Eizenberg Architects, Project Architect
1996-1997  Hodgetts + Fung Architecture Design

Licenses/Registration
Current registration in California and Georgia

Selected Publications, Awards and Recent Research
2013  “Sand and Surf,” Edie Cohen, Interior Design magazine
2013  Interior Design Best of Year Finalist – Silver Strand Residence
2013  Interior Design Best of Year Winner for Kitchen & Bath – Silver Strand Residence
2013  Interior Design Best of Year Finalist – Silver Strand Residence
2014  “Designer’s Forum”, Floor Focus magazine

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Architects
Christoph Korner
Assistant Professor, Chair of Interior Architecture

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 2013
UG ARCH 267 World Architecture 1
UG ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues
GR ARCH 555 Criticism 2: Architecture to Modern

Summer 2013
UG ARCH 4757 Foreign Study Studio: Rome
GR ARCH 5754 Fieldwork: Rome

Fall 2013
UG ARCH 267 World Architecture 1
GR ARCH 555 Criticism 2: Architecture to Modern

Spring 2014
UG ARCH 267 World Architecture 1
GR ARCH 555 Criticism 2: Architecture to Modern

Educational Credentials
MArch University of California Los Angeles
Dipl. Ing. Arch, Technical University Braunschweig, Germany

Teaching Experience
2008-present Woodbury University School of Architecture, Adjunct Instructor
2012-2014 Southern California Institute of Architecture, Los Angeles, Adjunct Faculty
2005-2013 Pasadena City College, Adjunct Faculty
2006-2007 University of California Los Angeles, Jump Start Program

Professional Experience
1998-present GRAFT

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2011 Graft: Distinct Ambiguity, Gestalten Verlag, Berlin
2009 Graftworld, Aedes, Berlin
1999 “Storyboard Las Vegas,” in Stadttauwelt, vol. 36

Other Accomplishments
2013 International Architecture Awards 2013, Solarkiosk
2013 Interior Innovation Award 2013, imm cologne, Winner, Fat Tony
2013 CDG-Unternehmerpreis, Solarkiosk
2013 Architecture of Necessity Award, Honorarable Mention, Solarkiosk
2013 AKG-Auszeichung herausragender Gesiundheitsbauten, Honorarable Mention, KU65
2012 Design and Healthcare Competition, Parametrische (T)Raumgestaltung, 1st prize
2012 AIT Award: Charity, Make It Right, 1st Prize
2012 AIT Award: Health Care Interior, KU65, 2nd Prize
2012 Heinze Architekten Award: KU65, Health Care, 1st Prize
2012 Heinze Architekten Award: Ginko Chengdu Restaurant, Wirtschaftsbauten, 2nd Prize
2012 exhibition “GRAFT – distinct ambiguity,” AIT Architektur Salon Hamburg
2011 AIA Los Angeles Restaurant Design Award, winner category bar. City Center Las Vegas
2011 Interior Innovation Award – Drift, Interprof Lounge
2011 exhibition EFIMERAS – alternativas habitables, Madrid, Spain
2011 exhibition “GRAFT – distinct ambiguity,” Haus am Waldsee, Berlin
2010 Contract Magazine: Designer of the Year
2010 Gold Key Award, Restaurants - Casual Dining, winner: City Center’s Aria Pool Deck
2010 GOOD DESIGN Awards, Graphics/Identity/ Packaging: Architecture in Times of Need
2010 Interior design Award, Best of Year - Hospitality/Restaurant: Merit Award: City Center’s Aria Pool
2010 Contractworld Award, Category “Hotel/Spa/Gastronomy” Shortlist: Gingko Bacchus
2010 Red Dot Design Award, Platoon Kunsthalle
2010 AIA Los Angeles Design Awards Exhibit, Los Angeles
2010 International Design House Exhibition, Seoul, South Korea
2010 Lumas Gallery Exhibition, Berlin
Jon Linton, AIA
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2012  ARCH 268  World Architecture II
Fall 2012   ARCH 267  World Architecture I
Spring 2013  ARCH 268  World Architecture II
Spring 2014  ARCH 334  Urban Design Theory

Educational Credentials
Deuxième Prix for Studies in Architecture and Urbanism, École d'Art Americaines
MS Arch & Urban Design, Columbia University
BArch, California Polytechnic State University

Teaching Experience
2003 – present  Woodbury University, San Diego
1994 – 2013  NewSchool of Architecture + Design

Professional Experience
2013 –present  Director of Architecture, Colkitt&Co, San Diego, CA
1996 –2013  Associate/Architect/Urban Designer, Studio E Architects, San Diego, CA
1986–89, 83–84  Project Designer, Ronald Wilson Architects, San Diego, CA
1987  Urban Designer, Ehrenkranz Group & Eckstut, New York, NY
1985 –1986  Project Designer, Bell Evans Yamamoto Architects, San Diego, CA

Licenses/Registration
California, 1986

Professional Membership
American Institute of Architects

Other Accomplishments
2010  San Diego Architecture Foundation, Orchid Award for Architecture: UCSD Housing Dining Hospitality Building
2010  American Institute of Architects/San Diego Chapter, Divine Detail Award UCSD Housing Dining Hospitality Building
2008  San Diego Architecture Foundation, Community Vision Award: Metro Career Center/Metro Villas, San Diego
2006  National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials, Award of Merit/National Award of Excellence nominee: Metro Villas, San Diego
2005  National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies, Meritorious Achievement Award Metro Villas, San Diego
2001  American Institute of Architects, San Diego, Citation of Recognition: Fletcher Cove Master Plan
2000  American Institute of Architects, San Diego, Citation of Recognition: Ballpark District Parking Garages
2000  American Institute of Architects, San Diego, Citation of Recognition Central California History Museum
1998  San Diego Historic Sites Board, Award of Excellence Greater Mid-City Historic Preservation Strategy, San Diego
1997  California Planning Association, Award: Greater Mid-City Historic Preservation Strategy, San Diego
1997  California Preservation Foundation, Award Greater Mid-City Historic Preservation Strategy, San Diego
1996  Orchid Award for Planning: Greater Mid-City Historic Preservation Strategy, San Diego
1996  American Institute of Architects/San Diego Chapter, Merit Award for Design Excellence Greater Mid-City Historic Preservation Strategy, San Diego,
M Victoria Liptak
Associate Professor

Recent Courses Taught
ARCH 670 Graduate Teaching Practicum: Introduction to Teaching Architecture (Spring 2012)

Selected Other Courses Taught (at Woodbury University)
ARCH 492 Degree Project, 2002 to 2008
ARCH 476 Design/Build Mini Studio, Fall 2004
ARCH 475 Foreign Study Summer Studio, Summer 2002 Paris
ARCH 375 Urban Environment: Foreign Study, Summer 2002 Paris
ARCH 330 Theory of Architecture, Spring 2002
ARCH 269 Objectmaking, San Diego and Burbank, 1998 to 2007
ARCH 182&183 First Year Architecture Studio, 1998 to 2009 (coordinator and instructor)
INAR 327 Constructions, Interior Architecture Studio, Spring 2004
INDS 373 Energy and Society, Fall 2006 (upper division general education)
INDS 104 Knowledges, Spring 2007 (lower division general education)
ENTP 330 New Venture Creation, Spring 2005 (interdisciplinary course on entrepreneurship)

Education
1994 MArch, Southern California Institute of Architecture
1985 BA in Linguistics, University of California, Santa Cruz

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: 1998-2012, 2014-present
Pasadena City College Department of Architecture adjunct instructor: 2000-2003

Academic Administration Experience
2013-14 Dean of the College, Kendall College of Art and Design
2012-13 Senior Vice President, Woodbury University
2009-12 Associate Dean, Woodbury University School of Architecture
2011-12 Associate for Academic Quality, Office of Academic Affairs, Woodbury University
2007-11 Dean of the Faculty, President of the Faculty Association, Woodbury University

Selected Publications and Recent Research

Other Accomplishments
2013  Curriculum consultant, Kendall College of Art and Design MArch program development
2011-12 Group mentor and sessions presenter, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (regional accreditor) retreats: Core Competencies, Assessment in Context, Student Success
2010  Design/Build workshop leader for the Design Bridge Program, February 2010, School of Architecture and the Allied Arts, University of Oregon, Eugene
Alan Loomis
Participating Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (Spring 2012 - Spring 2014)
ARCH 489 Studio 4B, Spring 2012

Educational Credentials
2000 MArch, Southern California Institute of Architecture
1996 BA, University of Detroit Mercy

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Participating Adjunct Faculty 2007-present

Professional Experience
2005-present City of Glendale, Community Development Department, Principal Urban Designer
1998-2005 Moule & Polyzoides Architects and Urbanists, Senior Urban Designer
1998 Rachlin Architects, Architectural Designer

Licenses/Registration
None

Selected Publications and Recent Research

Professional Membership
American Planning Association
Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design
Elizabeth Mahlow, PE
Participating Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (Summer 2010 - Spring 2014)
ARCH 327 Structures II, Fall, Spring, and Summer 2010 - 2014
ARCH 3930 Third Year Open Studio, Summer 2012
ARCH 2735 Undergraduate Advanced Structures, Fall 2013
ARCH 5735 Graduate Advanced Structures, Fall 2013

Educational Credentials
2006 BS, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Participating Adjunct Faculty 2010-present
Southern California Institute of Architecture (SCI-ARC), Adjunct Instructor 2009

Professional Experience
2012 - present Nous Engineering, Principal
2007 - 2012 Buro Happold, Design Engineer
2006 - 2007 Miyamoto International, Project Engineer

Licenses/Registration
Current Professional Engineering license in California

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014 “Annual Brunch Symposium: Breaking Ground, Stories of Innovation and Success,” Panelist, Association for Women in Architecture and Design

Professional Membership
California Disaster Service Worker, Structural Safety Assessment Program
Structural Engineers Association of Southern California, SEAOSC
Association of Women in Architecture, AWA
Michael McDonald, AIA
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2012-14 UG ARCH 283 Studio 2B
Fall 2012-13 UG ARCH 383 Studio 3A

Educational Credentials
Master of Architecture, Southern California Institute of Architecture (SCI-Arc), Los Angeles, CA
Bachelor of Arts, Environmental Design, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA

Teaching Experience
2011-2014 Woodbury University
2010-2011 East Los Angeles College
2009-2010 Woodbury University
2006-2007 Woodbury University
2003-2004 Southern California Institute of Architecture (SCI-Arc)

Professional Experience
2002-2014 Park McDonald, Los Angeles, CA

Licenses/Registration
California Architects Board, License No. 30494
National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB), License No. 63818

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2009 Ranch Houses: Living the California Dream, David Weingarten, Lucia Howard, Joe Fletcher, Rizzoli, New York, NY
2008 L.A. Modern, Tim Street-Porter, Rizzoli, New York, NY

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Architects, Member No. 30402773

Selected Projects
2014 Maguire Residence, Brentwood, CA, (3,500 s.f. remodel/interiors)
2014 Venice Beach House, Venice, CA, (7,300 s.f. addition/remodel)
2013 Bel Air Presbyterian Preschool, Bel Air, CA (exterior space concept design)
2013 Brentwood Residence, Brentwood, CA, (1,700 s.f. remodel/interiors)
2012 Jack Black Residence, Los Feliz, CA (6,500 s.f. remodel/interiors/landscape)
2010 Pier Point Development, Florence, OR 15 new homes on the Oregon coast (unbuilt)
2008 La Miniatura by Frank Lloyd Wright, Pasadena, CA (4,230 s.f. interiors)
2008 Design Within Reach, (multiple store locations), Felt Desk Set (product design)
2008 Montecito Residence by Lutah Maria Riggs, Montecito, CA (4,230 s.f. interiors)
2006 Schaffer Residence by John Lautner, Montrose, CA (3,500 s.f. interiors)

Other Accomplishments
2003-2014 Visiting Critic
Art Center College of Design Pasadena, CA
East Los Angeles College Los Angeles, CA
Los Angeles Harbor College Wilmington, CA
Otis School of Art and Design Los Angeles, CA
SCI-Arc Los Angeles, CA
University of Southern California Los Angeles, CA
Salvador Medina,
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 2012  ARCH 327  Structures II
Fall 2012  ARCH 326  Structures I
Fall 2012  ARCH 366  Contemporary Issues: Practice and Theory
Spring 2013  ARCH 327  Structures II
Fall 2013  ARCH 326  Structures I
Fall 2013  ARCH 546  Building III
Spring 2014  ARCH 327  Structures II

Educational Credentials
BA, California Polytechnic San Luis Obispo, Ca (1984-1987)

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University (2000-present)

Professional Experience
Mobayed Consulting Group, Structural Consulting, San Diego, Ca. (Project Engineer, 2002-present)
MSA, Structural Consulting, San Diego, Ca. (Structural Designer, 1996-2004)
ISD (Integrated Structural Design), San Diego, Ca. (Structural Designer, 1988-1989)

Selected Publications and Recent Research
Architecture-structure relation, Material Philosophy, Form-Finding, Bio-morphism/mimetic.

Other Accomplishments
Architectural projects:
Norman Millar, AIA  
Dean of the School of Architecture and Professor

**Educational Credentials**
- Certificate: Ross Minority Program in Real Estate Development University of Southern California 2006
- MArch: University of Pennsylvania School of Design (professional) 1978
- BA: Environmental Design, University of Washington 1976

**Teaching Experience**
- 2008-present: Woodbury University School of Architecture: Dean, Professor
- 2007-2008: Woodbury University School of Architecture: Director, Professor
- 1999-2007: Woodbury University School of Architecture and Design: Chair of Architecture, Professor
- 1987-1984: University of Southern California School of Architecture, Adjunct Instructor
- 1987: UCLA Department of Architecture, Visiting Lecturer
- 1986-1988: Art Center College of Design, Studio Instructor

**Professional Experience**
- 1987-present: Norman Millar Architects, Principal
- 1981-1983: Olson/Walker Architects, project designer
- 1979-1981: The Bumgardner Architects, project designer

**Licenses/Registration**
Current registration in California, Washington, Hawaii

**Selected Publications and Recent Research**

**Professional Membership**
The American Institute of Architects

**Other Accomplishments**
- 2013/14: NCARB Licensure Task Force member developing Licensure Upon Graduation programs
- 2013/14: National Academy of Environmental Design Councilor
- 2012/14: ACSA Vice-President/President-Elect, President, Past President
- 2012: Member, Mayor Villaraigosa’s Los Angeles Events Center Vision Team
- 2011: California Architectural Foundation Executive Committee; Regent 2008-present
- 2011: AIA California Council Service Award
- 2011: Architectural Education Summit Planning Committee. AIA California Council
- 2011: ACSA Administrators Conference Co-Chair
- 2011-2013: AIA Large-Firm Round-Table Dean Forum, participant
- 2010: AIA Awards Juror: San Joaquin chapter
- 2009: AIA Awards Juror: Pasadena Foothill chapter
- 2004-present: Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design Advisory Board
- 2002-present: AIA Los Angeles Chapter ex-officio Board Member
- 1986: 40 Under 40; Listing by the New York Architectural League, A2Z Architects
- NAAB Visiting Team member: University of Idaho 2004; Drexel University 2006; Illinois Institute of Technology 2007
Marc J. Neveu, PhD  
Chair of Architecture Los Angeles

Educational Credentials
PhD  History and Theory of Architecture, McGill University, Montréal, PQ, Canada  
Dissertation: Architectural Lessons of Carlo Lodoli: Indole of Material and of Self  
Fulbright Fellow, Venice Italy 2003-04  
Dean’s Honor List 2006  
ARCC King Student Medal for Excellence in Architectural Research, 2006  
MArch  History and Theory of Architecture, McGill University, Montréal, PQ, Canada  
BArch  Wentworth Institute of Technology

Teaching Experience
2014-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Los Angeles Chair  
2014-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Associate Professor  
2011-2014  Wentworth Institute of Technology, Associate Professor  
2007-2011  California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Assistant Professor  
2008  SCI-Arc, Visiting Faculty(Cultural Studies)  
2005-2007  University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada, Assistant Professor  
1997-2001, 05  Wentworth Institute of Technology, Adjunct Faculty

Professional Experience
2013-present  Executive Editor, Journal of Architectural Education  

Selected Publications and Recent Research
Editor  

Publications  
2012  “Concrete Twist.” Domus. 958, May.  

Presentations  
Jay Nickels
Participating Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Fall 2012  UG  ARCH 383  Studio 3A: House and Housing
Spring 2014  UG  ARCH 384  Studio 3B: Structure and Systems

Educational Credentials
BArch  University of Southern California

Teaching Experience
1995 – present, Woodbury University School of Architecture: Participating Adjunct Faculty

Professional Experience
1972 – 1996 Principal: Reibsamen, Nickels and Rex, Architects

Licenses/Registration
California License C-6012
Daniel Nissimov
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2014      ARCH 2742    Intensive Rhino Workshop
                 ARCH 589     Studio 4: The Total Building

Fall 2013        ARCH 128    Studio 1A: Principles and Processes, Bodies and Objects

Educational Credentials
MSArch  University of Michigan
BArch    Woodbury University

Teaching Experience
2013-2014      Woodbury University School of Architecture
2011 Spring    University of Michigan School of Architecture and Urban Planning

Professional Experience
JJQAD, Los Angeles, California
Architectural Designer
May 2014 - Current

LIN Architects + Urbanists, Berlin, Germany
Architectural Designer
September 2012 - August 2013

Selected Publications and Recent Research
Drylands Design Exhibit for UCLA, Institute of the Environment and Sustainability
Retrofitting Silver Lake Reservoir
Team Robert Lamb
Ed Ogosta, AIA
Visiting Professor 2014

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Educational Credentials
MArch Harvard University, Graduate School of Design
BA Architecture UC Berkeley, College of Environmental Design

Teaching Experience
Summer 2013 Visiting Professor, Centro de Estudios Superiores de Diseño de Monterrey (CEDIM); Monterrey, Mexico

Professional Experience
2011-present Principal, Edward Ogosta Architecture, Culver City, CA.
2002-2004 Job Captain, SPF:architects, Los Angeles, CA.

Licenses/Registration
NCARB Certified
California Architecture License #30480

Selected Publications and Recent Research
05.2012 "Big Boxes: An Ode to the Data Center", CLOG
05.2012 "Onsite Insight: A Guide to Experiential Gossip", Conditions
02.2010 "A Compromise Manifesto", Conditions

Professional Membership
American Institute of Architects
LEED Accredited Professional

Other Accomplishments
2013 AIA Small Projects Award (national): Four Eyes House
2013 Residential Architect magazine Design Merit Award: Four Eyes House
2013 Architizer A+ Award Finalist: Hybrid Office
2013 AIA Center for Emerging Professionals Exhibition selection: Hybrid Office
2013 AIA Center for Emerging Professionals Exhibition selection: Four Eyes House
2012 ArchDaily Building of the Year Finalist: Hybrid Office
2012 AIA Los Angeles Next LA Honor Award: Four Eyes House
2012 AIA Los Angeles Next LA Honor Award: Hybrid Office
2012 Boston Society of Architects | AIA Unbuilt Architecture Honor Award: Four Eyes House
2012 Boston Society of Architects | AIA Unbuilt Architecture Honor Award: Hybrid Office
**Eric W. Olsen**  
Professor

### Courses Taught (2012-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 366</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues: Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 3706</td>
<td>Study Abroad Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 384</td>
<td>Design Studio 3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 366</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues: Practice and Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 375</td>
<td>Urban Environment: Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 475</td>
<td>Foreign Study Studio: Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>ARCH 5751</td>
<td>Fieldwork Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 243</td>
<td>Materials and Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 491</td>
<td>Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>ARCH 691</td>
<td>Studio 5: Focus/Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 384</td>
<td>Design Studio 3B: Structure, Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 492</td>
<td>Degree Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>ARCH 544</td>
<td>Building 1 Matter and Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 366</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues: Netherlands/Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 375</td>
<td>Urban Environment: Netherlands/Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 475</td>
<td>Foreign Study Studio: Netherlands/Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 375</td>
<td>Urban Environment: Netherlands/Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>ARCH 475</td>
<td>Foreign Study Studio: Netherlands/Berlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Educational Credentials

- 2001 MArch, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts (professional)
- 1996 BEnvd, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

### Licenses/Registration

- Licensed Architect, State of Colorado, No. AR 400256

### Teaching Experience

- 2014-present Woodbury University School of Architecture, Professor
- 2013-14 Woodbury University School of Architecture, Graduate Chair
- 2009-14 Woodbury University School of Architecture, Associate Professor
- 2008-09 Woodbury University School of Architecture, Assistant Professor
- 2007-08 California College of the Arts, Senior Lecturer in Architecture
- 2007 University of California, Berkeley, Visiting Instructor in Architecture
- 2006-07 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mushenheim Fellow in Architecture
- 2003-06 University of Colorado, Denver, Senior Instructor in Architecture

### Professional Experience

- 2006-Present Eric Olsen Architect, Los Angeles, CA
- 2001-2003 Kennedy Violich Architecture, Boston, MA, Project Designer
- 1996-1997 Steven Wynn, Las Vegas, NV, Designer

### Selected Publications and Recent Research

- 2009 “Squat City,” *Designing Coexistence*, 010 / Sun Publishers, Amsterdam
- 2008 “Surface Tension,” *Dimensions 21*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

### Other Accomplishments

- 2012 Exhibition curator, "Un-Privileged Views." Woodbury Hollywood Gallery
- 2011 Maxine Frankel Foundation Faculty Grant Recipient for Un-Privileged Views exhibition
- 2010 Invited Exhibitor, Museo da Casa Brasileira. Sao Paolo, Brazil
Gregorio Ortiz-Muno
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Fall 2012       ARCH 487 Design Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design
                ARCH 491 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics
Spring 2014     ARCH 183 Design Studio 1B: Principles & Processes

Educational Credentials
2010           M.A. in Urban Planning, with a Concentration in Design Development,
                Community Development & Housing, University of California Los Angeles
2005           BArch, Woodbury University

Teaching Experience
2012- Present  Woodbury University San Diego
2011- Present  New School of Architecture & Design

Professional Experience
2013- Present  Constant Flux | Urban Research Design
2011          True Count, Consultant Firm
2008          Hidden Driver Productions
2004-2008      Estudio Teddy Cruz

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2005          “Urbanism 70 ft. deep,” Log 6- Observations on Architecture and the
                Contemporary City

Other Accomplishments
2011          Cronicas de Heroes/Hero Reports, San Diego/ Tijuana Coordinator
2009-2010      East Los Angeles Residents Association,
                Cityhood development team
2004 & 2010    Casa Familiar, Community Service Agency,
                Affordable Housing Overlay Zone, Coordinator
Mark Owen
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2012-14
UG ARCH 211 Design Communication 2
UG ARCH 2742 BIM Foundations
GR ARCH 6742 BIM Foundations
Summer 2012-14
UG ARCH 4931 Design Studio 4B
UG ARCH 4932 Design Studio 5A
GR ARCH 5755 Grad Studio
Fall 2012/13
UG ARCH 2742 BIM Foundations
ARCH 487 Design Studio 4A
ARCH 491 Design Studio 5A
GR ARCH 6742 BIM Foundations
ARCH 691 Grad Studio 5
Fall 2014
UG ARCH 383 Design Studio 3A
UG/GR ARCH 2742 BIM Foundations

Educational Credentials
MArch University of California Los Angeles
BArch Woodbury University

Teaching Experience
1999-present Woodbury University School of Architecture: Participating Adjunct
Art Center College of Design
University of California Los Angeles Extension
Otis College of Art and Design

Professional Experience
1994-96 Pacific Bank Technology General Contractors, Los Angeles CA
1996-97 JY Design + Planning, Los Angeles & Shanghai
1997-98 Altoon + Porter Architects, Los Angeles, CA
1998-99 Johnson Fain, Los Angeles, CA
1999-2011 Mark Owen Designs, Los Angeles, CA
2000-11 GPA Architects, Los Angeles, CA
2011-14 Johnson Fain, Los Angeles, CA

Licenses/Registration

Selected Publications and Recent Research

Professional Membership

Other Accomplishments
Jose Parral  
Associate Professor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)  
Spring 2012  ARCH 334  Urban Design Theory,  
           ARCH 489  Design Studio 4B  
Fall 2012   ARCH 383  Design Studio 3A, and 2013  
           ARCH 448  Professional Practice 2  
Spring 2013 ARCH 489  Design Studio 4B  
Fall 2013   ARCH 330  Theory of Architecture  
           ARCH 448  Professional Practice 2  
Spring 2014 ARCH 489  Design Studio 4B

Educational Credentials  
2001    MA, Landscape Urbanism, Architectural Association School of Architecture  
1996    BA, Landscape Architecture, University of California Berkeley

Teaching Experience  
2011-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Associate Professor  
2008-2011   Woodbury University School of Architecture, Assistant Professor  
2006-2007   Ohio State University Knowlton School of Architecture, Visiting Instructor  
2004-2005   Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct Faculty

Professional Experience  
2008-present  josetasi, Director  
2005-2007    AECOM, Land Planner  
1997-1998    Pamela Burton, Project Manager  
1996-2003    Spurlock Poirier Landscape Architects, Assistant to Project Manager  
1996        Walter Hood Designs, Assistant  
1996        Peter Walker and Partners, Intern

Licenses/Registration

Selected Publications and Recent Research  
2007    “Supernatural: Urban Fluctuations and the alter ego of self and planned organizations” Fluctuating Borders: Memory and the Emergent New possibilities for International Borders, Rosalea Monacella, Dr. SueAnne Ware eds.; RMIT Publications

Professional Membership  
Fellow, American Academy in Rome 2007

Other Accomplishments  
2013    Next Fresno Conference San Diego California, “Students Work”  
2011    ASLA Conference San Diego California, “Cause and Effect of the Border”  
2010    RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia  
2009    Frankel Foundation Grant, funding for Spring Lecture Series 2010  
2008    Frankel Foundation Grant, funding for publication of research of Chihuahua Mexico  
2007    Kate L. Brewster Rome Prize in Landscape Architecture, American Academy in Rome  
2007    Award for Excellence, Petco Park, San Diego’s Ballpark District, Urban Land Institute (Spurlock Poirier Landscape Architects)  
2006    City of Claremont Excellence in design Award Categories: New Construction, Landscaping, and Sustainability Richard C. Seaver Biology Building Pomona College (Spurlock Poirier Landscape Architects)  
2005    Merit Award, Petco Park, American Society of Landscape Architects, San Diego Chapter (Spurlock Poirier Landscape Architects)  
171
Rene Peralta,
Adjunct Instructor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 2012  ARCH 489  Studio 4B: Urban Design
Fall 2012  ARCH 330  Theory of Architecture
           ARCH487/491  Studio 4A/5A

Educational Credentials
1995  BArch, New School of Architecture

Teaching Experience
2014  UCSD Department of Political Science /Urban Studies & Planning
2006-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Adjunct Instructor
2010  Southern California Institute of Architecture
2008-2011  Washington University in St. Louis
2005  UCLA Department of Architecture, Visiting Lecturer
2000  Universidad Iberoamericana, Tijuana

Professional Experience
2000-present  Generica Arquitectura+Urbanismo, Principal
1996-2000  Spurlock + Poirier Landscape Architects, Project Manager

Licenses/Registration
Current registration in Mexico

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2013  “La Historia de una Bola” in Centro Cultural Tijuana, Arquitectura 30 Aniversario. Ed. Armando Garcia Orzo and Manolo Escutia, Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y Las Artes (CONACULTA), Mexico City, Mexico. 2013
2010  “Drive By Tijuana” in Geohumanities: Art, history, text at the edge of place, eds. Michael Dear, Jim Ketchum, Sarah Luria and Doug Richardson. Routledge
2008  “Tijuana’s Haunt,” in CA Biennial Catalogue 08, ed. Lauri Firstenberg, PhD. Orange County Museum of Art
2008  “The State of Practice” in ArcCA Magazine 08.1
2006  “Conversation: Catherine Herbst & Rene Peralta” in Magazine Cuarta Pared, #5. México
2006  “Urbicidio: El fenómeno de la vivienda de interés social en Tijuana” in Mas Arquitectura Revista del Colegio de Arquitectos de Aguascalientes #6, Aguascalientes, Mexico.
2005  “Drag and Drop Urbanism, Thoughts on the strategies of the generic” in Avatar Magazine Dislocazioni tra antropologia e comunicazione no.6 Roma, Italia

Other Accomplishments
2011-present  Columnist for the San Diego Reader
2010  Emergent Mexican Architects, Listing by Sociedad Central de Arquitectos, Buenos Aires, Argentina
2009  Smart Growth Award by the Urban Land Institute, San Diego Chapter
2009  Orchid Award from the San Diego Architecture Foundation
2012-present  Board President of Fundacion Esperanza de Mexico
Hector Perez,
Visiting Assistant Professor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2013 ARCH 3708 Architectural Provocations

Educational Credentials
1982 - 87 Bachelor of Architecture, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA
1986 - 87 Upper Division Architectural Design Studies, California State University, Florence, Italy

Teaching Experience
2012 - Present Graduate Programs Coordinator, Woodbury University, San Diego, CA
2009 - 2012 Lecturer, New School of Architecture & Design (NSA+D), San Diego, CA
2000 - 2009 Adjunct Faculty, Woodbury University, San Diego, CA
1998 Graduate Studio Teaching Assistant, Mass. Inst. of Tech. - MIT, Cambridge, MA
1994 - 97 Adjunct Faculty, Southern California Institute of Architecture (SCI-Arc), Los Angeles, CA
1995 & 96 Annual Design Workshop, Inst. Tec. Estudios Superiores (ITESM), Monterrey, MEX
1996 Visiting Fellows Program, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA

Professional Experience
1999 - Present Principal, De-Arc, La Jolla, CA
2006 - 2007 Designer, MW Steele Group Inc., San Diego, CA
1993 - 1997 Founding Partner with Teddy Cruz, Oficina de Arquitectura (OdA), San Diego, CA
1992 - 1993 Project Designer, Taller de Enrique Norten y Asociados (TEN), Mexico City, MEX
1992 Design Assistant, Gensler and Associates Architects, Santa Monica, CA
1985 Design Assistant, Pacific Associates Planners Architects (PAPA), San Diego, CA

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014 “Building Community” San Diego City Beat, January, pgs. 26-27
2014 “CLICK La Jolla Shores Lifeguard Station” Riviera Magazine, November, pgs. 28-29
2013 “Logan’s Run” Riviera Magazine, January, pgs. 60-62
2009 “The Barrio Exam” Riviera Magazine, April, pgs. 44-46
2006 “FrameWorks: Art Spilling into the Public Sphere,” SDMA Quarterly, June, pg. 11
Heather Peterson  
Assistant Professor  

Courses Taught (2012-2014)  

Spring 2012  
UG  ARCH 183  Studio 1B: Natural Tendencies  
UG  ARCH 492  Degree Project  
UG  ARCH 4991  Degree Project Publication  

Summer 2012  
UG  ARCH 114  Design Communication 1  
UG  ARCH 1930  First Year Open Studio  
UG  ARCH 1931  First Year Open Studio  
UG  ARCH 211  Design Communication 2  
UG  ARCH 2930  Second Year Open Studio  
UG  ARCH 2931  Second Year Open Studio  

Fall 2012/13  
GR  ARCH 564  Visualization 3: Advanced Drawing  

Summer 2013  
GR  ARCH 4757  Foreign Study Studio: Rome  

Fall 2013  
UG  ARIA 114  Design Communication 1  

Educational Credentials  
MArch  Southern California Institute of Architecture  
BFA  Rhode Island School of Design  

Teaching Experience  
2012 - 2013  Assistant Chair, Interior Architecture. Woodbury University  
2012 - 2013  Assistant Professor, Interior Architecture. Woodbury University  
2009 - 2012  Participating Adjunct, Architecture. Woodbury University  
2009 - 2012  Lecturer, Design. California State University Long Beach  
1999 - 2001  Pre-College Faculty, Architecture. Rhode Island School of Design  
1998 - 1999  Adjunct Faculty, Architecture. Boston Architectural Center  

Professional Experience  
1998 - 2010  Principal. Studio Heather Peterson  
2006 - 2010  Director of Research. Shubin + Donaldson Architects  
2005 - 2006  Creative Director. Frederick Fisher and Partners  
2004  Research Consultant. Rachel Allen Architecture  
2002 - 2003  Designer / Fabricator. The Art Office  
1999 - 2001  Designer / Fabricator. Stempel Form  

Selected Publications and Recent Research  
2014  IDEA Journal: Unbecoming  
2014  Made Up: Design’s Fictions. JRP Ringier Publishers  
2014  Creative Scholarship Presentation / National IDEC Annual Conference / New Orleans, LA  
2013  On the Road / West of La Brea / Panel Discussion / Los Angeles, CA  
2013  Gentleman’s Duel / Galleria d’Architettura Come Se / Rome, Italy  
2010  LIVE + WORK: The Southern California Architecture of Shubin + Donaldson. ORO editions  
2006  Delight: A Dossier on the Interests and Influences of Frederick Fisher  

Other Accomplishments  
2014  MacDowell Fellow  
2009  Juror’s Pick. New American Paintings. No.85  
2007 - 2008  Viewing Program. The Drawing Center. New York, NY  
2007- 2008  Artist Registry. The Drawing Center. New York, NY  
2000  Rhode Island State Council on the Arts. Fellowship in Writing  
1999  Boston Architectural Center. Faculty Development Grant  
1999  The Institute for Writing and Thinking. Bard College. Assistance Grant  
1996 -1997  European Honors Program (RISD). Fellowship in Painting. Rome, Italy
Michael Pinto
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Fall 2012/13    GR    ARCH 620    Practice 1: Contemporary Arch Profession
Spring 2013/14 UG    ARCH 489/491    Studio 4B/5A    Urbanism/Contemporary Topics

Educational Credentials
MArch    Southern California Institute of Architecture

Teaching Experience
2011 - present    Woodbury University, Adjunct Faculty
2003    Woodbury University, Adjunct Faculty

Professional Experience
Year    Firm, title

Licenses/Registration
State    License Type

Selected Publications and Recent Research
Year    Title, Publisher, location

Professional Membership
Organization

Other Accomplishments
Year    accomplishment
Christopher Puzio,  
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012- 2014)
Spring 2014  ARCH 384  Design Studio 3B: Structure, Systems, Space & Form  
Fall 2013  ARCH 281  Design Studio 2A: Program And Spacecraft  
Spring 2013  ARCH 3708  Furniture Design  
Fall 2012  ARCH 281  Design Studio 2A: Program And Spacecraft  
Spring 2012  ARCH 3703  Material Production Studio  

Educational Credentials
MArch, Cranbrook Academy of Art, BArch, Boston Architectural Center.

Teaching Experience
Woodbury School of Architecture San Diego:  
AR 384 Design Studio 3B: Structure, Systems, Space & Form 2014  
ARCH 281 Design Studio 2A: Program And Spacecraft 2013  
ARCH 3708 Furniture Design 2013  
ARCH 281 Design Studio 2A: Program And Spacecraft 2012  
ARCH 3703 Material Production Studio 2012  
ARCH 281 Design Studio 2A: Program And Spacecraft 2011  
ARCH 3703 Material Production Studio 2011  
ARCH 491 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics Studio 2010  
ARCH 384 Design Studio 3B: Structure, Systems, Space & Form 2010  
AR 487 Design Studio 5A: Design Build Topics Studio 2009  
ARCH 384 Design Studio 3B: Structure, Systems, Space & Form 2009  
ARCH 3734 Material Production Studio 2008  
AR 370 F1 Studio: Metal Shop 2007  
University of San Diego:  
ARTV 105 Introduction to Sculpture 2014  
ARTV 369 Intermediate/ Advanced Sculpture 2013

Professional Experience
HUB Hillcrest | San Diego, CA | commission 2014  
La Jolla Crossroads | La Jolla, CA | commission 2014  
Village Lofts | City of Claremont, CA | commission 2014  
Search Optics | San Diego, CA | 2014  
Influx Café | San Diego, CA | 2014  
Shaughnessy Residence | San Clemente, CA | 2014  
Hubbard Residence | La Jolla, CA | 2014  
Segal Residence | The Cresta | La Jolla, CA | 2013  
North Park Post Office | San Diego, CA | commission 2013  
North Parker | San Diego, CA | commission 2013  
You Are Here | San Diego, CA | commission 2013  
Tom Ham's Lighthouse | San Diego, CA | commission 2013  
Higuera Garage, Culver City, CA | commission 2013  
Steelhouse Offices, Culver City, CA | commission 2013  
The Sanford Consortium for Regenerative Medicine | commission 2012  
San Francisco Arts Commission | 2011-12 Bay Area Artist Registry 2011  
San Diego County Operations Center | commission 2010

Selected Publications and Recent Research
Pacific Magazine, RE: Creation, By Patricia Dwyer, April 2014  
Molecular Aesthetics, Peter Weibel, editor, MIT Press 2013  
ARUP Connect, Controlled Randomness 2013  
San Diego Union Tribune, Island Arbor Dedication, 2013  
Riviera Magazine, Art Power, 2012  
San Diego Home & Garden, Architectural Digress, 2011
PHILIP RA, AIA
ADJUNCT PROFESSOR

Courses Taught (Spring 2012 - Spring 2014)
ARCH 589  Cinematic Spatialities/Comprehensive Design Studio (Graduate), Spring 2013 & 2014
ARCH 491/487  Cinematic Spatialities/Comprehensive Design Studio (Undergraduate), Spring 2013 & 2014
ARCH 589  Emerging Technologies/ Comprehensive Design Studio (Graduate), Fall 2012 & 2013
ARCH 491/487  Emerging Technologies/ Comprehensive Design Studio (Undergraduate), Fall 2012 & 2013

Educational Credentials
1998  MArch, Harvard University Graduate School of Design (post-professional)
1996  BArch, University of Southern California

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct Professor 2007-present
SCI_ARC: Co-Instructor with Ilaria Mazzoleni Graduate Thesis 2009
University of Southern California School of Architecture, Teaching Assistant 1993-1996
Harvard University Graduate School of Design, Teaching Assistant (Graduate Design Studio) Spring 1997

Professional Experience
2014-present  HOK, Senior Design Leader, Vice President, San Francisco
2004-2014  Yazdani Studio of Cannon Design, Senior Design Leader, Associate Vice President, Los Angeles
2002-2004  COArchitects, Project Designer, Los Angeles
2000-2002  ZGF, Project Designer, Los Angeles
1998-2000  GWA, Project Designer, Los Angeles
1997-1998  Boston Redevelopment Authority / Department of Neighborhood Development, Boston
1995-1996  John Mutlow Architects, Intern, Los Angeles
1995  Eric Owen Moss Architects, Intern, Los Angeles
1994  Barton Myers Architects, Intern, Los Angeles
1993  Daly Genik Architects, Intern, Los Angeles

Licenses/Registration
Current registration in California and Arizona

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2012  Archiscene, “CJ Only One Research Center”
2009  Architizer, “Chaparral Hall Science Building”

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Architects
USGBC LEED BD+C
Deborah Richmond, AIA
Adjunct Instructor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

**Spring 2012**
- UG ARCH 487 Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design
- UG ARCH 491 Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics
- GR ARCH 589 Studio 4: The Total Building
- GR ARCH 692/1 Thesis Studio

**Fall 2012**
- UG ARCH 243 Materials and Methods
- UG ARCH 281 Studio 2A: Program and Space

**Spring 2013**
- UG ARCH 384 Studio 3B: Structure and Systems

**Summer 2013**
- UG ARCH 1930 First Year Open Studio
- UG ARCH 2930/1 Second Year Open Studio

**Fall 2013**
- UG ARCH 243 Materials and Methods

**Spring 2014**
- UG ARCH 384 Studio 3B: Structure and Systems

Educational Credentials

MArch  University of Minnesota, Minneapolis (professional)
B.A.  Art Theory and Practice, Northwestern University

Teaching Experience

2011-present  Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct Faculty,
2007-2008  University of California Los Angeles Department of Architecture, Visiting Lecturer
1998-1999, 2001-2002  University of Southern California School of Architecture, Adjunct Instructor
1998  Art Center College of Design, Critical Theory Seminar

Professional Experience

2012-present  Deborah Richmond Architects, Owner, Santa Monica, CA
2001-2011  Touraine Richmond Architects, Partner, Venice, CA
2001-2002  OMA/Rem Koolhaas, Rotterdam, NL
1996-1998  The Jerde Partnership, Venice, CA

Licenses/Registration

CA License # C 28542

Selected Publications and Recent Research

*Intermodes, research, writing and photography, website.*

2004  *Divestitures in Log 3, Anyone Corporation,* c.
2006  *Schmods + Mockers in Log 7, Anyone Corporation,* c.
2008  "Consumers Gone Wild," in *Infrastructural City,* ed: Kazys Varnelis, ACTAR
2009  "Central High School 9, Los Angeles, by Coop Himmelb(l)au," in *Icon Magazine,* February

Professional Membership

The American Institute of Architects
Co-Chair, AIA-Los Angeles Committee on the Environment (COTE)

Other Accomplishments

2013  Mobile Village project awarded a federal grant for construction of the first prototype mobile cooking school for youth in foster care in Los Angeles County
2013  One Window House included in MOCA's "New Sculpturalism" exhibition
2012  Un-Privileged Views, WUHO Gallery, Los Angeles, CA
2012  AIA/LA Honor Award for Silverwood Lake Visitors Center
2011  Tokyo/LA Houses Exhibition, Japanese American Cultural Center, Los Angeles, CA
2009  TRA: Work in Progress, A + D Museum Exhibition, Los Angeles, CA
2008  Colorado University-Denver College of Architecture and Planning Lecturer, Spring
2007  University of California Los Angeles School of Architecture Lecturer, Spring
2007  AIA/LA Design Award for One-Window House
2006  LA Forum for Architecture and Urban Design's On the Map series Lecturer, at the One-Window House, Venice, CA
Todd Rinehart,  
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012- 2014)
Spring 2013   ARCH 283       Design Studio: Site Orders
Summer 2013  ARCH 4756     Foreign Study Studio: Korea

Educational Credentials
2008  MArch, Montana State University (professional)
1989  BArch, Montana State University

Teaching Experience
1999-present   Woodbury University
2012-2013       University of San Diego
2011            Orange Coast College
2007-2008       Mesa College
2006            Montana State University
2002            Arizona State University

Professional Experience
2001-present    Rinehart Herbst, Principal
1998-2002       Rob Wellington Quigley, FAIA, Project Architect

Other Accomplishments
2014            AIA Awards Juror: Raleigh/Durham/ North Carolina
2012            SDAIA: Merit Award, Modest House Silver City New Mexico
2011            CCAIA: Merit Award, San Dieguito River Park Administrative Offices
2011            SDAF Orchid Award, San Dieguito River Park Administrative Offices
2009            SDAF Orchid Award, Woodbury University/Gould Hardware Adaptive Reuse
2008            National Concrete Masonry Association Award for Excellence, Welton Residence
Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 2012
- ARCH 3993: Policy 2: Do Real Architecture
- ARCH 3994: Policy 2: Do Real Architecture
- ARCH 3996: Policy 2: Do Real Architecture
- ARCH 5719: Policy 2: Do Real Architecture

Fall 2012
- ARCH 4736: Policy 1
- ARCH 4737: Policy 3
- ARCH 630: Policy 1: Introduction to Arch Policy
- ARCH 6730: Policy 3 Adv. Seminar in “Do Real Arch”

Spring 2013
- ARCH 4738: Policy 2
- ARCH 4739: Policy 4
- ARCH 5719: Policy 2: Do Real Architecture
- ARCH 6732: Policy 4: Do Real Architecture

Fall 2013
- ARCH 4736: Policy 1
- ARCH 489: Studio 4B: Urbanism
- ARCH 491: Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics
- ARCH 5990: Arch Practice
- ARCH 630: Policy 1: Introduction to Arch Policy
- ARCH 691: Studio 5: Focus/Topic

Spring 2014
- ARCH 4738: Policy 2
- ARCH 4739: Policy 4
- ARCH 5719: Policy 2: Do Real Architecture
- ARCH 6732: Policy 4: Do Real Architecture
- ARCH 692: Thesis Studio 2

Educational Credentials
1982 MS Architecture, Columbia University
1976 BArch, Arizona State University

Teaching Experience
2010-Present Woodbury University School of Architecture
Previous University of Southern California School of Architecture

Professional Experience
1987-present Roschen Van Cleve Architects, founding principal

Licensed/Registration
Current registration in California

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Architects, elevated to College of Fellows in 2010
U.S. Green Building Council, Member and accredited LEED professional

Other Accomplishments
2013-present Zoning Advisory Committee, re:code LA
2014-present Los Angeles Conservancy, Board member
2012-present AIA National Design + Health Leadership Group, Inaugural Chair (2012-13)
2012-2103 Los Angeles Transit Corridors Mayoral Cabinet, Co-Chair
2005-2013 Los Angeles City Planning Commission, Mayor’s appointee, President (2008-13), Vice-President
2006-2009 Center for Livable Communities, Communities by Design Committee, AIA, Chair (2008-9)
2004-2007 National Housing Committee, AIA
2002-2005 State of CA Board of Professional Engineers Commission, Governor’s appointee, Commissioner
2001-2006 Hollywood Heritage, Board Member (rejoined 2013) & Preservation Issues Committee
1997-2003 CORO Southern California, Board Member
1993-1997 Los Angeles Contemporary Exhibitions (LACE), Board of Directors
Catherine M. Roussel, AIA  
Career and Outreach Coordinator

Courses Taught (Fall 2012 - Fall 2014)  
ARCH 620 Practice 1

Educational Credentials  
1995 MA, International Policy Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies  
1994 MA, Liberal Arts, St. John’s College  
1981 AB, Architecture, Honors, University of California, Berkeley (non-professional)

Teaching Experience  
Woodbury University School of Architecture, Adjunct Instructor, 2012-present

Professional Experience  
2012-present Woodbury University, School of Architecture, Career and Outreach Coordinator  
2003-2009 The American Institute of Architects, Washington, DC, Education Director  
1996-2002 The Joslyn Institute for Sustainable Communities, Omaha, Nebraska, Executive Director  
1986-87 Cannon/Yan, New York, NY  
1984-85 John Gillis Architects, New York, NY  
1984 Whistler-Patri, San Francisco, CA  
1982-83 Trinity Architecture, Research & Design, San Francisco, CA  
1981 Bull Field Volkmann Stockwell, San Francisco, CA

Licenses/Registration  
Current registration in California

Selected Work  
2005 Models of Educator-Practitioner Collaboration Across the Americas, a special session at the ACSA International Conference, Mexico City (organized)  
2002 Regional Conference on Growth, Omaha, NE (organized)  
1999 Projects and Visions for Omaha, an affiliated event of the National Town Meeting for a Sustainable America (organized)  
1997 Recycled Building Materials Conference, Omaha, NE, 1997 (organized)

Honors  
2005 Honored by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture for distinguished service

Professional Membership  
The American Institute of Architects
Micah Rutenberg
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Fall 2012/13
UG ARCH 182 Studio 1A
UG PPDV 200 Transition to Woodbury
UG INDS 101 Journeys
Spring 2013
UG ARCH 183 Studio 1B
UG ARCH 2743 Portfolio Discourse
UG INDS 101 Journeys
Spring 2014
UG ARCH 183 Studio 1B
UG ARCH 2743 Portfolio Discourse
UG ARCH 492 Degree Project
UG INDS 3764 Magical Realism: Theory and Practice

Educational Credentials
Master of Science in Design Research University of Michigan
Master of Architecture University of Michigan
Bachelor of Science in Architecture University of Michigan

Teaching Experience
2012-present Woodbury University
2014 Arizona State University
2011 University of Michigan

Professional Experience
2011-present StudioMARS, Los Angeles, CA
2012-2013 RoTo Architects, Los Angeles, CA

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014 Geographies of Consumption in Open Cities: The New Post-Industrial Word Order, ACSA International Conference

Other Accomplishments
2014 Wedge Gallery Director, Woodbury University, Los Angeles
Marcel Sanchez-Prieto
Associate Professor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 2012  UG  ARCH 211  Design Communications 2  
             ARCH 492  Degree Project  
             ARCH 4992  Degree Project Exhibition  

Summer 2012  UG  ARCH 3751  Urban Environment: China  
             ARCH 4751  Foreign Study Studio: China  
             GR  ARCH 5752  Fieldwork: China  

Fall 2012    UG  ARCH 383  Studio 3A House and Housing  
             ARCH 448  Degree Project Prep  

Spring 2013  UG  ARCH 211  Design Communications 2  
             ARCH 492  Degree Project  
             GR  ARCH 6734  Urbanism and Development Systems  

Fall 2013    UG  ARCH 383  Studio 3A House and Housing  
             ARCH 448  Degree Project Prep  

Spring 2014  UG  ARCH 211  Design Communications 2  
             ARCH 492  Degree Project  

Educational Credentials
MArch  University of California Los Angeles  
BArch  Iberoamerican University  

Teaching Experience
2013 – present  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Associate Professor  
2009 – 2013  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Assistant Professor  

Professional Experience
2007 – present  CRO Studio, Principal  
               Kieran Timberlake  
               Frank Gehry Associates  

Licenses/Registration
Licensed Architect: Mexico No.2887958  

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014  Panorama of Mexican Design in Folio v.006  
2013  60th P/A Awards in Architecture Magazine.  
2013  Biblioteca Modulo Prep in Domus magazine  

Other Accomplishments
2014  Award in 9th annual Bienal Iberoamericana de Arquitectura y Urbanismo  
2014  Honorable mention for the Arquine No.16 | Umbral de las Américas competition  
2013  60th Annual Progressive Architecture Design Award for Biblioteca Modulo Prep  
2013  First Prize, Services and Public Assistance Building, XXII Cemex Awards, Mexico.  
2013  Third Prize, Sustainability, XXII CEMEX Awards, Mexico.  
2013  IHS Fellowship, International Institute of Urban Management, Erasmus University, Rotterdam  

Sebastian Seimer,
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Fall 2013
ARCH 487 Design Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design
ARCH 491 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics

Spring 2014
ARCH 283 Design Studio 2B: Site Orders

Educational Credentials

Bachelor of Architecture, Woodbury University, San Diego, CA | Graduated 2007: Cum Laude & Dean's List

Teaching Experience

Woodbury University School of Architecture, San Diego | Adjunct Professor 2013-2014
Woodbury University School of Architecture, San Diego | Shop Manager 2013-2014
New School of Architecture + Design | Adjunct Professor 2012-2014

Professional Experience

Professional Design Practice:
Factoryhaus, Design By making | Owner & Principal maker 2012-Present

Professional Work & Collaborations:
Special Topics, LLC | Collaborator 2014-Present
Exitecture ArchLab Inc., San Diego | Collaborator 2014-Present
Ferguson Pape Baldwin Architects | Job Captain 2009-2013

Licenses/Registration

Completed and Passed all seven National NCARB Architectural Registration Exams
Currently preparing for the California State (Supplemental) Exam

Selected Publications and Recent Research

Publications:
Union Tribune - San Diego, “Quiet Places” for the NSAD Faculty Show - “Beyond Plots” January 2013

Competitions:
2X8 AIA|LA | Collaboration with: Point of Departure, Role: Project Designer 2013
Who’s Next 1.0 Competition | Role: Project Designer 2010

Professional Membership
NCARB
Patrick Shields,
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012 - 2014)
Fall 2012          ARCH 2740      Tools as Thinking 2
                  ARCH 2744      Tools as Thinking 1
Spring 2013        ARCH 211      Design Communication II
Fall 2013          ARCH 114      Design Communication I
Spring 2014        ARCH 211      Design Communication II
                  ARCH 492      Degree Project

Educational Credentials
BArch, Southern California Institute of Architecture.

Teaching Experience
New School of Architecture & Design - San Diego, CA 2011 - 2012
Adjunct Professor - 2nd year undergraduate studio and material fabrication seminars

SCI_ARC (Southern California Institute of Architecture) - Los Angeles, CA - 2007 - 2011
Instructor / Making + Meaning - graduate level - 2009 - 2011
Assistant Instructor / Testa Xlab / Thesis Prep / Making + Meaning - graduate level - 2007 - 2010

Professional Experience
MTV VMA Award show – Visualization 2014
Port Journey’s Artist Residency - Zou No Hana Terrace - Yokohama, Japan - 2012
The Periscope Project Artist Residency - San Diego, California - 2012
Coachella Gateway Pavilion - Indio, California – 2012
Paulette Singley, Ph.D
Professor and Director of the Rome Center for Architecture and Culture

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 2012
UG ARCH 489/491 Studio 4B/5A (Rome)
UG ARCH 334 Urban Design Theory (Rome)
UG ARCH 492 Degree Project Studio (Rome)

Summer 2012
GR ARCH 4757 Foreign Study Studio: Rome
GR ARCH 5754 Fieldwork: Rome

Fall 2012
UG ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues: Practice and Theory
GR ARCH 554 Criticism 1: Fieldwork Los Angeles
ARCH 5702 Contemporary Issues: Practice and Theory

Spring 2013
UG ARCH 334 Urban Design Theory (Rome)
UG ARCH 492 Degree Project Studio (Rome)
UG ARCH 489 Studio 4B: Urban Design (Rome)
UG ARCH 491 Studio 5A: Topic
GR ARCH 556 Criticism 3: Architecture from Modern (1945-now)
ARCH 691 Studio 5: Rome

Summer 2013
UG ARCH 4757 Foreign Study Studio: Rome
GR ARCH 5754 Fieldwork Studio: Rome

Spring 2014
UG ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues
UG ARCH 492 Degree Project Studio
GR ARCH 5702 Contemporary Issues: Practice and Theory

Educational Credentials
1998 PhD, Architectural History and Theory, Princeton University
1989 MArch, Architectural History, Cornell University
1985 BArch, University of Southern California

Teaching Experience
2006-present Woodbury University School of Architecture, Professor
2001-06 Woodbury University School of Architecture, Associate Professor
2000-01 Woodbury University School of Architecture, Assistant Professor
2010-present Woodbury University Rome Center for Architecture and Culture, Director,
2006-2009 Woodbury University School of Architecture, History and Theory Program Head
Mar-Aug 2009 Woodbury University School of Architecture, Graduate Chair
2005-2007 University of Southern California, Public Art Studies Program, lecturer
2005-2007 UCLA, Department of Architecture and Urban Design, lecturer

Professional Experience
1990 Venturi, Scott Brown and Associates, Philadelphia, PA

Licenses/Registration
Architectural Registration in Minnesota (License Number 26911, dormant)

Professional Memberships
Editorial Board Member Journal of Architectural Education

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014 In progress: How to Read Architecture: Notes on Interpreting the Built Environment, book proposal under contract at Routledge, manuscript due fall 2014.
Gerard Smulevich  
Professor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 2012  
UG ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues: Practice and Theory  
ARCH 3706 Capturing Rome  
ARCH 384 Studio 3B: Structures, Systems

Summer 2012  
ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues: Practice and Theory  
ARCH 375 Urban Environment: Berlin  
ARCH 475 Foreign Study: Berlin  
GR ARCH 5751 Fieldwork Berlin

Fall 2012  
UG ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues: Buenos Aires  
ARCH 489 Design Studio 4B: Buenos Aires  
ARCH 114 Design Communications 1  
ARCH 384 Studio 3B: Structures, Systems  
GR ARCH 6744 Photography

Summer 2013  
UG ARCH 366 Contemporary Issues: Netherlands, Berlin  
ARCH 375 Urban Environment: Netherlands, Berlin  
ARCH 475 Foreign Study Studio: Netherlands, Berlin

Fall 2013  
ARCH 114 Design Communications 1  
ARCH 487 Design Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design  
ARCH 491 Design Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics

Spring 2014  
ARCH 114 Design Communications 1  
ARCH 2744 Photography  
ARCH 384 Studio 3B: Structures, Systems  
GR ARCH 6744 Photography Workshop

Summer 2014  
UG ARCH 3755 Urban Environment: Netherlands, Berlin  
ARCH 4755 Foreign Study Studio: Netherlands, Berlin

Educational Credentials

MArch II University of California, Los Angeles. Second Professional Degree Program  
Diploma of Architect, National University of Buenos Aires, School of Architecture and Urbanism (FAU/FADU)  
6-year professional degree

Teaching Experience

1991-present Woodbury University School of Architecture

1996 Southern California Institute of Architecture

1995 University of Southern California School of Architecture, Adjunct Instructor

1986 University of Buenos Aires, Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism

Professional Experience

2000-2008 Steven Ehrlich Architects (Consultant)

1993-1997 Zeballos + Smulevich Architects

1991-1993 Ridley Scott/Tony Scott – The System Design

Selected Publications and Recent Research

2013 “Constructed Landscapes”, Solo Photography Exhibition, WUHO Gallery, Hollywood

2012 “Bauen, Wohnen, Denken,” Smartloft Gallery/Berlin, photography exhibit

2012 “Un priveleged Views” Group Exhibition WU CDRC, Hollywood

Other Accomplishments

2003-2011 Thirteen (13) prizes in ACSA and Lyceum student design competitions

2009-2011 Two AIA “2x8” awards for student design projects
Maxi Spina
Associate Professor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 12-14 UG ARCH 384 Design Studio 3B
Spring 2012 GR ARCH 563 Visualization 2
Fall 2012 UG ARCH 487 Studio 4A: Comprehensive Studio
ARCH 491 Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics
GR ARCH 691 Studio 5: Focus/Topic
Spring 13/14 GR ARCH 4741 Advanced Visualization: Taxonomies
Fall 2013 UG ARCH 489 Studio 4B: Urbanism
ARCH 491 Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics
Fall 2014 UG ARCH 383 Design Studio 3A

Educational Credentials
MArch Princeton University (post-professional)
BArch National University of Rosario, Argentina

Teaching Experience
2013-present Woodbury University School of Architecture: Associate Professor
2010-2013 Woodbury University School of Architecture: Assistant Professor
2011 Lund University Of Technology, Sweden, Guest Professor
2008-2010 California College of the Arts, Adjunct Professor
2007-2008 UC Berkeley, Visiting Fellow
2001-2003 National University of Rosario, Argentina, Instructor

Professional Experience
2006-present MSA: Maxi Spina Architects, Principal
2005-2007 Studio Daniel Libeskind, Senior Designer and Project Architect
2002 Neil M Denari Architects, Project Designer
2001-2003 MSA: Maxi Spina Architects, Principal
2001 Sebastian Guerrico Architect, Project Manager And Designer

Licenses/Registration
2001-present Argentina (Santa Fe Province)

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014 “S,M,L,XLA” group exhibition (featuring ‘In Turn’), A+D Museum, Los Angeles, Jun-Aug ’14
2014 “Chess” group exhibition (featuring ‘In Turn’), Jai & Jai Gallery, Los Angeles, Feb –Apr ’14
2014 ArchDaily (Selected Works section, featuring Jujuy Redux) Mar 7th, 2014
2014 Clarín Arquitectura (featuring Jujuy Redux), Apr 8th, 2014
2014 Smithsonian.com, (featuring ‘In Turn’)
2013 “On the Road” group exhibition series (featuring ‘Three’s a crowd’), Los Angeles, Jun ’13
2013 “Rhythmic Space”, solo exhibition (featuring MSA & student work), Wedge Gallery, Jan-Feb ’13
2013 “Uncertain” group exhibition (featuring MSA & student work), WUHO Gallery, Sep ’13
2013 Surmount: Style + Copy II: Innovative Residences, 8-23 (China: Hong Kong Architecture Science Press)
2012 The Architect, Sep Issue (featuring Jujuy Redux), 114-121, (Hanley Wood Inc.)
2011 Arquine # 56, (featuring Jujuy Redux), 76-79, (Mexico City)

Professional Membership
Colegio de Arquitectos, Santa Fe Province, Argentina

Other Accomplishments
2014 Architizer A+ Awards Finalist, for the Jujuy Redux Apartment Building
2012 Merit Award, AIA/LA Design Awards, for Jujuy Redux
2012 Honorable Mention, Architect Magazine Annual Design Review, for Jujuy Redux
Mark Stankard
Adjunct Faulty

Courses Taught (Spring 2012 - Spring 2014)
ARCH 448  Professional Practice 2, Fall 2013
ARCH 487  Design Studio 4a, Comprehensive Studio, Fall 2012
ARCH 492  Degree Project, Spring 2014

Educational Credentials
1988  MArts, History of Architecture, Cornell University
1980  BArch, University of Notre Dame

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct Faculty 2005, 2012-present
University of Southern California School of Architecture: Adjunct Instructor 2002-2004
Southern California Institute of Architecture: Visiting Lecturer 2002
Art Center College of Design: Visiting Lecturer 2002
Iowa State University: Assistant Professor 2000-2002; Adjunct Assistant Professor 1995-2000; Temporary Assistant Professor 1994-1995
Boston Architectural Center: Instructor 1981-1983

Professional Experience
2012-present  Mark Stankard Architecture
2007-2012  Tetra-IBI Group: Architect, Project Manager
2002-2005  Osborn Architects: Architect, Project Manager

Licenses/Registration
Current registration in California

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014  The Southwest Museum at 100: Beauty, Utility, Memory (public presentation)
2003  Society of Architectural Historians, Session Leader, Drawing Architectural Implications from Modernist Representation Denver, CO
2003  Hearing Architecture, Walt Disney Concert Hall (public presentation)
2002  *Journal of Architectural Education*  "Re-covering Mies van der Rohe's Weissenhof"

Professional Membership
LEED AP
California Preservation Society
Joshua Stein, FAAR
Associate Professor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Fall 2012  GR  ARCH 5723  Digital Mold Making
           UG  ARCH 212  Digital Media (Digital Mold Making)
           ARCH 587  Graduate Design Studio 3
Spring 2013 GR  ARCH 692  Graduate Thesis Studio
           UG  ARCH 384  Studio 3B: Structure, Systems
Fall 2014  GR  ARCH 5723  Digital Mold Making
           UG  ARCH 212  Digital Media (Digital Mold Making)
           ARCH 587  Graduate Design Studio 3

Educational Credentials
MArch  University of California Los Angeles
BA    University of Wisconsin, Madison

Teaching Experience
2008 – present  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Associate Professor
2011 – 2012  California College of the Arts, San Francisco/Oakland, Visiting Architect
2008  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Acting Department Chair, Interior Architecture
2004 – 2008  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Assistant Professor, Interior Architecture
2003 – 2004  Southern California Institute of Architecture, Instructor
2002 – 2004  Milwaukee Institute of Art & Design, Assistant Professor

Professional Experience
2002 – present  Radical Craft, Principal
2013 – present  Data Clay Network, Co-Director

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2013  Pocket Landscapes: Trajan’s Monument to Poché in Floor Journal Issue #2

Professional Membership
The Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture
The American Institute of Architects

Other Accomplishments
2014  Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts Award for the development of Data Clay: Digital Strategies for Parsing the Earth symposium and exhibition.
2013  Faculty Development Award to develop Trajan’s Hollow publication.
2013  Maxine Frankel Award to develop Data Clay Network online.
2013  Deviant Artifacts: The Work of Radical Craft, WEDGE Gallery (WU), Burbank, CA (Solo Show)
2012  Architecture in the Expanded Field, CCA Wattis Institute, San Francisco, CA (Group Exhibition)
Clark Philipp Stevens  
Adjunct Faculty 2014 and 2010-2011, Professor of Practice, 2012-2014

Courses Taught (Spring 2012 - Spring 2014)
ARCH 692 Graduate Thesis Studio, Spring 2013
ARCH 681/691 Topic/Focus Design Studio, Spring/Fall 2011, Fall 2012,
ARCH 489 Urban Design Studio, Spring 2014
ARCH 487/589 The Total Building Design Studio, Fall 2010, Spring/Fall 2011, Fall 2013

Educational Credentials
1989 March with Distinction, Harvard Graduate School of Design
1985 BS in Arch with Honors, University of Michigan College of Architecture and Urban Planning

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Professor of Practice, Fall 2010- present
UCLA Landscape Architecture and Sustainability Programs, Adjunct Instructor, Fall 2011
University of Southern California School of Architecture, Part-Time Lecturer, Fall 2009
University of Michigan, Elie Saarinen Visiting Professor, 2004, Visiting Critic, 1996
University of Texas, Austin, Charles Moore Visiting Critic, 1999
Southern California Institute of Architecture (SCI-Arc), Adjunct Faculty, 1991-1998

Professional Experience
2000-present New West Land Company, Inc., Owner, Principal Architect

Licenses/Registration
Current registration in California and Montana; NCARB; previous:  Hawaii, Utah, Wyoming

Selected Publications, Exhibitions and Lectures
“Living Large in Small Spaces: 700 Square Feet,” by Norman Kolpas, in Mountain Living
2010 “The New West: Re-engagement with the Land,” in Center 14: On Landscape Urbanism,
University of Texas Press, Austin, Texas, Dean Almy, editor 2007
2007 RoTo Architecture: Still Points, by Clark Stevens and Michael Rotondi. Rizzoli, New York, NY
1997 “Everyday Observations: Sinte Gleska University and RoTo Architects,” Architectural Design

Selected Professional Honors
2013, 2012 Top Mountain Architect, Mountain Living magazine (NWLCO)
2007 AIACC Merit Award, Architecture and Art Building, Prairie View A&M University
2006 Holcim Award for Sustainable Construction, Global Division Silver Award: “Waterpower”
2005 AIALA Citation Award, Architecture and Art Building, Prairie View A&M University
AIA, Jury Member, National Honor Awards for Architecture
Holcim Award for Sustainable Construction, European Division Gold Award: “Waterpower”
2002 AIACC Design Award and Wood Design Award, View Silo House
1999 AIA National Design Award, Carlson-Reges House
AIACC Design Awards for Warehouse and Teiger House
1996 Progressive Architecture Award, Citation, Sinte Gleska University Campus Plan
AIACC Merit Award, Carlson-Reges Residence; “40 under 40”, Architectural League of N.Y.
1995 AIACC Merit Award, Dorland Mountain Cabin
Sunset Magazine Honor Award, Carlson-Reges House

John Sturla, AIA
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Fall 2012     ARCH 464     Systems Integration
Fall 2013     ARCH 464     Systems Integration

Educational Credentials
BArch, California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University, San Diego
August 2009-Present

Professional Experience
Architectural Consultant to Architects BundyThompson
March-December 2012

Licenses/Registration

Professional Membership
American Institute of Architects, 1980 to Present.
Linda Taalman Koch, AIA
Associate Professor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2013    ARCH 487  Design Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design
              ARCH 547  Building 4: Environmental Systems Integration
              ARCH 589  Design Studio 4: The Total Building
Fall 2013     ARCH 281  Design Studio 2A: program and Space
              ARCH 464  Systems Integration
Spring 2014   ARCH 547  Building 4: Environmental Systems Integration
              ARCH 589  Design Studio 4: The Total Building
Fall 2014     ARCH 464  Systems Integration
              ARCH 487  Design Studio 4A: Comprehensive Design

Educational credentials
1997        BArch, Cooper Union (professional)

Teaching Experience
2008- present  Woodbury University School of Architecture, Associate Professor
2008-2009    University of Southern California School of Architecture, Adjunct Instructor
2003-2006    SCI Arc School of Architecture, Adjunct Instructor
2005        UCLA School of Art and Design/Media Arts, Visiting Lecturer
2003-2006    Art Center College of Design, Lecturer
2001        Cooper Union, Studio Instructor

Professional Experience
2010-present  itHouse Inc., Founder and CEO
2003-present  Taalman Architecture, formerly Taalman Koch Architecture, Founder and Principal

Licenses/Registration
Current registration in California No.C-30187 and inactive registration in New York No. 029356

Selected Publications and Recent Research
PUBLISHED WRITING
2014 Dwell, “Lost in Chandigarh,” by Linda Taalman, October
BLOGS
2012 Dwell Magazine Online, “Refinishing Alvar Aalto’s Finnish Pavilion,” September

SELECTED RECENT PROJECT ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS
2013 MARK, ‘The It Factor,” by Katya Tylevich, October/November 2013
2013 MARK, ‘Tune Off, Tune In,” by Katya Tylevich, October/November 2013
2013 MARK, ‘Set for Life,” by Katya Tylevich, October/November 2013
2012 The Wall Street Journal, “(Almost) Off the grid,” October 5
2012 Architect’s Newspaper, “Chris Burden builds a Small Skyscraper in Old Town Pasadena,” by Sam Lubell
2012 Dwell, “The Homemakers,” by Sarah Amelar, July/August
2012 Architektur & Wonen, “Mehr Platz und Bunter,” February

RESEARCH
2004-present Prefabrication: process and prototypes, research for professional and student directed projects
2011-12 Diagrammatica: research for publication on diagrams in architecture

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Architects
Los Angeles Forum for Architecture and Urban Design- Board member since 2012
LAXART Advisory Board
James Michael Tate  
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Fall 2013  
UG  ARCH 281  Design Studio 2A: Program and Space  
UG  ARCH 464  Systems Integration

Spring 2014  
UG  ARCH 492  Degree Project  
GR  ARCH 563  Visualization 2: Analytical Construction  
UG  ARCH 464  Systems Integration

Educational Credentials

MArch  Yale University  
BEnvDes  Texas A&M University

Teaching Experience

2013-2014  Woodbury University School of Architecture

Professional Experience

3/2014 – ongoing  T8 projects

Licenses/Registration

LEED AP

Selected Publications and Recent Research

Co-Organizer of On the Road Project LA  
www.ontheroadprojectla.org  

A+D Museum Los Angeles: S,M,L,XLA Exhibition Participant  

Big City Forum: City of Hope, City of Resistance Exhibition Participant  
Courses Taught (2012-2014)

Spring 2012
ARCH 3993  Policy 2: Do Real Architecture
ARCH 3994  Policy 2: Do Real Architecture
ARCH 3996  Policy 2: Do Real Architecture
ARCH 5719  Policy 2: Do Real Architecture

Fall 2012
ARCH 4736  Policy 1
ARCH 4737  Policy 3
ARCH 630  Policy 1: Introduction to Arch Policy
ARCH 6730  Policy 3 Adv. Seminar in “Do Real Arch”

Spring 2013
ARCH 4738  Policy 2
ARCH 4739  Policy 4
ARCH 5719  Policy 2: Do Real Architecture
ARCH 6732  Policy 4: Do Real Architecture

Fall 2013
ARCH 4736  Policy 1
ARCH 489  Studio 4B: Urbanism
ARCH 491  Studio 5A: Contemporary Topics
ARCH 5990  Arch Practice
ARCH 630  Policy 1: Introduction to Arch Policy
ARCH 691  Studio 5: Focus/Topic

Spring 2014
ARCH 4738  Policy 2
ARCH 4739  Policy 4
ARCH 5719  Policy 2: Do Real Architecture
ARCH 6732  Policy 4: Do Real Architecture
ARCH 692  Thesis Studio 2

Educational Credentials
1983  MArch, Harvard University, Graduate School of Design
1979  BA, University of California, Los Angeles

Teaching Experience
2010-Present  Woodbury University School of Architecture
Previous  University of Southern California School of Architecture

Professional Experience
1987-present  Roschen Van Cleve Architects, founding principal

Licenses/Registration
Current registration in California
Certified Interior Designer, State of California

Professional Membership
The American Institute of Architects

Other Accomplishments
2013-present  AIA LA Board member
2010  AIA LA Presidential Award Recipient, Building Team of the Year
2008-present  Co-Chair, Hollywood Historic Trust
2005  Los Angeles Business Journal, Real Estate Award Recipients, Architects of the Year Award
1998-present  Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, Chairman of Board (2003-4), Executive Committee, Board
2001-2003  Economic Development Committee, Chairman Annual Economic Development Summit
2003-2008  Los Angeles City College Foundation, Board Member
1995-1996  Fee Study Group, Mayor Riordan appointee
1989-1998  Los Feliz Improvement Association, Board of Directors and Zoning Committee Chair
1990-1996  Los Feliz Mobility Action Committee, Mayor Bradley appointee
Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, AIA
Associate Dean and Professor

Educational Credentials
MArch University of California, Los Angeles (professional)
BA University of California, Los Angeles

Teaching Experience
2012-present Woodbury University Professor
2005-2012 Woodbury University Associate Professor, Assistant Professor
2003-2006 Yale University, New Haven, CT, Lecturer
2003-2005 Southern California Institute of Architecture, Hardtech Coordinator, Full-time Faculty
2002-2003 The Bartlett, University College of London, London, UK, Unit Tutor
2002-2003 Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK, Unit Tutor
1999 - 2002 Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, Visiting Professor

Courses Taught (2012-2014)
Spring 2012 ARCH 692 Graduate Thesis Studio
Summer 2012 ARCH 6990 Independent Study
Spring 2013 ARCH 692 Graduate Thesis Studio
Summer 2013 ARCH 4753 Foreign Study Studio: Tahiti
ARCH 5758 Fieldwork: Tahiti

Professional Experience
2009-present Director, WUHO Gallery
2002-present [WROAD] Los Angeles, a partnership practice of architecture with Roland Wahlroos-Ritter
1999-2002 Ingalill Wahlroos Architects, New York, sole practitioner
2002-present Dewhurst Macfarlane & Partners, Senior Associate; founder and director, Los Angeles office
1994-present Smith-Miller + Hawkinson Architects, New York, NY, project architect

Licenses/Registration

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014 Introduction to “Beyond Environment”, Actar, publication
2014 “Real Architecture: WUHO exhibitions”, Inclusive Museum Conference, presentation
2013 “Fieldwork Tahiti: Houses of Flux”, ACSA conference, Miami, paper
2013 Graham Foundation Grant for “Beyond Environment”, with Amit Wolf and Emanuele Piccardo
2012 MAK Institute exhibition, ‘Light My Fire, Stranger’
2012 “Bachelors, Brides and Open-Source Technologies,” 2011 ACSA panel convener and moderator
2011 Bloom, Experimental installation at M&A Gallery, with Doris Sung and Matthew Melnyk
2011 Graham Foundation Grant for Bloom, with Doris Sung and Matthew Melnyk
2011 Maxine Frankel Grant, Woodbury University, for WUHO Gallery signage
2011 “Interface and Immersion,” ACADIA 2011, session moderator
2011 Architecture: A Woman’s Profession, Tanja Kullick (ed.), featured contributor
2011 “Architecture: A Woman’s Profession,” panelist at the MAK Center for Art and Architecture
2010 Woodbury University Faculty Development Grant, for experimental research project Bloom
2010 Chair for The Page, Guggenheim Gallery at Chapman University, exhibition
2010 “Interviews,” Idea News, Fall 2009, University of Southern California, publication
2010 Maxine Frankel Grant, Woodbury University, for faculty exhibitions at WUHO, with Barbara Bestor
2010 “Archipelago Construct: Museum of the Society Islands, Polynesia,” International Conference on Arts
and Humanities, paper
session responder
2006 Glass: Material Matters, LACMA exhibition catalogue

Professional Membership
2014-present Appointed LA AIA Board of Directors
Janet Yoon
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (Fall 2012 - Fall 2014)
ARCH 281 Studio 2A Program and Space, Fall 2012
ARCH 283 Studio 2B Site Orders, Spring 2013
ARCH 283 Studio 3A House and Housing, Fall 2013, Fall 2014
ARCH 384 Studio 3B Structure, Systems, Spring 2014
ARCH 2743 Studio Portfolio Discourse, Spring 2014

Educational Credentials
2012 M.Sc Design Research, University of Michigan (post-professional)
2008 MArch, University of Michigan with Distinction
2001 BArts in Architecture, University of California, Berkeley

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture, Adjunct Faculty 2012-present
University of Michigan, Teaching Assistant to Chair of Architecture 2012
University of Michigan, Graduate Student Instructor 2008

Professional Experience
2014-present SPF:a, Project Designer
2012-present STUD10, Founder
2008-2011 Cannon Design, Designer

Licenses/Registration
LEED AP

Selected Publications and Recent Research
2014 “The Discreet Architect,” exhibition Letters to the Mayor at Storefront for Art and Architecture

Professional Membership
Giulio Zavolta
Adjunct Instructor

Courses Taught (Spring 2012 - Spring 2014)
ARCH 250  Professional Practice 1, Spring 2012
ARCH 250  Professional Practice 1, Spring 2013
ARCH 250  Professional Practice 1, Spring 2014

Educational Credentials
1999  Masters of Architecture II, UCLA (post-professional)
1993  Bachelor of Architecture, Universite de Montreal
1992  LAX, Los Angeles Experiments, SCI-Arc
1989  Diploma in Architectural Technology

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct Instructor 2004-2014
University of California Los Angeles, Teaching Assistant 1998-1999

Professional Experience
2005-present  Totum, Principal
1998-2005  Koning Eizenberg Architecture, Associate
1994-1997  Shore Tilbe Irwin & Partners, Designer

Licenses/Registration
---

Selected Publications and Recent Research
1994  LAX: The Los Angeles Experiment - SITES/Lumen Books, Design work/essays

Professional Membership
USGBC – LEED Accredited Design Professional
Royal Architectural Institute of Canada
Urban Land Institute
Canadian Architectural Certification Board
Alvaro R. Zepeda
Adjunct Faculty

Courses Taught (Spring 2012 - Spring 2014)
ARCH 383  Design Studio 3A, Fall 2012 & 2013
ARCH 283  Design Studio 2B, Spring 2013 & 2014
ARCH 3931 Third Year Open Studio, Summer 2013 & Summer 2014
ARCH 281  Design Studio 2A, Fall 2014
            International Studio Spain Summer 2008

Educational Credentials
2016   MBA, Woodbury University (current studies)
2004   MArch, California State Polytechnic University Pomona
1994   BArch, Woodbury University

Teaching Experience
Woodbury University School of Architecture: Adjunct Professor 2008-present
Universidad Jose Simeon Cañas, San Salvador El Salvador, Visiting Professor 2012 to Present

Professional Experience
2004-present Honles + Zepeda Architects, Principal
1998-2013 Randell L. Makinson Restoration Consultant, Project Architect
1995-1998 Fremer Savel Architects, Junior Designer
1994-1995 Jubany Architecture, Draftsman

Licenses/Registration
none

Selected Publications and Recent Research
none

Professional Membership
United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, Flotilla Commander 2011 to Present
United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, Language Interpreter 2011 to Present
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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments

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

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

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

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

Student enrollment in the program has grown 50% from 336 in 2000-1, to 506 in 2006-7. The full-time faculty has grown from 8 to 10 during this period (25%). As a result, the student/full-time faculty ratio has devolved from 42:1 to 50.6:1 since the last visit. As outsiders witnessing the past six years of continued development within the program, we see an alarming picture. It is hard to understand how or why the university has allowed this situation to develop in this way. Several of these concerns have now moved to deficiencies, particularly Condition 6 – Human Resources and Condition 10 – Financial Resources; additional commentary is provided under the two conditions noted. The program would benefit from the development of a deliberate plan by university administration to address these problems. To be successful, commitment should also be established at the trustee level. The program has been authorized to hire two new full-time faculty members, but at the time of the APR and visit, these faculty members have not been retained.

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

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

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

**Condition 5, Human Resources (2002):**

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

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

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

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

**Condition 6, Human Resource Development (2002):**

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

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

**2008 Visiting Team Assessment** This condition has been met.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Program Self-Assessment Procedures  
4. Social Equity  
5. Studio Culture  
13.7 Collaborative Skills

13.8 Western Traditions  
13.17 Site Conditions

4. **Conditions Not Met**

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

5. **Causes of Concern**

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

B. Students admire the faculty and understandably view them as role models. In many cases, upon graduation they will immediately move into the workforce and licensure is a vital asset. There is a concern this important step in the affirmation of the student’s abilities is not consistently reinforced by the faculty. Licensure should be a clear prospect for all Woodbury alumni.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

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

1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context

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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

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

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

1.2 Architecture Education and Students

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

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

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

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

1.3 Architecture Education and Registration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.5 Architecture Education and Society

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

2. **Program Self-Assessment Procedures**

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

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

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

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

3. **Public Information**

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

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

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

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

- Met
- Not Met

[X]       [  ]

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

5. **Studio Culture**

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

- Met
- Not Met

[X]       [  ]

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

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

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

See prior commentary under Team Comments. Notwithstanding the serious concerns, it is important to note that the school is held together by its extraordinarily dedicated faculty and through the sensitive and creative leadership of Norman Millar, Catherine Herbst, Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, Debra Abel, and many others who fill formal and informal leadership roles.

The staff of the school is also truly impressive in the quality of their work and their ability to operate in a challenging environment of limited resources.

At the moment, while the human resources are just barely meeting the basic needs of the students (with certain qualitative gaps already appearing), the signs of stress and failure are also evident in several unmet Student Performance Criteria. Perhaps even more important is the unmet potential of a program that is clearly trying to emerge in the local, state, and national arena.

The turnover of talented adjunct faculty is of serious concern; when one of these dedicated colleagues leaves, it represents a tremendous waste of one of the core strengths of this program. There is continuing concern about burnout among the full-time faculty given their numbers in relation to the dramatic increase in student numbers. This important picture of a program’s health is seriously out of balance, especially when the team sees the disconnect between dramatic growth in student numbers in the last six years and only two new full-time faculty hired during this period.

7. Human Resource Development

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9. Information Resources

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

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

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

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

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

10. Financial Resources

An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.
The program accomplishes a great deal with a very tight budget. They should be commended for their ingenuity and enthusiasm. Nonetheless, as with Human Resources, it is the assessment of this team that the balance between student numbers and financial support has not found the proper equilibrium to adequately support this fine program. This was implicitly a Cause for Concern at the last visit, and although there have been significant steps in the right direction with respect to capital investment (primarily in the new Burbank architecture building and with the projected new space for San Diego opening this summer), operating funds have not kept pace. Comparative data in the APR show clearly that architecture has slipped on a per-student funding basis, and this situation needs to be corrected.

11. Administrative Structure

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

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

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

12. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

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

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

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

13. Student Performance Criteria

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

13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills

Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

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

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

13.2 Critical Thinking Skills

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

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

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

13.3 Graphic Skills

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

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

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

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

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

13.5 Formal Ordering Skills

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

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

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

13.6 Fundamental Skills

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

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

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

13.7 Collaborative Skills

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 13.9 Non-Western Traditions

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

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

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

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

### 13.10 National and Regional Traditions

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

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

### 13.11 Use of Precedents

Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into 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>

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

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

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

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

13.13 Human Diversity

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

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

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

13.14 Accessibility

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

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

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

13.15 Sustainable Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

13.17 Site Conditions

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

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

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

13.18 Structural Systems

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

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

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

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

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

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

13.20 Life-Safety

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

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

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

13.21 Building Envelope Systems

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

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

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

13.22 Building Service Systems

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

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

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

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

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

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

13.24 Building Materials and Assemblies

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

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

13.25 Construction Cost Control

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

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

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

13.26 Technical Documentation

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

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

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

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

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

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

13.28 **Comprehensive Design**

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

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

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

13.29 **Architect’s Administrative Roles**

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

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

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

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

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

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

13.31 Professional Development

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

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

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

13.32 Leadership

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

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

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

13.33 Legal Responsibilities

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

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

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

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

Met  Not Met
[X]  [ ]
III. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

1. History and Description of the Institution

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

In the late 19th century, Los Angeles was a rapidly growing city with a population of approximately 11,000. In 1884, responding to the needs of the city's growing business community, F.C. Woodbury, an educator and entrepreneur from San Francisco, arrived and founded Woodbury Business College, as it was initially named.

Woodbury College was accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in 1961. In 1969 the school changed its charter with the addition of a graduate program leading to a Master of Business Administration (MBA). In 1972, Woodbury College became a non-profit institution of higher learning. In 1974, Woodbury College became Woodbury University. Computer information systems was added as a major in 1982. In 1984 the university added a major in architecture.

In 1985, after 103 years in central downtown Los Angeles, Woodbury acquired a 22.4 acre campus (the former home of one of the nation's oldest convents) that straddles the border of Burbank and Los Angeles in the San Fernando Valley. In 1994 the architecture program received its initial three-year NAAB accreditation term. That same year, the university formally organized its undergraduate and graduate programs into three schools: the School of Architecture and Design, which had departments of Architecture, Fashion Design, Graphic Design, and Interior Design; the School of Business and Management, which had departments of Accounting, Business and Management, Computer Information Systems, and Marketing; and the School of Arts and Sciences, which had departments of Humanities and of Natural and Social Sciences and provided all university departments a full range of general education courses. New architecture studios were completed in 1996. In 1997 the architecture program was reaccredited by NAAB for a five-year term.

In 1998, in a joint effort with Mesa Community College, Woodbury opened a facility at the Point Loma Naval Training Center in San Diego to expand access to an accredited architecture program to students in that border region. The growing San Diego architecture program was moved to a larger facility centrally located in the city's downtown business district in the summer of 2001. Since 1996, the federal government has defined Woodbury University as a Hispanic Serving Institution, and in 2001, Woodbury University received a $2.2 million Title V grant from the federal government to fund several important projects. These include a complete renovation of the institution's management information system, funding for improvement in the teaching of basic skills and foundation courses, and support for faculty development and technology in the classrooms. In 2005, the Department of Architecture initiated a 12-month post-professional master's degree in Real Estate Development for architects at its facility in San Diego, the Department of Interior Architecture was accredited by FIDER (now the Council for Interior Design Accreditation), and anticipating a bid for AACSB accreditation, the School of Business and Management refined its name to become simply the School of Business, which included the Departments of Accounting, Business and Management, and Marketing. Kirby Hall, a new sprung structure studio building, was completed adjacent to North Hall in the summer of 2005. In 2005, a major gift from the renowned architectural photographer made it possible for Woodbury to establish the Julius Shulman Institute, housed within the architecture program. In 2006, the School of Arts and Sciences was
reorganized into the Institute of Transdisciplinary Studies (ITS) housing the Departments of Math and Natural Science, Art History, and Politics and History. A continued surge in enrollment justified the decision to build a new 20,000 sq ft School of Business building with a 250-seat auditorium on the main quad, a new 15,000 sq ft architecture studio building parallel to Glenoaks Boulevard in the architecture complex, and a new 340-car parking lot on the upper campus. The parking lot was completed in summer 2006 and completion of the two new buildings is expected in spring 2008.

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

2. Institutional Mission

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

Woodbury University is committed to providing the highest level of professional and liberal arts education. The integrated nature of our educational environment cultivates successful students with a strong and enduring sense of personal and social responsibility. We prepare innovative learners who are adept at communicating and willing to cross the boundaries of knowledge in a rapidly changing and complex world.

Ideals
Integrity and ethical behavior
Diversity
Empowering students to determine and manage their own destinies
Academic rigor
Liberal arts-based professional education that effectively prepares students for careers Student focus in all aspects of its operations

Educational Goals
The members of the Woodbury community have identified six principles that articulate what is necessary for the university to achieve its mission:

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

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

Woodbury's architecture major began in 1984 under the direction of Don Conway. Beginning with ten students in modest facilities at the downtown location, the program expanded both facilities and enrollment with the move to the Burbank campus. With the appointment of Louis Naidorf as department chair in 1990, the program took further important steps toward accreditation. In 1994, Woodbury's architecture program achieved NAAB accreditation for a three-year term. Louis Naidorf was promoted to dean of the School of Architecture and Design and Geraldine Forbes became the chair of the Department of Architecture. In 1996, additional architecture studio space was added to accommodate the growing enrollment. After the 1997 NAAB visit, Woodbury's accreditation was extended to a five-year term through 2002.

In 1997 the university decided to expand the architecture program to a facility located in San Diego, in a joint effort with Mesa Community College. Geraldine Forbes was promoted to assistant dean of Architecture and Design and director of the newly forming San Diego campus. Stan Bertheaud assumed the position of interim chair and Jay Nickels was hired to fill the newly created administrative position of assistant chair for the department. The architecture library holdings were greatly increased for the new San Diego location. The department opened up the Hollywood Community Design and Urban Research Center (CD+URC) on Hollywood Boulevard under the coordination of Peter DiSabatino. The study-abroad program was expanded to include Barcelona and Paris, and a metal shop was constructed adjacent to the wood shop. In fall 1998, approximately 30 transfer students became the first to enroll in the third year of Woodbury's architecture program at its new San Diego facility in the former Point Loma Naval Training Center. The facility was outfitted with a new shop and computer lab, seminar rooms and studio space. After a team visit in the spring of 1999, Woodbury's NAAB accreditation was extended to include the San Diego branch of the program.

Norman Millar became the chair of the Department of Architecture in the fall of 1999 and filled a newly added full-time faculty position. Under his direction, the full-time faculty further refined the curriculum and began to develop a new program mission and strategic plan. To more fully assure the successful implementation of the new curriculum, a full-time faculty member was assigned the responsibility to teach in and coordinate each of the ten studio semesters of the program. First-year students were given dedicated studio space for the first time. Additional equipment was added to shops and computer labs at both locations and their hours of operation were greatly increased. A new three-year "green" lecture series funded by a grant from Toyota Motor Sales was instituted. The name of the Hollywood program was changed to the Center for Community Research and Design (CCRD), it was moved to an improved larger location next door on Hollywood Boulevard, and Jeanine Centuori took over as its coordinator. In 1999, Woodbury architecture students placed first in the ACSA steel competition and have continued to win national, regional and local design awards regularly since then.

In 2000 Heather Kurze was appointed the new dean. Geraldine Forbes was promoted to dean of the San Diego campus, and was elected secretary of the ACSA and later became its president. The San Diego space was increased by leasing a storefront for three sections of studio. The department gained two new full-time faculty positions, bringing the total to three in San Diego and six in Burbank/LA. Woodbury faculty and students won national and local design awards in growing numbers, and our graduates have entered leading graduate programs and professional offices at an increasing rate.

In 2000 Heather Kurze was appointed the new dean. Geraldine Forbes was promoted to dean of the San Diego campus, and was elected secretary of the ACSA and later became its president. The San Diego space was increased by leasing a storefront for three sections of studio. The department gained two new full-time faculty positions, bringing the total to three in San Diego and six in Burbank/LA. Woodbury faculty and students won national and local design awards in growing numbers, and our graduates have entered leading graduate programs and professional offices at an increasing rate.
In 2001, after the graduation of San Diego’s inaugural class of students, Geraldine Forbes stepped down as San Diego's program director. Jay Nickels was appointed San Diego's interim director and Victoria Liptak assumed the position of interim assistant chair of the department. During the summer of 2001, the San Diego program was moved to a new, larger facility in the central downtown business district. The NAAB re-accredited the architecture program in the summer of 2002 with a six-year term. In the summer of 2002, Woodbury signed a memorandum of understanding with Woosong University in Daejon, establishing an exchange program for design and architecture students. Also during the summer of 2002, tenant improvements were made to the studio spaces on the second and third floors of the San Diego facility, resulting in spaces that more efficiently accommodate student and faculty needs.

Also in the fall of 2002, a new administrative assistant position was established in the Faculty Center at Burbank/LA to directly support the architecture program. In fall 2002, the computer labs in San Diego and LA were expanded to have 17 and 20 stations each. In spring and summer 2003, tenant improvements were made to the second and third floor corridors of the San Diego facility. During the spring of 2004, architecture students organized a series of demonstrations to voice their concerns to the university that adjunct architecture faculty who played important roles in their education were leaving the program because they were underpaid and received no benefits. President Nielsen responded by establishing a new full-time position for the department in LA, which began in the following fall with an interim appointment and was permanently filled a year later after a national search. In the summer of 2004, the architecture study-away programs open to both San Diego and Los Angeles students expanded dramatically with programs in Korea, Rome, Barcelona/Paris, a sustainable topic studio in Chile, and the American West.

In the fall of 2004, Woodbury ended its agreement with Mesa College to teach the first two years of the architecture curriculum in San Diego and began to offer all five years at that facility. Still, Mesa continued to be the primary feeder school of transfer students into the third year. Following the recommendation of the 2002 NAAB VTR, Woodbury’s San Diego library holdings were moved from Mesa College to the second floor of our downtown architecture facility. The newly remodeled teaching computer lab was introduced to SD faculty and students. Woodbury’s outstanding San Diego lecture series continues to serve the entire regional architectural community extending from Tijuana to Orange County. A second architecture computer lab with 20 stations for student use was added adjacent to the existing teaching lab in LA.

In 2004 with an initial gift from the Jeanne R. Woodbury estate, the university has established a portion of its endowment to be earmarked specifically for the architecture program for scholarships. During the 2004-05 academic year, the architecture enrollment in San Diego surpassed all other all other undergraduate programs. During that year, the architecture faculty approved the curriculum for the new Master of Architecture in Real Estate Development for Architects (M.Arch.RED) program to be offered at the San Diego facility. The 3-semester, 12-month post-professional program under the co-direction of Ted Smith and Jonathan Segal is open to individuals with a professional degree in architecture. During the summer of 2005, improvements were made to the north side of the third floor in the San Diego facility to accommodate the needs of the new program, which began in fall 2005 with a cohort of eight students. The main interrelationship between the B.Arch program and the M.Arch.RED program is that to date, the B.Arch program is a primary feeder to the RED program providing about 30-40% of its students. B.Arch students and faculty also informally sit in on reviews and discussions in the RED program.
In 2005 the architecture program received a one million dollar gift from Julius Shulman. Half of that was used to initiate a capital campaign for a new architecture studio building. The other half-million was used to establish the Julius Shulman Institute and endowment in the architecture program with a goal of focusing on his enduring involvement in issues of modernism. Also in 2005 the Raymond and Maxine Frankel family established the annual Frankel Foundation Award Program to benefit students, faculty and academic initiatives in the architecture and fashion programs at Woodbury. From 2005 on, $50,000 each year is awarded: $20,000 in faculty development grants, $20,000 in student funding initiatives, and $10,000 for special events.

In early 2006, to address the classroom space shortage due to increasing enrollment, design work commenced on the new 19,000 square foot two-story studio building at the Los Angeles facility. Completion of the highly anticipated project is expected for January 2008.

Jay Nickels stepped down from his position as assistant chair of Architecture in July of 2006 and Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter was appointed assistant chair. Also in the summer of 2006, Dean Heather Kurze took permanent leave from Woodbury when the position of dean of the School of Architecture and Design was discontinued in order to allow for planning that would alter the organization of the school. During the ensuing months, chairs of the five departments of the school and the architecture faculty agreed that the Department of Architecture (now 500 strong) and the programs in design would be better served if they were housed in separate units. As a result, the School of Architecture and Design was dissolved and the concept of the School of Architecture came to life. It was hoped that this new independent structure would allow the architecture programs to follow a critical path that would lead to greater success. Following a fall of vigorous debate, the architecture faculty agreed upon a newly reorganized structure for their program and in January 2007 the new School of Architecture at Woodbury University was established with Norman Millar serving as its director and Catherine Herbst and Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter as its associate directors. Please refer to the Organizational Chart on page 19.

In 2007 the Frankel family donated a large collection of the paintings of Jan Stussy to the School of Architecture, with the anticipation that the eventual sale of the collection will establish endowment to fund the Raymond Frankel and Maxine Stussy Frankel Chair in Architecture by the year 2010.

4. Program Mission

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

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

WOODBURY : ARCHITECTURE : TRANSFORMS

We believe in architectural education as transformative.
We believe in the radical possibilities of architecture's relevance, socially, environmentally, and formally.
We are architects and critical thinkers who produce other architects and critical thinkers. Woodbury's students, faculty, and graduates are committed to architecture that is:
• intelligent – articulates a critical position;
• effective – addresses the challenges of contemporary life; and
• beautiful – fully vested in the transformative power of beauty.

consistent with the university's mission, the School of Architecture is committed to the training and education of articulate and innovative design professionals. The curriculum prepares our students to balance the need to work competitively in the marketplace with the equally important concerns of ethical conduct and social responsibility.

5. Program Self Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Measures of Success: Life after Graduation
The School is committed to undertaking an evaluation of School of Architecture alumni's post-graduate success, including implementing a more thorough tracking of our alumni, in order to understand how well they were prepared by Woodbury for graduate school, paying off student loans, licensing, gainful and/or meaningful employment as professionals and/or educators, alternative careers, etc.
CURRICULUM

Strengths: Woodbury's School of Architecture offers a comprehensive curriculum with a clear set of learning objectives that aligns with the guiding principles of the university and fulfills and surpasses NAAB requirements. The school is committed to exploiting the regional laboratory that is Southern California, taking full advantage of its proximity to centers of fabrication, industry, media and entertainment, as well as natural, cultural, and academic resources.

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS + NEXT STEPS

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

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

- human resources: personnel/salaries + benefits
- physical resources: space
- information resources: technology/equipment
- other
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Appendix B: The Visiting Team

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

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

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

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

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

Sunday, March 2, 2008

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

Monday, March 3, 2008 – SD Campus

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

Tuesday, March 4, 2008

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

Wednesday March 5, 2008

8:00  Team breakfast - Millar – hotel
9:00  Drive to main campus; continue work – Team Room
11:00 Team lunch - SD and LA students [Schwartz leaves]
12:30 Visit Center for Community Practice and Design (CCRD) – Hollywood
2:00  Drive to main campus
2:30  Complete work – Team Room
6:00* Team-only dinner
### Thursday March 6, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Hotel check-out Chronister - team only breakfast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00 | Exit meeting - School Administrator(s)  
Norman Millar, Director  
Catherine Herbst, Associate Director, San Diego  
Ingulill Wahlroos-Ritter, Associate Director, Los Angeles |
| 10:15 | Exit meeting - Chief Academic Officers of the Institution  
Ken Nielsen, President  
David Rosen, Senior Vice-President, Academic Affairs |
| 11:00 | School-wide exit meeting -faculty and students |
| 12:00 | Team lunch |
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Marzette Flander
Team Chair
Representing the NCARB

Kenneth A. Schwartz, FAIA
Team member
Representing the ACSA

Merritt M. Ertel
Team member
Representing the AIAS

Lisa Chronister, AIA, NCARB
Team member
Representing the AIA

Michael Rotondi, FAIA
Observer
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Woodbury University
School of Architecture

Initial Accreditation Visiting Team Report

M. Arch
(preprofessional degree + min. 68 graduate credits)
(non-preprofessional degree + min. 93 graduate credits)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
26 September 2012

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 a NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Summary of Team Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Team Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conditions Not Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Causes of Concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Educational Outcomes and Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Appendices:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Program Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conditions Met with Distinction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Visiting Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Report Signatures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Confidential Recommendation and Signatures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The 2012 NAAB accreditation team wishes to thank Woodbury University for its hospitality during this accreditation visit. Thank you for the many hours of preparation spent in anticipation of this visit along with the time spent while we were on campus. The course exhibits, team room and preparations for this visit were well presented and organized. We would particularly like to express appreciation to President Luis Calingo, Dean Norman Millar, Senior Vice President Vic Liptak, Assistant Dean Randy Stauffer, and Graduate Chair Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter. Our thanks also extend to the entire faculty, staff, and students within the School of Architecture at Woodbury University for their hospitality during this visit and hard work in preparation for the visit.

The intent and vision of architecture is clearly expressed in the student projects displayed in the team room. This was seen as a clear direction of Woodbury University toward this new Master of Architecture program. Woodbury University captures the social and environmental context of Southern California along with the entire global society. The international and cultural diversity is recognized throughout the campus and at every curriculum level within the architecture program. Intellectual freedom, artistic values, academic excellence, and social responsibility are but a few of the guiding values of this well-rounded program.

This initial accreditation visit is essentially the springboard for a great opportunity of the university and the School of Architecture to become recognized globally for their faculty, students and quality of achievement within the architectural field. The visiting team was impressed with the quality of work being developed by students within this very young program. The opportunities of both local and global travel will provide students with a diverse education and a continual opportunity of the program to develop and grow.

Administration

The team was highly impressed with the leadership and organization skills of Dean Norman Millar and Graduate Chair Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter. It is obvious they both enjoy the support of the faculty, upper administration, and the students themselves. It was evident from our interviews that they have successfully communicated their values and direction for this program to evolve. This skill has led to a consistent message being delivered to all constituents and will certainly advance this school toward its clearly defined direction and strategic vision.

Students

The visiting team found students to be energetic and enthusiastic about learning—with a great desire to obtain a full and extensive education. The level of drawing detail along with the extensive research evident on many projects was impressive. The team meeting with the students was a delightful experience. Students were very responsive to questions, they understood their role in their education experience, they were familiar with their future professional role in architecture, and they even expressed excitement about being part of this initial accreditation visit.

Students in the architecture program described a very positive experience and strong commitment to the continued development of this program. They understand and support the addition of this new M. Arch. program at Woodbury University. The design studios and course work are all viewed as productive and supportive environments where a high level of dialog, cooperation, and respect exist.

Facilities

The architecture program is presently housed within adequate facilities. As the university continues to grow and the School of Architecture adds students, these facilities will also require expansion. Classrooms are presently shared around the campus but are sometimes tightly
scheduled. The campus is attractive with well-maintained open spaces and historic and modern buildings that collectively foster a positive learning environment.

2. **Conditions Not Met**

   A. 9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture  
   B. 2. Accessibility  
   C. 1. Collaboration

3. **Causes of Concern**

**A. Future Perspectives**

The rapid growth of the School of Architecture creates exciting opportunities but also poses challenges at several levels. As the size of the architecture faculty increases and new types of positions emerge, such as the professor in practice, extra care must be taken to address shared governance issues. For instance, the success of the new M. Arch. program will require that long-term faculty are engaged in graduate program decisions and changes that impact the entire school. The new Dean’s Advisory Committees are a positive development, but these focused committees cannot replace full faculty meetings where all departmental issues are debated openly. Increased student numbers are putting a strain on existing human resources and facilities, such as administrative assistants, classroom space, and shop/fabrication facilities.

**B. Financial**

The rapid growth noted above and the higher expectations of a graduate program both generate new demands on current financial resources. For instance, the establishment of the new graduate program will necessitate hiring more experienced adjunct faculty at more competitive salary scales. This concern is exacerbated by the current uncompetitive low compensation paid to adjunct faculty in comparison with local peer institutions. This will need to be addressed in order for the School, and the graduate program in particular, to achieve their full potential.

Also the faculty and administration are concerned with continued and adequate funding of the signature summer abroad “Fieldwork” course, which is mandatory for all M. Arch. students.

**C. Student Performance Criteria Concerns**

The team has identified three Student Performance Criteria as not met: Historical Traditions and Global Culture, Accessibility, and Collaboration. While the team recognizes that the school has made an effort to integrate these elements into educational outcomes found in student work, the team did not find enough evidence to deem these SPC as met.

In Historical Traditions and Global Culture there is insufficient evidence of student exposure to “examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres.” While some students are exposed to one particular hemisphere, most students are not exposed to the same opportunities and in all four hemispheres.

With Accessibility, the team could not find examples where student work clearly demonstrates an ability to show handicapped toilet stalls, ramps that meet slope and landing requirements, and site accessibility issues that accommodate physical, sensory, and cognitive disabilities.

Lastly, while there is evidence of collaboration among architecture students within studios and class work, there is little to no evidence that multidisciplinary collaboration is happening or
available to students.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2010)

2004 Condition 3, Public Information: To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

Previous Team Report (2010): The required text is in the catalog. However, it is not in the various other promotional materials. In addition, multimedia announcements—flyers, posters, mailers, and the web site—have inconsistencies in noting the program is not yet accredited, and various other inconsistencies in the details of program expectations, admissions standards, etc. These need to be rigorously edited for accuracy and clarity. The proposed communications director position would provide great benefit in addressing this unmet condition.

2012 Team Assessment: This Condition has now been expanded into three conditions under Part Two Section 4 of the 2009 Conditions of Accreditation as II.4.1, II.4.2, II.4.4. This condition has now been found to be met. Also, the recent hire of a communications director has made noticeable improvements to all promotional materials and public information.

2004 Criterion 13.5, Formal Ordering Skills: Understanding of the fundamentals of visual perception and the principles and systems of order that inform two- and three-dimensional design, architectural composition, and urban design

Previous Team Report (2010): These do not appear to be evidenced in the courses identified for this criterion. However, the studio design work does show evidence of this.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion has been changed in the new format to be included in SPC A.8 Ordering System Skills. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.9, Non-Western Traditions: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

Previous Team Report (2010): The students have completed two courses that indicate this is a learning outcome, but the work does not indicate coverage of this topic.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion has been changed in the new format to be included in A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture. This SPC remains not met. See comments in Part Two: Section 1. Student Performance Criteria A.9.

2004 Criterion 13.14, Accessibility: Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities
Previous Team Report (2010): Understanding is evident, but not ability.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now B.2 Accessibility. This SPC remains not met. See comments in Part Two: Section 1. Student Performance Criteria B.2.

2004 Criterion 13.15, Sustainable Design: Understanding of the principles of sustainability in making architecture and urban design decisions that conserve natural and built resources, including culturally important buildings and sites, and in the creation of healthful buildings and communities

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now B.3 Sustainability. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Condition 13.16, Program Preparation: Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion has been changed in the new format to be included in B.1 Pre-Design. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.20, Environmental Systems: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of environmental systems, including acoustical, lighting, and climate modification systems, and energy use, integrated with the building envelope

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now B.8 Environmental Systems. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.20, Life-Safety: Understanding of the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now B.5 Life Safety. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.21, Building Envelope Systems: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building envelope materials and assemblies
Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now B.10 Building Envelope Systems. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.22, Building Service Systems: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now B.11 Building Service Systems. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.23, Building Systems Integration: Ability to assess, select, and conceptually integrate structural systems, building envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion has been expanded to be in B.8 Environmental Systems, B.9 Structural Systems, B.10 Building Envelope Systems, and B.11 Building Service Systems. Each of these new SPC has been found to be met. Therefore, the requirements of this original 13.23 Building Systems Integration are now considered to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.24, Building Materials and Assemblies: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now B.12 Building Materials and Assemblies. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.25, Construction Cost Control: Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion has been changed in the new format to be included in B.7 Financial Considerations. The components of this SPC have been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.26, Technical Documentation: Ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.
2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now A.4 Technical Documentation. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.27, Client Role in Architecture: Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and resolve the needs of the client, owner, and user

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now C.3 Client Role in Architecture. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.28, Comprehensive Design: Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now B.6 Comprehensive Design. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.29, Architect’s Administrative Roles: Understanding of obtaining commissions and negotiating contracts, managing personnel and selecting consultants, recommending project delivery methods, and forms of service contracts

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion has been changed in the new format to be included in C.4 Project Management. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.30, Architectural Practice: Understanding of the basic principles and legal aspects of practice organization, financial management, business planning, time and project management, risk mitigation, and mediation and arbitration as well as an understanding of trends that affect practice, such as globalization, outsourcing, project delivery, expanding practice settings, diversity, and others

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion has been changed in the new format to be included in C.5 Practice Management. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.31, Professional Development: Understanding of the role of internship in obtaining licensure and registration and the mutual rights and responsibilities of interns and employers

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.
2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion has been removed and incorporated into condition 1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development and I.1.3.A. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment. This condition has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.32, Leadership: Understanding of the need for architects to provide leadership in the building design and construction process and on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics in their communities

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now C.6 Leadership. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.33, Legal Responsibilities: Understanding of the architect’s responsibility as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, historic preservation laws, and accessibility laws

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now C.7 Legal Responsibilities. This SPC has now been found to be met.

2004 Criterion 13.34, Ethics and Professional Judgment: Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment in architectural design and practice

Previous Team Report (2010): N/A.

2012 Team Assessment: This Student Performance Criterion is now C.8 Ethics and Professional Judgment. This SPC has now been found to be met.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

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

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

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The APR provides a detailed description of the history, mission and culture of Woodbury University, the School of Architecture, and the specific Master of Architecture program. Part I.1.1.A also includes a very specific “Dean’s Vision” that charts a five-year plan and four focus areas. In addition, Part I.1.1.E provides a clear School of Architecture mission.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The team found significant evidence that this criterion has been met. It was observed by the team and expressed by the students, faculty and administration that Woodbury University exhibits a strong environment for learning with rich social equity that fosters innovation and a pursuit of lifelong learning. Woodbury naturally echoes the rich diversity that the Los Angeles metropolitan area offers and thrives because of this excellent atmosphere that fosters social equity.

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

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

[1] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The Architecture Program Report prepared by Woodbury University provides a clear overview of the rich contributions made by program faculty, staff, and students. Detailed sections describe compelling examples of faculty scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching, as well as faculty and student opportunities. For instance, the Architecture + Civic Engagement Center is an excellent example of how the Woodbury academic community collaborates with nonprofit groups to support social and environmental justice. The Arid Lands Institute is another example of a funded engaged research initiative that unites faculty and students in the service of the public and the academy.

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

[1] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: Students at Woodbury University are engaged in a program that fosters a rich appreciation for learning; students are challenged not only to think critically, discuss, and be informed about the direction architecture but also to emerge as leaders in their communities and around the world. Students are involved in a vast array of opportunities that prepare them to live and work in a global profession through their involvement in Fieldwork Studies, their work in studios, leadership in the Woodbury Chapter of the American Institute of Architecture Students, and through course elective opportunities such as those offered in the policy sequence. They are passionate and prepared to improve the future of our profession and have a positive impact on the communities in which we live.

---

1 See Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1990.
While students are being prepared for their future in architecture, the student body reflects the idealistic model of diversity that our profession seeks. Woodbury is a place where ethnic, economic, social, and gender boundaries fall aside; where dignity and respect blossom, creating a rich studio culture that supports a learning environment where students thrive. This rich studio culture is further enhanced by a respectful and powerful relationship between the students, faculty, and administration. Student leaders are free to advocate the needs of the student body and further foster new opportunities for learning that are met with exceptional support by the faculty and administration.

C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located, and; prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The M. Arch. program in the School of Architecture at Woodbury University is afforded immense professional opportunity resulting from an insightful and well-directed administration, a wide variety of professional and well-trained faculty, and a competent staff. Students were remarkably enthusiastic about their futures as this new Master of Architecture program continues to develop. The faculty and students genuinely respect each other with full and ready access not only during lecture and studio courses but also outside structured time.

One of the primary goals of this program is to equip students with the knowledge, understanding and desire to continue growth toward professional licensure after graduation. The curriculum is structured to result in a professional architecture degree, one of the first milestones toward the significant step of becoming a licensed architect. The team enjoyed the energy of the students as they were very positive and encouraging toward their own success. Most if not all hands went up when the question was asked, “How many of you are planning to become a licensed architect?”

While the desire to become an architect was strong, not all were entirely knowledgeable of the process. Within the realm of professional development, most of the students were aware of the necessity of taking “an examination” (the Architect Registration Examination) but knew little about it. Some of the students were aware of the Intern Development Program (IDP) but many did not know about the process of working with NCARB or had not yet set up an IDP record. When administration and faculty were questioned regarding this matter, the team was reminded that school had only been in session a few weeks and the professors and AIAS had not yet had time to present much of this information. Regardless, initial and continual encouragement should be given to all students with regard to their professional development toward future licensing.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.
2012 Team Assessment: The narrative describing Architectural Education and the Profession is found in the Architecture Program Report beginning on p. 35. The Woodbury School of Architecture has concentrated one of the program’s five tracks of mastery to professionalism, i.e., the ability to manage, argue, and act legally, ethically, and critically in society and the environment. Exposure and consideration of practice in a global economy and recognition of design’s positive impact on the environment begin in the very first semester, Fieldwork Los Angeles, and continue throughout the program. Students investigate current events and challenges and understand them in the context of relevant precedents. The cultural diversity of the students, which includes a strong international cohort, benefits both students and faculty. This diversity, unique among architecture schools, provides an extraordinary opportunity and responsibility, which the school recognizes. As a result, the global practice of architecture exists within the design studios, and the sense of the world as a shared resource is real.

The university’s transdisciplinary culture continually prepares students to practice and assume new responsibilities, as well as diverse and collaborative roles as architects working with professionals from other disciplines. The practice courses specifically explore the collaborative nature of professional practice, and many graduate electives, including the policy sequence and courses developed as Arid Lands Institute research seminars, ask students to develop transdisciplinary ways of working and designing.

Student work demonstrates respect for client expectations, which is manifest in design-based solutions responding to multiple needs with emphasis on real-life issues. Students are prepared for practices that are informed and collaborative and that build leadership. Several elements of the program tackle professionalism within the context of client relations and response/responsibility to multiple needs and diverse constituents/users—not just clients. The demands of the client, the requirements of codes, and the weight of professional responsibility to people and communities larger than the client provide a basis for thoughtful programming, site design, and form making demonstrated in thesis projects.

M. Arch. students contribute to the growth and development of the profession serving as research assistants to faculty and programs that stake out new territory for the profession, including the Arid Lands Institute and the Architecture + Civic Engagement Center. Others work with the LA Forum for Architecture and Urban Design to stimulate ongoing debate about contemporary, alternative, and/or radical architecture practices. Finally, participation in the Woodbury AIAS creates opportunities for other students and develops leadership abilities.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The narrative describing Architectural Education and the Public Good is found in the APR on pp. 36–39. The school presents the discipline of architecture “as a social art beholden to multiple stakeholders—some individual, some collective, some abstract—an art that shapes the built environment by balancing the complex processes those stakeholders engage in.” The program’s six imperatives (listed below) relative to the Public Good form a rich and complex set of conditions that engage students and faculty in healthy and vigorous debates regarding the role of the architect and architecture in society. The team found evidence of the student’s understanding of the tensions between perceived social
obligation and perceived creative autonomy as the basis of a critical and responsive pedagogy reflected in architectural proposals.

1. Active, engaged citizens responsive to a changing world.
2. Knowledge acquisition to address pressing contemporary and future challenges through design, conservation and responsible professional practice.
3. Ethical implications of decisions.
4. Reconciling differences between architect’s obligation to client and to public.
6. Commitment to professional and public service and leadership.

Evidence of these practices can be found in a number of curricular offerings, research programs, and faculty role models.

The visiting team was particularly impressed with the unique opportunity that the remarkable cultural diversity of the student body provides in differentiating and positioning the program as a leader in both defining and engaging a more multivalent definition of the public relative to the field of architecture.

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

[X] The program’s processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: The narrative describing Long-Range Planning was found in the APR on pp. 39-48. The M. Arch. program at Woodbury University has identified multiyear objectives for continuous improvement within the context of the mission and culture of the SoA, the mission and culture of the university, and the five NAAB perspectives. Data are collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform future planning and strategic decision making in the School of Architecture. The School of Architecture’s nine objectives for continuous improvement have been tied directly to the NAAB perspectives, as part of the school’s ongoing five-year plan for satisfying these objectives. An annual calendar of meetings between administrators, administrators and faculty, faculty, administrators and students, and faculty and students provides the framework for the process of identifying and addressing the nine objectives for continuous improvement. The APR has provided a comprehensive outline of their five-year plan for continuous improvement for the years 2011–2016.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

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

[X] The program's processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: The APR identified several levels of self-assessment procedures and also provided a detailed assessment plan. The program is also coordinating its self-assessment procedures with WASC and Woodbury University institutional requirements.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: Personnel policies are documented in sections describing several types of faculty positions, including full-time faculty, professor of practice, adjunct faculty, participating adjunct faculty, and graduate teaching assistants. EEO/AA policies are adequately described in Section I.1.2. Social Equity at Woodbury School of Architecture.

The team has concerns that the full-time faculty workload is too heavy for the M. Arch. program’s expectations for increased faculty research and creative work.

The School of Architecture has an IDP Education Coordinator that meets the requirements above. Faculty professional development includes support for faculty attendance at professional meetings (approx. $2,000/full-time faculty member) according to the APR page 62. Of note is APR page 52, which states: “the department pays for AIA membership for all full-time faculty who are members and request support.” This policy may partially explain the high number of AIA members on the faculty.

Woodbury does not have a tenure system. An overview of the policies used for determining rank are described on pages 61-62 of the APR and the Faculty Handbook provides detailed policies, procedures and criteria.

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

2 A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
[X] Human Resources (Students) are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that this criterion has been met. There is opportunity for students to learn outside of the studio by being engaged in professional organizations like the American Institute of Architecture Students, balanced by the strong reinforcement of a positive studio culture. Students and faculty contribute to a very strong studio culture that further enriches learning opportunities in an environment that benefits students in a profound way. Students are constantly provided excellent human resources including financial aid, admissions, and a strong advisory program that is dedicated to providing a diverse learning environment with significant opportunities to grow as referenced in student resources and established policies.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The narrative describing Administrative Structure is found on p. 74 of the Architecture Program Report prepared for the 2012 NAAB accreditation visit. The administrative organizational chart for the school was produced at the time of the team visit. The program has sufficient autonomy to meet the conditions for accreditation.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: Through discussion with administrators, faculty, and students, the team believed there are equitable opportunities to participate in governance of the program and institution. However, there is concern by the faculty that program growth will require new, more transparent equitable faculty governance models be established. The university president recognizes the importance of the School of Architecture and has created opportunities for participation in university initiatives and leadership.

I.2.3 Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The narrative describing Physical Resources is found in the APR on pp. 77–82. The team found that physical resources are adequate to support the program. However, the resources currently provided by the Title Five (PPOHA) Grant have allowed expansion and improvement of facilities and equipment imperative to the success of the new master’s program, such as the digital fabrication lab. It is essential that the university provide continued resources as noted in the APR p. 90 after the sunset of the Title Five Grant.
I.2.4 Financial Resources: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The narrative describing Financial Resources is found in the APR on pp. 83–91. Current Financial Resources are adequate to support student learning and achievement. The School of Architecture leads the university in program revenue generation. However, the university is moving toward an RCM (Responsibility Centered Management) financial structure, and the impact of this new model for the school has not yet been determined. There are financial areas of concern as the program grows and matures—see 1.3 Causes of Concern, B. Financial.

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

Further, the accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resources professionals who provide information services that teach and develop research and evaluative skills, and critical thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The team found sufficient evidence that this criterion has been met. Studios are well equipped with high-speed Internet access that allows students to virtually access all needed resources that support a professional education in the field of architecture. Information resources are also well supplemented by the university library with a librarian dedicated to the School of Architecture.
PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports. Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

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

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that this criterion has been met. The APR, pp. 103–106, provides statistical reports for all program student and faculty characteristics.

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

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

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

---

3 In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

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

2012 Team Assessment: Annual reports for 2009, 2010, and 2011 are found on the School of Architecture’s web site. Prior to 2009 there are no Annual Reports as the program did not exist.

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

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The program provides adequate evidence of faculty credentials through résumés and the faculty exhibit in the Wedge Gallery.

---

\(^4\) The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team’s ability to view and evaluate student work.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

[X] The policy documents in the team room met the requirements of Appendix 3

2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that this criterion has been met as all policy documents were provided in the NAAB visiting team room.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

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

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

A.1. Communication Skills: Ability to read, write, speak and listen effectively.
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of writing skills is found in ARCH 648 Criticism 4, in portfolios and in Criticism 3. The evidence was enough to meet the criterion, however, the student work samples were inconsistent and weak in some cases. The team attributed part of this to the cultural diversity and international character of the student body.

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

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 589 Grad Studio 4: Total Building and ARCH 692 Grad Thesis both show obvious ability to question, interpret, and reason toward relevant design conclusions. Several thesis projects demonstrate this ability step by step toward a well-thought-out final solution.
A. 3. Visual Communication Skills: Ability to use appropriate representational media, such as traditional graphic and digital technology skills, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion has been well met in a number of courses and studios throughout the graduate curriculum. Examples are: Arch 587 Graduate Studio 3: Infrastructure & Territories- site, program, spatial, circulation (flows) and infrastructure drawing analysis. Also ARCH 564 Visualization 3: Adv. Drawing and Modeling- abstract representation of drawing and modeling, case study analysis, 3D models and fabrications.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Each aspect of Technical Documentation is well demonstrated as an ability within required work of several courses. Student work from ARCH 547 Systems Integration presented well-drawn floor plans, building sections, and elevations. Models developed from the drawings illustrate the subsequent understanding of construction components and structure. Outline specifications are written and included with project work in ARCH 589 Grad Studio 4.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 575 Fieldwork: Research & Design presents student work showing how research is gathered, assessed, and applied. This ability is then used to evaluate information toward the end result of use within the design process.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Student projects completed in the required studios, Arch 587 Grad Studio 3 and Arch 589 Grad Studio 4, display the ability of students to use fundamental design skills.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: There is sufficient evidence in ARCH 664 Building 4 and in thesis prep with course ARCH 648 Criticism 4 that demonstrates the ability to examine, comprehend, and make choices about integration of precedent. Student work goes into great depth of precedent study demonstrating the ability to understand complex building systems.
A. 8. Ordering Systems Skills: Understanding of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Students are introduced to formal ordering systems in Arch 564 Visualization 3 through readings, case studies, and drawing exercises. This course has a particular focus on mapping at various scales.

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

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: There is insufficient evidence of student exposure to “examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres.” Arch 556 Criticism 3: Architecture from Modern (1945-now) is primarily focused on canonical Western modern theory and “high design,” with forays to Algiers via Corb, Brazilia, and Tokyo via the Capsule Hotel, and post-colonial theory. Arch 575 Fieldwork: Research & Design provides the opportunity for students to study one particular place and culture, but because students may elect to work in LA, Berlin, China, Tahiti, or other program locations, this course cannot fulfill SPC A.9 for every student. Crit 2 (required only for 3 yr students) has a reading on the Taj Mahal, Katsura Villa, and the Shanghai Expo Pavilions, but again nothing vernacular.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The course syllabus for Criticism 1: Fieldwork Los Angeles clearly communicates a focus on the “social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals” as students study the diverse conditions of Los Angeles as a physical laboratory. Numerous course readings are clear evidence of how students are introduced to these issues, such as Edward Soja writing on the heterotopology of “the Citadel-LA” and Dolores Hayden’s chapter on “Workers’ Landscapes and Livelihoods,” in The Power of Place. Completed student work for the Field Guide and Five Site Document assignments, such as student reports on the Watts Tower Project, Chinatown, and El Pueblo, depict an understanding of cultural diversity.


[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Understanding how research informs the design process is evidenced in ARCH 648 Criticism 4: Arch. Research Salon & Thesis Prep – in-depth topical research/theory case
study readings with student responses and critique. Also ARCH 692 Graduate Thesis Studio requires translation of research/informed hypothesis into form and building systems.

Realm A: General Team Commentary: The team found that the requirements for Critical Thinking and Representation were met in the sources identified in the APR, except for A. 9, Historical Traditions and Global Culture. Overall, student work demonstrated the ability to use a wide range of media to think about and present architecture information. Graphic and representational skills are particularly strong, but writing skills are not on par with visual communication.

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

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Preparation of a comprehensive program for the development of an architecture project is presented in ARCH 648 Criticism 4: Architecture Research Salon and Thesis Preparation. Student work shows research into site conditions and relevant laws and their effect on the final design solution. Examples of client and user needs are reviewed with the result showing an ability of this Pre-Design assessment criterion.

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

2012 Team Assessment: Many student design projects do not demonstrate the ability as described above. For instance, several projects from M. Arch. 589 Total Building Studio do not show handicapped toilet stalls, several have ramps that do not meet the slope and landing requirements, and site accessibility issues are not accommodated (e.g., no handicap parking spaces, etc.).

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 589 Graduate Studio 4: The Total Building – “Performative Building” criteria are discussed in the syllabus and demonstrated in the work through site design and orientation, and HVAC system recognition. ARCH 547 Building 4: Environmental Systems Integration – Sustainable systems are demonstrated through Ecotect modeling, wind-rose analysis, and psychometric solar analysis, building materials, and environmental wall sections of proposed building designs. There is no evidence of carbon neutral or bioclimatic design metrics.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Student projects, particularly in Arch 587 Grad Studio 3: Infrastructures & Territories, displayed clear ability in responding to diverse site characteristics in their project design.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH547 - Building 4: Readings and lectures cover life safety topics, including design for fire resistance sources of ignition, products of combustion, objectives of fire safety, protection of life which concentrates on egress, protection of property, smoke control, and sprinkler and other fire suppression systems, etc. Assignments provide egress diagrams including handicap exiting. Ability is shown on particular drawings for Building Systems Project Documentation. ARCH589 – Studio 4 focuses on basic principles of life safety with an emphasis on egress. ARCH691 – Studio 5 provides additional assignments utilizing case studies of selected existing buildings that include life safety and egress narratives and diagrams.

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   B.2. Accessibility
A.5. Investigative Skills      B.4. Site Design

B.5. Life Safety

[X] Met
2012 Team Assessment: Student projects in the paired Arch 589 Total Building Studio and Arch 547 Building 4 courses demonstrate the ability to produce a comprehensive architecture project that integrates the SPC components criteria. SPCs A.9 and B2 are lacking from this comprehensive overview but other components make up the difference to the level of ability.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 620 Practice 1 lectures and handouts provide (a) good fundamental knowledge of the business of architecture, (b) terminology and methodology to understand business plans, including profit planning, staffing and revenue projections as well as project planning and monitoring, and (c) construction cost estimating with life-cycle analysis.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of understanding of Environmental Systems is found in the two courses listed below. ARCH 589 Graduate Studio 4: The Total Building provides evidence of understanding with some ability in both passive and active environmental systems relative to solar orientation/daylighting, mechanical rooms, ductwork, and ventilation/operable fenestration. Readings in ARCH 547 Building 4: Environmental Systems cover HVAC, lighting, acoustics—the expectations of the topic.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence is found in ARCH 546 Building 3 that demonstrates a clear understanding of structural systems.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence is found in ARCH 547 Building 4 and ARCH 589 Graduate Studio 4 that demonstrates the ability to understand and communicate various building envelope systems. The full-scale drawings seen in ARCH 544 Building 1 also clearly demonstrate ability to intimately communicate the vast array of assemblies within the building envelope. While the precedent studies demonstrate an understanding of how moisture transfer and durability work, it is not clear in student work that envelope systems respond to these components.
B. 11. Building Service Systems Integration: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Lectures, handouts, and readings in ARCH547 Building 4 provide the basic principles, application, and performance of the required building systems. Multiweek assignments provide an understanding of building service systems: (1) through case studies of significant buildings, which a student must research/document, construct a 3-D digital model with systems analysis diagrams, and present findings in a graphic (Revit) format, and 2) complete a similar assignment on their current studio project.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence is found in ARCH 547 Building 4 as well as ARCH 589 Studio 4 that shows a clear understanding of building materials and assemblies. Through readings, course work, and studio projects, students are exposed not only to conventional materials and assemblies but also to innovative exploration through sustainable programs like LEED and modern advancements in building science.

Realm B: General Team Commentary: The team found that the requirements for Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge were met in the sources identified in the APR, except for SPC B.2. Accessibility. Graphic Presentation with well-prepared components was clearly part of studio work and understanding. All of the SPCs in this realm (with the exception of Accessibility) were found in course work and project presentations.

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

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

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

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: Presently, there is evidence of collaboration among architecture students; however, there is little to no evidence that multidisciplinary collaboration is happening or available to
students. This multidisciplinary collaboration is necessary for students to understand the coordination needed to combine all the components together for a complete project.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** Evidence found in ARCH 648 Criticism 4 demonstrates an understanding of human behavior through course work readings and student writing assignments.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** ARCH 620–Practice 1: Lectures, readings and handouts provide (a) good fundamental knowledge of the relationship between owner and architect and (b) the architect’s responsibilities to the users and the greater public/community. Homework assignments engage students in scenarios for predesign tasks toward thesis project development.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** ARCH 620–Practice 1: Lectures, readings, and handouts on the profession, practice, project/process management, and project delivery (traditional and alternative) provide an understanding of the management of a project and one’s role as a project manager.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** ARCH 620 –Practice 1: Lectures, readings, and handouts on practice management, firm operations, financial and risk management provide a fundamental understanding of the management of an architecture practice. One particular assignment, “Designing a Practice,” required students to consider all aspects of planning and initiating an architecture practice. See also B.7 Financial Considerations above.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** Understanding of leadership is evident in more than one course in the program, but it is most clearly articulated in ARCH 620 Practice 1.
C. 7. Legal Responsibilities: Understanding of the architect’s responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Some of the components of this SPC are presented in ARCH 620 Practice 1 in the form of AIA Documents, written local ordinances along with copies of local and national building codes. While limited information on historic preservation and accessibility laws was found, this criterion is met to the level of understanding.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 648 Criticism 4: Numerous readings provide an understanding of the ethical issues an architect may encounter through literal, philosophical, and real-life examples. Assignments, including thesis statements, provide representation of a student’s professional judgment of the social, political, and social aspects and responsibilities encountered in architecture design and practice.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found that this criterion was met in ARCH 554 Criticism 1 through examples of readings and student fieldwork that looks at Los Angeles and the fabric of communities and public architecture. While students explore communities across the globe in the fieldwork studio, emphasis on social responsibility and community was not as prevalent as was found in ARCH 554 Criticism 1.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The team found that the requirements for Realm C–Leadership and Practice were met in the sources identified in the APR, except for SPC C.1: Collaboration. Specifically, there was little evidence of “multidisciplinary teams successfully completing design projects,” ARCH 620 Practice 1 provides a good foundation in many of the leadership and practice issues, while ARCH 575 Graduate Studio 5 and ARCH 692 Graduate Thesis Studio provide opportunity to synthesize many of the performance criteria into students’ research and design.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The Architecture Program Report prepared for the 2012 NAAB accreditation visit contains a letter certifying current accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). This can be found on p. 272.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The team found this condition has been met. The degree for which accreditation is under consideration is appropriately titled M. Arch. (Master of Architecture) requiring 168 credit hours. Credit hours are broken down with 93 graduate credit hours for the 3-year M. Arch. program and 63 graduate credit hours for the 2-year M. Arch. program. Both programs have 12 elective credit hours and 45 general studies credit hours.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The APR pp.115-116 describes the process by which the curriculum is evaluated and modified.
PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The APR, p.116, describes the process by which preparatory and preprofessional education is evaluated.

Evaluation of student’s preparatory/preprofessional education for the 3-year Master of Architecture program is based upon portfolio review. There is no case in which a student is exempt from demonstrating mastery of an SPC based upon their preparatory work. The 2-year Master of Architecture program admission is similarly evaluated by reviewing the applicant’s undergraduate degree transcripts and portfolio. Each transcript is reviewed to ensure the student has completed at least 45 units of general study (non-architectural) course work and at least 40 units of professional (architectural) course work. The program does not grant advanced placement status based upon previous undergraduate work. In addition to the above, international students whose first language is not English must demonstrate English language proficiency in the form of TOFEL or IELTS scores.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The exact language of the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5, was found on the school's web site, in catalogs, and in promotional material.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:

- The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
- The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and the most recent version of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation are available on the schools web site through a link to the NAAB web site.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:

- www.ArchCareers.org
- The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
- Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
- The Emerging Professional’s Companion
- www.NCARB.org
- www.aia.org
- www.aias.org
- www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The career development information listed above is available through a number of links on the school’s web site.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs
In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:

- All Annual Reports, including the narrative
- All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
- The final decision letter from the NAAB
The most recent APR
The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Public access to Architectural Program Reports (APRs) and Visiting Team Reports (VTRs) is available on the school's web site.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The Woodbury University School of Architecture makes this information available to the public via a link on its web site’s accreditation page at http://architecture.woodbury.edu/accreditation. However, since this new M. Arch. program has only graduated two classes (2011 and 2012) and is not NAAB accredited, these graduates are not eligible to take the ARE. Thus, there are no ARE Pass Rates for these M. Arch students. Since Woodbury’s ARE pass rates are shown for its B. Arch. graduates, Woodbury is encouraged to make this link easily accessible to prospective students and their parents.
III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

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

A. History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)

Reference Woodbury University, APR, pp 6-10.

B. History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)

Reference Woodbury University, APR, pp. 11-17.

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference Woodbury University, APR, pp. 39-48.

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference Woodbury University, APR, pp. 48-51.
2. **Conditions Met with Distinction**

A. **Student Performance Criteria:**
   SPC A.3 Visual Communication  
   SPC B.4 Site Design

B. **Student Diversity**
The team was continually impressed and has made comments throughout this report regarding the diversity of the students. Ethnic, economic, social, and gender diversity are extended to the full breadth of international society. This provides the learning atmosphere and environment needed for a well-rounded education and global architecture practice.

C. **Students, Faculty and Administration**
This NAAB visiting team again expresses how impressed we were with the students in this architecture program. The student leaders were well spoken and each student with whom we met was well directed in his/her educational goals while expressing excitement for this new M. Arch. program. Students spoke very highly of the faculty not only in their role as instructors but also as professionals and mentors. The availability and access to faculty and administration by the students was mentioned several times and was certainly deemed a point of distinction.
3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the NCARB
Dennis B. Patten, AIA
P.C. Architects, Inc.
301 E Tabernacle #206
St. George, UT 84770
(435) 673-6579
(435) 673-3350 fax
dbpatten@infowest.com

Representing the AIA Ronald
J. Battaglia, FAIA Flynn
Battaglia Architects, PC
617 Main Street, Suite S401
Buffalo, NY 14203-1400
(716) 854-2424
(716) 854-2428 fax
rbattaglia@flynnbattaglia.com

Representing the AIAS
Nicholas A. Mancusi, Past President
260 South Reynolds Street
Apartment 808
Alexandria, VA 22304
(603) 401-1548 mobile
nickmancusi@aias.org

Representing the ACSA
Phoebe A. Crisman, AIA
Professor
School of Architecture
University of Virginia
Campbell Hall
Charlottesville, VA 22904
(434) 924-1006
crisman@virginia.edu

Non-voting member
Darren Petrucci, AIA
Full Professor
The Design School
Herberger Institute for Design and The Arts
Arizona State University
(480) 329-1888 (mobile)
darren.petrucci@asu.edu
Catalog, Student Handbook, and Faculty Handbook URLs

**Undergraduate Catalog and Graduate Bulletin 2014-15**  
http://woodbury.edu/calendar-catalogs/

**Student Handbook (currently under revision)**  
http://my.woodbury.edu/Students/Documents/Student%20Handbooks/11-12%20student%20handbook.pdf

**Faculty Handbook**  
http://my.woodbury.edu/Faculty/Documents/Faculty%20Handbook/Faculty%20Handbook%20section%20C%20personnel%20August%202013%20update.pdf
Offsite Campus Questionnaire

Name of Institution:
The Name of the Institution is Woodbury University School of Architecture.

Title of Degree:
The NAAB accredited degrees offered in San Diego are MArch and BArch.

Name of Program Administrator:
Norman Millar, AIA is the dean of the School of Architecture at Woodbury University, LA, and San Diego, and Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, AIA is the Associate Dean.

Name of Person Completing this Form:
The person who completed this form is Norman Millar, AIA, Dean of Architecture.

Location of Additional Site:
The location of the San Diego Campus is 2212 Main Street, San Diego, CA 92113.

Distance from Main/Flagship Campus:
The Distance from the LA campus to the San Diego campus is 136.22 miles.

Number of Courses from Curriculum Leading to a NAAB-Accredited Degree Offered at this site:
All courses of both the MArch and BArch curricula are offered in San Diego.

Is attendance at the additional site required for completion of the NAAB-accredited degree program?
Attendance is required at either the campus in San Diego or at the Los Angeles for completion of the NAAB-accredited programs. Students enrolled in the programs can choose to attend at either location.

Who has administrative responsibility for the program at the branch campus?
The San Diego chair of architecture is Catherine Herbst, AIA.

To whom does this individual report?
Catherine Herbst reports to Norman Millar, as does Marc Neveu, the LA chair of architecture.

Where are financial decisions made?
Day to day operational decisions are made in San Diego, with approval of the dean. Larger financial and budgetary decisions are made in LA by the dean, provost or president’s cabinet.

Who has responsibility for hiring faculty?
The dean and provost are responsible for hiring full-time faculty, while the San Diego chair of architecture is responsible for hiring adjunct faculty with dean approval.

Who has responsibility for rank, tenure, and promotion of faculty at the branch campus?
The university personnel committee (which may or may not have a San Diego member) has the responsibility for rank and promotion of all Woodbury full-time faculty.

Does the branch campus have its own curriculum committee?
There is only one university wide curriculum committee which may or may not have a San Diego member. The San Diego chair sits on the SOA curriculum work group along with the associate dean, the other SoA chairs and program coordinators.

Does the branch campus have its own admissions committee?
There is a single graduate admissions committee, but we don’t really have an undergraduate committee. However all SoA undergraduates are admitted by the admissions office staff under the same policies.

Does the branch campus have its own grievance committee?
Faculty, student development, and human resources grievance committees are ad hoc and university-wide.

Does the branch campus have its own resources for faculty research and scholarship?
There is only one university-wide Faculty Development Committee which may or may not have a San Diego member.
Does the branch campus have its own AIAS or NOMAS chapter?
   We currently have separate LA and San Diego branches because AIAS won't permit us to have presidents at both locations.

Does the branch campus maintain its own membership in ACSA?
   The School of Architecture LA/San Diego shares one ACSA membership.
Woodbury’s School of Architecture is committed to an architectural education that is radically transformative of ourselves, our profession, and our surroundings. — Generated by the students and faculty of Woodbury’s School of Architecture, the following studio culture policy outlines standards of conduct for both students and faculty.

Manifesto for STUDIO CULTURE at Woodbury School of Architecture*

CRITICAL THINKING : DESIGN : BUILDING : REPRESENTATION : PROFESSIONALISM

BE OPEN, HONEST, CRITICAL, AND PASSIONATE
Exchange ideas to foster the richest possible constructive dialog. There is no place for hostile criticism. Collaborate, mentor and lead by seeking, encouraging and engaging in faculty-student collaborations. Students help shape the life of the school; speak and develop your voice. Mutually evaluate your colleagues and your mentors. Reciprocate a challenging and supportive critique to maintain a standard of rigor and excellence. Student-faculty evaluations are strictly confidential. Maintain academic honesty and integrity.

ARTICULATE A CRITICAL DESIGN INTENT AND REALIZE IT
Expose yourself to critical differences as they provide alternative methods and viewpoints that are essential to diversity. Find balance in criticality and practicality to support continued growth. Continually emphasize the development of design skills and concepts. Cultivate curiosity and take full advantage of the cultural and natural resources available. Explore, discover, and engage yourself in the city; these activities are essential to the critical practice of architecture.

RESPECT THE STUDIO ENVIRONMENT AND BE PROFESSIONAL
Manage time and workloads strategically. Show up on time to maximize the value of the studio environment, although studio does not stop when the class does. Value and respect your non-studio academic obligations. Maintain a creative and collegial environment to optimize the quality of your resources. Maintain your health and manage your stress levels. The studio environment can be intense and stressful. Maintain your physical, mental, and spiritual health. Be aware of your resources for preventing and relieving stress. Physical exercise and time spent outdoors are effective to boost mood, gain perspective and ward off stress. Maintain an environment where safety comes first. Respect all safety rules as dictated by SHOP on campus. Practice safe techniques of cutting, gluing, pouring, etc. Share knowledge of best safety practices with your colleagues. Be aware of the locations for first aid kits, health services, and nearby emergency rooms. Only use first aid kit items for medical uses. Engage in studio pin-ups as they expose you to an ethos of constructive and respectful criticism. Maintain studio etiquette. Share the learning and working environment equally with an ethos of collegiality and professionalism - it is conducive to instruction, study, and production. Display a courteous comportment with respect to the gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and religion of others.

Implementation, Enforcement, and Revision

At the all-school meeting each semester, faculty and students agree to support and maintain studio culture. The policy is posted in each studio and appears in every studio syllabus. By agreeing to engage in studio, each participant agrees to adhere to these guidelines.

Breaches of studio culture policy may be addressed in a variety of ways. Students and instructors should communicate early and openly with each other about perceived infractions. Studio culture concerns can be taken to the American Institute of Architecture Students – Woodbury Chapter (AIAS-WU) for discussion and recommended action. The officers of the AIAS-WU are expected to bring recommendation to the faculty meeting for discussion and/or action in emending or enforcing the studio culture.

At the conclusion of each academic year, faculty and representatives of the AIAS-WU will review and revise the studio culture policy as necessary. The revision will then be presented, distributed, discussed, and signed at the start of the following academic year.

This updated policy was approved by the faculty and AIAS-WU on ________

*Exposure to critical differences encourage the exchange of ideas that highlight constructive, respectful, and creative environments.

Implementation, Enforcement, and Revision

At the all-school meeting each semester, faculty and students agree to support and maintain studio culture. The policy is posted in each studio and appears in every studio syllabus. By agreeing to engage in studio, each participant agrees to adhere to these guidelines.

Breaches of studio culture policy may be addressed in a variety of ways. Students and instructors should communicate early and openly with each other about perceived infractions. Studio culture concerns can be taken to the American Institute of Architecture Students – Woodbury Chapter (AIAS-WU) for discussion and recommended action. The officers of the AIAS-WU are expected to bring recommendation to the faculty meeting for discussion and/or action in emending or enforcing the studio culture.

At the conclusion of each academic year, faculty and representatives of the AIAS-WU will review and revise the studio culture policy as necessary. The revision will then be presented, distributed, discussed, and signed at the start of the following academic year.

This updated policy was approved by the faculty and AIAS-WU on ________
Technical Details supporting STUDIO CULTURE at Woodbury School of Architecture

Woodbury offers a variety of co-curricular activities and a proximity to urban life, parks and hiking trails. The Office of Student Development (OSD) exists to support the academic and personal development of students.

Early Alert messages can be discretely sent to the Director of Academic Advising (818.252.5129).

Counseling Center, located in the Whitten Center of the Burbank Campus, provides free counseling to any currently enrolled Woodbury student. The center offers a variety of counseling, workshops, and support groups. Consultations about emotional and mental health as well as referrals to specialized mental health services are available. To access Woodbury’s Online Screening for Depression, Anxiety, Alcohol, and Eating, go to www.mentalhealthscreening.org/screening/welcome.asp (keyword: Woodbury). This service is anonymous and is connected with local resources for treatment. For more information, contact Monica Valdivia (818.252.5237, monica.valdivia@woodbury.edu, or www.woodbury.edu under current students, health and counseling). If urgent, ask the campus operator to page her.

Emergencies exhibiting extreme emotional distress indicating that an urgent intervention is necessary, call: 9-1-1

- Campus Security (Burbank - 818.767.0888, ext 208 or 414; c. 818.355.8026, ext. 414; c. 818.355.5023) (San Diego 619.235.2900, ext. 205)
- Psychiatric Model 24 hour Response Team (LA – 800.854.7771) (San Diego – 800.479.3339)
- OSD – Anne Ehrlich, Dean of Students (818.252.5252) or Phyllis Cremer, AVP of Student Development (818.252.5254)
- Health Services – Mikhail Lyubarev, MSN, ANP, OEHN – 818.252.5238 - Monday-Friday, 8 a.m.-4:30 p.m.; lunch 12:30-1 p.m.

Guidelines for maintaining a safe and productive work environment

- 18” minimum of clear space in front of all electrical panels.
- 3’-8” minimum aisles that are ADA accessible.
- 4’-0” maximum height of dividers or partitions, although are strongly discouraged.
- 1 computer storage cabinet per student.
- No excess/unauthorized equipment should be stored in studio.
- No overhead structures or power tools in studio.
- Studios are not to be used as a primary residence.
- No beds, clothing storage units, and other domestic furnishings in studio.
- No cooking.
- No music/acoustic distractions during class time. Maintain courteous sound levels during non-class hours.
- Do not take/use the property of others without permission, including studio space and desk.
- No drinking or illegal substances in studio.
- Exterior doors are to be kept closed.
- Studio keys/codes are not to be duplicated/shared.
- Students are responsible for cleaning out work spaces by the end of the semester. Anything left in studio will be disposed of.
Agreement

Please indicate your agreement to adhere to the above policies and guidelines by signing below and returning this signed statement to your instructor.

Student name/Faculty name: ____________________________________________________________

Course/Section number: ______________________________________________________________

Signature: _________________________________________________________________________

Date: ____________________________________________________________________________
Woodbury University Architecture School Complex

Classroom / Laboratory
a  A101: Seminar Classroom
b  A111: Computer Laboratory
c  A103: Computer Laboratory
d  A107: Physics Laboratory

Forum / Gallery
1  Ahmanson Main Space (Gallery and Lecture Hall)
2  Wedge Gallery
3-4 Architecture School Building First and Second Floor Galleries

Other
A  Making Complex: Digital Fabrication Laboratory
B  Making Complex: Wood Shop
C  Making Complex: New Metal Shop (Coming in Fall 2014)

Studio
1-2  Studio (First and Second Floor) for Upper-Level B.Arch Students and Graduate Students
3  Studio for Mid-Level B.Arch Students
4-8  Studio for Foundation-Level B.Arch Students
Isaacs Faculty Center

Forum / Gallery
1 Kirkendall Conference Room
2 Nielsen Conference Room
3 Faculty Annex Conference Room

Office
1 School of Architecture Reception
2 Dean Norman Millar
3 Andrea Dietz, Graduate Program Activity Coordinator & Curriculum Specialist
4 Catherine Roussel, Outreach Coordinator
5 Jesse Brink, Director of Communications
6 Jeanine Centuori, Full Time Faculty
7 Mark Neveu, Architecture Chair
8 Ingalill Wahlroos-Ritter, Associate Dean
9 Gerard Smulevich, Full Time Faculty
10 Eric Olsen, Full Time Faculty
11 Dr. Paulette Singley, Full Time Faculty
12 Joshua Stein, Full Time Faculty
13 Anthony Fontenot, Full Time Faculty
14 Christoph Korner, Interior Architecture Chair
15 Annie Chu, Full Time Faculty
16 Linda Taalman, Full Time Faculty
17 Dr. Ewan Branda, Undergraduate Coordinator, Architecture
18 Mark Ericson, Graduate Coordinator, Architecture
19 Hadley Arnold and Peter Arnold, ALI
20 Dr. Emily Bills, Julius Shulman Institute
21 Maxi Spina, Full Time Faculty
22 Matthew Gillis, Full Time Faculty
23 Heather Peterson, Full Time Faculty
24 Kristin King, Full Time Faculty
The School of Business

Forum / Gallery
1 Fletcher Jones Auditorium
2 Bowman Conference Room

Office
1 Ed Ogosta, Visiting Position
2 Vincent Blocker, University Relations
3 Berenika Boberska, Professor of Practice
Louis Molina, Participating Adjunct
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Purpose/Destination</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Development Travel 2008-2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Owen</td>
<td>AIDP 3D Max training at Autodesk University</td>
<td>August 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Roberts</td>
<td>Revit Software training at CADlearning</td>
<td>September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Horles</td>
<td>Attending the CLEA USA Conference in Costa Rica with Woodbury students</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Smulevich</td>
<td>Attending the CLEA USA Conference in Costa Rica with Woodbury students</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Daleiden</td>
<td>Presenting at the College Art Association Conference</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Liptak</td>
<td>Presenting at the National Conference on the Beginning Design Student at LSU in Baton Rouge, LA</td>
<td>March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Smulevich</td>
<td>Receiving the ACSA Steel Competition 2008 Award at the ACSA Conference in Portland</td>
<td>March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Acting as juror at thesis reviews at ASU in Phoenix</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanine Centuori</td>
<td>Attending the Public Art Network Conference</td>
<td>June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Development Travel 2009-2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Owen</td>
<td>Revit and 3D Max Design training at GRM, Inc.</td>
<td>July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanine Centuori</td>
<td>Receiving AIACC Design Award at the Monterey Design Conference</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Attending a California Architectural Foundation Board of Regents Meeting in Pacific Grove, CA</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Horles</td>
<td>Attending the CLEA USA Conference in Costa Rica with Woodbury students</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Horles</td>
<td>Attending a conference in Buenos Aires, Argentina</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Smulevich</td>
<td>Serving as juror with University of Buenos Aires, School of Architecture and Urban Design</td>
<td>Oct-Nov 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Administrators Conference in St. Louis</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Owen</td>
<td>Attending an Autodesk University Conference in Las Vegas</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingall Wahroos-Ritter</td>
<td>Delivering a paper, &quot;Archipelago Construct,&quot; at international conference on Arts and Humanities in Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Serving as AIAJS Design Award juror in Fresno, CA</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Liptak</td>
<td>Giving a weeklong workshop for Design Bridge at University of Oregon, Eugene</td>
<td>February 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingall Wahroos-Ritter</td>
<td>Delivering a paper, &quot;Archipelago Construct,&quot; at ACSA conference at Tulane U in New Orleans</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Smulevich</td>
<td>Receiving the ACSA Steel Competition 2009 Award at the ACSA Conference in New Orleans</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Horles</td>
<td>Scouting visit for Summer Studio in Colombia</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Serving as juror for final reviews at ASU, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Development Travel 2010-2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximiliano Spina</td>
<td>Attending a SIGGRAPH 2010 Conference in LA</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Fontenot</td>
<td>Presenting at the International Conference &quot;Deltas in Times of Climate Change,&quot; Rotterdam, the Netherlands</td>
<td>Sept.-Oct. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Administrators' Conference in Washington, DC</td>
<td>November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingall Wahroos-Ritter</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Administrators' Conference in Washington, DC</td>
<td>November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Herbst</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Administrators' Conference in Washington, DC</td>
<td>November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Owen</td>
<td>Attending Autodesk University Conference in Las Vegas</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Visiting University of Darmstadt, Germany</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Herbst</td>
<td>Visiting University of Darmstadt, Germany</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela Deutsch</td>
<td>Visiting University of Darmstadt, Germany</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Attending AAACC Educational Summit Committee meeting</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Fontenot</td>
<td>Lecturing at the Getty Center for the Spring Lecture Series</td>
<td>February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Roberts</td>
<td>Presenting paper at ACSA National Conf in Quebec</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Visiting Woodbury program in Rome, Italy</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Dietz</td>
<td>Visiting Woodbury grad program in Rome, Italy</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Smulevich</td>
<td>Surveying study-abroad locations in Rome, Italy, and Berlin, Germany, for ADA access conditions</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>Serving as midterm review juror at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>Co-directing workshop at RMIT Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, Australia</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Fontenot</td>
<td>Presenting in the &quot;What is Design?&quot; symposium at the Storefront for Art and Architecture, NYC</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koje Shoraka</td>
<td>Attending AIASC Educators' Conference in New York</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Development Travel 2011-2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Fontenot</td>
<td>Presenting at Guangju Bienalle International Curator Course</td>
<td>August 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Molina</td>
<td>Representing Woodbury at Excellence in Action Alass Workshop, Washington, DC</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingall Wahroos-Ritter</td>
<td>Moderating a panel at ACADIA Conference in Banff, Canada</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Participating in Deans Forum, Palo Alto, CA</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Olsen</td>
<td>Presenting at the ACSA National Fall Conference, Houston, TX</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Chu</td>
<td>Attending/blogging in AIAACC Monterey Design Conference</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Chu</td>
<td>Serving as juror for the National AIA Institute Honor Awards</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Chu</td>
<td>Serving as juror &amp; presenter of the AIA/LA Cultural Affairs Commission Design Awards</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Owen</td>
<td>Attending Autodesk University Conference in Las Vegas</td>
<td>November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Attending AIA/CC 2011 Arch. Education Summit, San Francisco</td>
<td>November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Chu</td>
<td>Lecturing at Cal Poly Obispo as part of the 2011-2012 Hearst Lecture Series</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Chu</td>
<td>Lecturing at Kansas State University</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Taalman</td>
<td>Visiting Lecturer and Professor, CEPT University School of Architecture, Ahmedabad, India, Diagrammatica / Emerging Water Technologies: Soft Infrastructure / Prefabricated Building Systems</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Conference in Boston, MA</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingall Wahroos-Ritter</td>
<td>Moderating a panel at ACSA Conference in Boston, MA</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanine Centuori</td>
<td>Presenting at ACSA Conference in Boston, MA</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>Presenting at UABC Autonamus University of Baja California , Tijuana Mexico</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Participating in the Nat Owings Jury as a CAF repres. , Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Board Meeting in Washington, DC</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Board Meeting in Washington, DC</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Name</td>
<td>Purpose/Destination</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faculty Development Travel 2012-13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Consulting on M.Arch. program launching at KCAD, Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingall Wahnoos-Ritter</td>
<td>Presenting at ACADIA Conference in San Francisco</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>serving as final review Juror at UDG University of Guadalajara, Guadalajara Mexico</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Taalman</td>
<td>Participated as lecturer/panelist, University of Buffalo, Beyond Patronage Symposium, Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingall Wahnoos-Ritter</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Administrators Conference in Austin, TX</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Administrators Conference in Austin, TX</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Herbst</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Administrators Conference in Austin, TX</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>Receiving the 60th PIA Progressive Architecture award, New York, NY</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Taalman</td>
<td>Visiting lecturer, Ecole National Superieure de Versailles (ENSA-V), Sustainable Architecture in Paris</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Owen</td>
<td>Attending Tex Fab Conference in U of Texas @ Arlington</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Gambetta</td>
<td>Presenting at ACSA National Conference in San Francisco</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxi Spina</td>
<td>Presenting at ACSA National Conference in San Francisco</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Stein</td>
<td>Presenting a project at ACSA National Conference in San Francisco</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Gambetta</td>
<td>Chairing a panel at the Architectural Historians Annual Meeting in Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>Attending diploma course &quot;Developing Social Housing Projects&quot; at Erasmus University, in Rotterdam Holland</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Taalman</td>
<td>Presenting at OCAD University, Urban Ecologies, Tapping into Urban Water, Soft Infrastructure/Wet City: Reconstructing Los Angeles with water, Toronto, CA</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Gambetta</td>
<td>Doing archival research in New York, Boston, London for Visiting Fellowship</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faculty Development Travel 2013-14</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ericson</td>
<td>Presenting at ACADIA Conference in Waterloo, Canada</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Attending the Large Firm Round Table with Deans, Chicago</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingall Wahnoos-Ritter</td>
<td>Presenting Nick's paper and moderating a panel at the ACSA Conference in Ft. Lauderdale</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingall Wahnoos-Ritter</td>
<td>Serving as juror for Spark Awards in San Francisco</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Chu</td>
<td>Attending AIA Women's Leadership Summit, Phoenix</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>Lecturing at Mesa College as part of their 2013-2014 Lecture Series</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>Receiving the XXI CEMEX award, Mexico City, Mexico</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>Speaking at TEDX ZonaRío, Tijuana Mexico</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Annual Administrators Conference RISD</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingall Wahnoos-Ritter</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Annual Administrators Conference RISD</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxi Spina</td>
<td>Presenting paper at TxA Interactive Conference in Fort Worth, TX</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Fontenot</td>
<td>Lecturing at the &quot;Everyday Modernism in the California Landscape&quot; Conference, Los Angeles</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Chu</td>
<td>Serving as juror for ASU's Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts, Annual Design Excellence</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faculty Development Travel 2014-15</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulie Singley</td>
<td>Attending ACSA Board meeting as a new JAE Board member</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenika Boberska</td>
<td>Presenting at Mediated City Conference in Los Angeles</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ericson</td>
<td>Presenting at ACADIA Conference at USC</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>Lecturing at Universidad San Francisco, Quito, Ecuador</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>Receiving the IX BIAU award, Rosario, Argentina</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Banyasz, Bojana</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Boberska, Berenika</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Catellon, Teagan</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Centuori, Jeanine</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Centuori, Jeanine</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Cusma, Donatella</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Diaz, Brian</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Ericson, Mark</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Gambetta, Curt</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Herbst, Catherine</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Herbst, Catherine</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>King, Jason</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Ramirez, Ramon</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Richmond, Deborah</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Rienhardt, Todd</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Smith, Ted</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Smith, Ted</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Spina, Maxi</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Spina, Maxi</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Stein, Joshua</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Talley, Barry</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Ward, Sonny</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Ward, Sonny</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Boberska, Berenika</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Gambetta, Curt</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Richmond, Deborah</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Stein, Joshua</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Astian, Gevork</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Arnold, Hadley &amp; Peter</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Arnold, Hadley &amp; Peter</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Arnold, Hadley &amp; Peter</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Arnold, Hadley &amp; Peter</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Balyani, Hovannes</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Benson, Shawn</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Boghrobian, Wana</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Bonner, Jennifer</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Centuori, Jeanine / ACE</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Claudio, Monica</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Clementi, Frank</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Clementi, Frank</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Clementi, Frank</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Clementi, Frank</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Clementi, Frank</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Colmenares, Gabriela</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Colmenares, Gabriela</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Colmenares, Gabriela</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Diaz, Brian</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Diaz, Brian</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Gillis, Matthew</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Hughes, Casey</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Hunkler, Emily</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Iwazaki, Miki</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Kerr, Robert</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Kerr, Robert</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Kornr, Christoph</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Kornr, Christoph</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Kornr, Christoph</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Kornr, Christoph</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Kornr, Christoph</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Lam, Sunny</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Lee, Phong</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Legon-Talamoni, Sergio</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Lopes Angel, Cesia</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Maroquin, Byron</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Owens, Justin</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Peralta, Rene</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Perez, Hector</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Perez, Hector</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Pope, Jennifer</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Rincon, Bryan</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Roschen, Bill</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Sahagun-Soto, Esther</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Sanchez-Prieto, Marcel</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Sanchez-Prieto, Marcel</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Sanchez-Prieto, Marcel</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Segal, Jonathan</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Segal, Jonathan</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Segal, Jonathan</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Segal, Jonathan</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Shaver, Scott</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Siqina, Jose</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Solana, Michael</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Solana, Mike</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Souza, Tyler</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Spina, Maxi</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Tapia, Joseph I. Ruiz</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Tenette, Dominic</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Toller, Craig</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Vargas, Sal</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Yoon, Janet</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Yoon, Janet</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Shokir, Ahmed</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Arnt Wolf</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Brand, Ewan</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ericson, Mark</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Fontenot, Anthony</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Mike Solona</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Roschen, Bill</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Wahroos-Ritter, Ingall / Amit Wolf (WUHO)</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty and Student Awards, 2014**

<p>| 2014 | Abdalla Almula    | Student           | Faculty Choice Award                                                   | Internal          |
| 2014 | Abel Zatarain     | Student           | The Nielsen Study Away Scholarship, Bachelor of Architecture program    | Internal          |
| 2014 | Abel Zatarain     | Student           | Nielsen Award for Study Away                                           | Internal          |
| 2014 | Agnes Nakiganda   | Student           | Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Master of Architecture        | Internal          |
| 2014 | Agnes Nakiganda   | Student           | Thesis Award                                                            | Internal          |
| 2014 | Amanda Clay       | Student           | Ward-Lombardo Architecture and Civic Engagement (ACE) Center Scholarship Award | Internal          |
| 2014 | An Ho             | Student           | Thesis Award                                                            | Internal          |
| 2014 | Anali Gharkhani   | Student           | AIA/SFV American Architectural Foundation Scholarship                  | External          |
| 2014 | Anali Gharkhani   | Student           | School of Architecture Student Service Award, Master of Architecture program | Internal          |
| 2014 | Andrew Wagner     | Student           | Highest Studio GPA Award                                                | Internal          |
| 2014 | Azadeh Sadrieh    | Student           | Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Master of Architecture        | Internal          |
| 2014 | Bernardo Rubio-Gonzalez | Student | Best Master of Architecture Portfolio Award                              | Internal          |
| 2014 | Brian Diaz        | Student           | AIA/SFV George G. Terapati AIA Memorial Scholarship Award               | External          |
| 2014 | Brian Diaz        | Student           | Degree Project Awards                                                   | Internal          |
| 2014 | Brian Diaz        | Student           | Highest Studio GPA Award                                                | Internal          |
| 2014 | Brian Diaz        | Student           | AIA Henry Adams Medal and Certificate, Bachelor of Architecture program | External          |
| 2014 | Bryan Rincon      | Student           | AIA/SFV American Architectural Foundation Scholarship                  | External          |
| 2014 | Byron Maroquin    | Student           | 2013 ACSA/AISC Steel Design Student Competition: Open Category, First Place | External          |
| 2014 | Conner MacPhee    | Student           | Frankel Award                                                           | Internal          |
| 2014 | Conner MacPhee    | Student           | AIA Henry Adams Certificate, Master of Architecture program            | External          |
| 2014 | Cordell Sheppard   | Student           | AIA/SFV American Architectural Foundation Scholarship                  | External          |
| 2014 | Cory Bitting      | Student           | Fourth Year Outstanding Student Award                                   | Internal          |
| 2014 | Craig Toller      | Student           | AIA/SFV American Architectural Foundation Scholarship                  | External          |
| 2014 | Crystal Tan       | Student           | 2013 Association for Women in Architecture Foundation (AWAF) Scholarship Award | External          |
| 2014 | Crystal Tan       | Student           | The Nielsen Study Away Scholarship, Master of Architecture program      | Internal          |
| 2014 | Crystal Tan       | Student           | Nielsen Award for Study Away                                           | Internal          |
| 2014 | Daniela Angelo    | Student           | The Nielsen Study Away Scholarship, Bachelor of Architecture program    | Internal          |
| 2014 | Daniela Angelo    | Student           | Nielsen Award for Study Away                                           | Internal          |
| 2014 | Denisse Alejandro | Student           | The Nielsen Study Away Scholarship, Bachelor of Architecture program    | Internal          |
| 2014 | Denisse Alejandro | Student           | Nielsen Award for Study Away                                           | Internal          |
| 2014 | Diana Barash      | Student           | The Nielsen Study Away Scholarship, Master of Architecture program      | Internal          |
| 2014 | Diana Barash      | Student           | Nielsen Award for Study Away                                           | Internal          |
| 2014 | Dominie Tenette   | Student           | 2013 Design Village Competition: MAKE. MOVE. PLAY.                      | External          |
| 2014 | Esther Sahagun-Soto | Student         | 2013 Design Village Competition: MAKE. MOVE. PLAY.                      | External          |
| 2014 | Forrest Whilmore  | Student           | The Nielsen Study Away Scholarship, Bachelor of Architecture program    | Internal          |
| 2014 | Forrest Whilmore  | Student           | Nielsen Award for Study Away                                           | Internal          |
| 2014 | Gabriela Colmenares | Student       | 2013 Julius Shulman Emerging Talent / Julius Shulman Rising Star Award | External          |
| 2014 | Gabriela Colmenares | Student       | AIA/SFV Rudolph De Chelles, FAIA Scholarship Award                      | Internal          |
| 2014 | Gabriela Colmenares | Student       | Degree Project Awards                                                   | Internal          |
| 2014 | Gabriela Colmenares | Student       | Student Choice – AIAS Studio Award                                     | External          |
| 2014 | Gevork Aetian      | Student           | AIA/SFV American Architectural Foundation Scholarship                  | External          |
| 2014 | Ghiozzi, Charles   | Alumni            | Winner, Northeast Los Angeles Placemaking Competition                  | External          |
| 2014 | Jennifer Pope     | Student           | 2013 Julius Shulman Emerging Talent / Julius Shulman Rising Star Award | External          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Internal/External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Jennifer Pope</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Master of Architecture</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Jennifer Pope</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Thesis Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Jennifer Pope</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>AIA Henry Adams Medal and Certificate, Master of Architecture program</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Jesse Santiago</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Bachelor of Architecture program</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>John Herman</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Bachelor of Architecture program</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Jose Siquina</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>AIA/SFV American Architectural Foundation Scholarship</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Joseph Gravius</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>The Nielsen Study Away Scholarship, Master of Architecture program</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Joseph Gravius</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Nielsen Award for Study Away</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Juan Alatorre</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student Choice – AIAS Studio Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Juan Guandadillo</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>The Nielsen Study Away Scholarship, Bachelor of Architecture program</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Juan Guandadillo</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Nielsen Award for Study Away</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Jung Mi Kim</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Fourth Year Outstanding Student Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Justin Owens</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>AIA/SFV American Architectural Foundation Scholarship</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Justin Owens</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Degree Project Awards</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Kakar, Omar</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>San Diego Film Festival, Best ArtExperimental Film</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Karla Lopez</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>The Nielsen Study Away Scholarship, Bachelor of Architecture program</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Karla Lopez</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Nielsen Award for Study Away</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Kha Nguyen</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Third Year Portfolio Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Kirsten Meza</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>AIA/SFV American Architectural Foundation Scholarship</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Lauren Amador</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>School of Architecture Student Service Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Maria Petrova</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>School of Architecture Student Service Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Mike Sotona</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2013 California Architectural Foundation Mel Ferris Award, Grand Prize</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Mike Sotona</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2013 Julius Shulman Emerging Talent / Julius Shulman Rising Star Award</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Mike Sotona</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>AIA/SFV Joel Jaffe, AIA &amp; Robin Jaffe, AIA Scholarship Award</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Mike Sotona</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Faculty Choice Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Milina Nuemaimaiti</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Third Year Portfolio Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Miriam Jacobsen</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Degree Project Awards - Frankel Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Miriam Jacobsen</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>AIA Henry Adams Certificate, Bachelor of Architecture program</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Nia Jones</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Alpha Rho Chi Leadership Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Nia Jones</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Bachelor of Architecture program</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Nikolofar (Lily)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Alpha Rho Chi Leadership Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Nikolofar (Lily)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Thesis Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Parya Nassiri</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Master of Architecture</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Peterson, Heather</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>MacDowell Fellowship</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Phong Lee (Captain)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2013 Design Village Competition: MAKE. MOVE. PLAY.</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Richard Esquivel</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Bachelor of Architecture program</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Sal Vargas</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2013 ACSA/AISC Steel Design Student Competition: Open Category, First Place</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Sanchez-Prieto, Marcel</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Arquitect No. 16, Honorable Mention</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Sattam Aljohani</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Master of Architecture</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Sergio Legon-Talamoni</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2013 Design Village Competition: MAKE. MOVE. PLAY.</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Talal Aalissa</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Master of Architecture</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Wassem Hawary</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Master of Architecture</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Wassem Hawary</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Thesis Award</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Willis Nalle</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Certificate for Emphasis in Urban Policy, Master of Architecture</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Anthony Fontenot</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Graham Foundation grant for publication, New Orleans Under Reconstruction: The Crisis of Planning</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Ingallil Wahinos-Ritter</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>WUHO pop-up awarded 'best of show' by Dwell in Design</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Joshua Stein (with Del Harrow)</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Graham Foundation grant for exhibition and symposium, Data Clay</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Peter Culley (and team)</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Honor Award for Excellence in Contextual Design for Family Farm Pavilions from the Virginia Society AIA</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Ewan Branda (co-investigator)</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$30,000 NEH grant for developing an international, multilingual index for electronic literature</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Jeanine Centuori</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>The City of Los Angeles, Certificate of Recognition to the ACE Center for their contribution to Watts</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Mark Ericson</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>published in Log 31 and MOMA publication, Uneven Growth: Tactical Urbanisms for Expanding Megacities</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Norman Millar</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>LA AIA Educator of the Year Award</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Maxi Spina</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Jujuy Redux Building in Argentina was a finalist at the Architizer A+ Awards</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Marc Neveu</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Executive Editor of Journal of Architectural Education</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Marcel Sanchez-Prieto</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>CRO Studios, won the 9th annual Bien iberoamericana de Arquitectura y Urbanismo award</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring 2014

Lectures, Los Angeles
April
Felipe Mesa
March
Francesco Lipari
February
Elena Manferdini
January
Kory Bieg

Lectures, San Diego
April
Monica Ponce de Leon
March
Emily Abruzzo
February
Carla Juáçaba
January
Beat Suter

Exhibitions, WUHO
March
Evolution
April
An Olfactory Archive: 1738-1969
April
Julius Shulman Institute Photography Award
March
Cityvision
April/May
How To Make Waste Public: Experiments With Infrastructure
Feb
Piminski - A Show of Works by Joakim Dahlqvist
Dec/Jan
Deborah Sussman Loves L.A.
April
In Between Projects
March
Objects in Space
February
Stack & Gather: Re-arrangeable picnic spots, Monteith Park
January
Blue collar talent: making something beautiful daily
January
Have your WEDGE and eat it too

Fall 2013

Lectures, Los Angeles
November
Thomas Auer
October
Luis Callejas
October
George T Whitesides
October
Lola Sheppard
November
Langarita-Navarro
November
Dave Hampton
November
Julia Koerner
November
Joseph Redwood-Martinez
October
CROstudio (joint lecture with Mesa College
November
Incendiary Traces
November
A Framework for Judgement: Criticism in Architecture and the Visual Arts
December
Deborah Sussman
November
Constructed Landscapes
October
Beyond the Assignment
November
Beyond the Assignment
October
Berenika Boberska, Mark Ericson, Heather Peterson, Maxi Spina

Lectures, San Diego
November
Juan Pablo, Corvalan Hochberger
February
Nuno Mateus, Jose Mateus
January
Unseen

Exhibitions, WUHO
November
Working Drawings
November
Woodbury Study Away Exhibition
November
Public Speaking
November
Presentations and Media Platforms
October
Case Study Charette
September
Schools of Thought
September
Storytelling

Workshops, Los Angeles
November
Public Speaking
November
Presentations and Media Platforms
October
Case Study Charette
September
Schools of Thought
September
Storytelling

Spring 2013

Lectures, Los Angeles
April
Michael Young
April
Roberto Rovira
March
Benedetta Tagliabue
February
James Ramsey
February
Etienne Turpin and Meredith Miller
January
Margaret Griffin
January
Unseen

Lectures, San Diego
April
Juan Pablo, Corvalan Hochberger
February
Nuno Mateus, Jose Mateus
January
Paul Lewis

Exhibitions, WUHO
April
Very Large Organizations
March
Catherine Opie: In & Around L.A.
February
BCF: The Hub at WUHO
January
Unseen
March
SNAP, Celebrating Architecture and Photography

Fall 2012

Lectures, Los Angeles
November
Architects Beyond Architecture II (AIAS)
November
Architects Beyond Architecture II (AIAS)
October
Nick Roberts
October
Izaskun Chinchilla
October
Kengo Kuma
December
Furniture Show
November
Optional Features: Selections from Woodbury San Diego
December
Larsson
September
Installations: Ahrens, Brockway and Webb
San Diego

Lectures, San Diego
October
Carol Young, Undesigned Clothing
October
Anne Porter, movie set designer
October
Joakim Dahlqvist, restaurateur

Exhibitions, WUHO
November
Inside Marina City: A Project by Iker Gil and Andreas E.G. Larsson
October
Larsson
September
Installations: Ahrens, Brockway and Webb
San Diego
### Woodbury School of Architecture - 2012-14 Lectures, Exhibits and Events

#### Symposia, Los Angeles
- **September**
  - **Emerging Asian City Symposium**
- **December**
  - **6th Annual American City Symposium**

#### Workshops, Los Angeles
- **September**
  - **Serial Series Workshop**
  - *Speakers:*
    - Sean Lally
    - Studio Mode/modeLab
    - Satoru Sugihara with Yasushi Ishida
    - Christopher Connock
    - Jason Johnson
    - Alexander Robinson
    - Miles Kemp
    - Peter Simmonds
    - Andrew Atwood
    - Francois Perrin
    - Michael Manalo
    - Yilip Kang
    - Jeremy Windle
    - Alvin Huang
    - Nick Antonio
    - Tony Coca
    - Nathan Miller

#### Lectures, Los Angeles
- **February**
  - **Robin Clark; Phenomenal: California Light, Space, Surface**
  - *Curator:* Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego
- **April**
  - **Jeanne Gang**
  - Studio Gang Architects
- **April**
  - **Architects Beyond Architecture (AIAS)**
  - Won Ju Lim, visual artist
  - Brett Farrow, architect/developer
  - Yeekai Kim, Cognoscenti Coffee
  - Natasha Case, Coolhaus
  - Carmen Salazar, sculptor/glassblower
  - Sebastian Munoz, designer, Arkura
  - CROstudio
- **March**
  - **Tatiana Bilbao**
  - Tatiana Bilbao S.C., Mexico City
- **February**
  - **Freedomland**
  - Keith Krumwiede
- **January**
  - **Hollywood Urban Planning Pop-Up Shop**
  - James Rojas
- **April**
  - **The Algorithms of Event**
  - Student Exhibition
- **March**
  - **Aquifer: Exhibition V**
- **February**
  - **Drawn: New Works**
- **January**
  - **Subterranea: Drawings**
  - Jennifer Gilman
- **March**
  - **Drylands Design Exhibition (A+D Museum)**
  - Rick Gooding

#### Exhibitions, WUHO
- **February**
  - **Drawn: New Works**
- **March**
  - **Aquifer: Exhibition V**
- **January**
  - **Subterranea: Drawings**
- **March**
  - **Drylands Design Exhibition (A+D Museum)**
- **May**
  - **Pedro E. Guerrero: A Retrospective**
  - Keith Krumwiede

#### Lectures, San Diego
- **February**
  - **Marcel Sanchez-Prieto**
  - CROstudio
- **April**
  - **Tatiana Bilbao**
  - Arquitectos, Guadalajara
- **March**
  - **Luis Callejas**
  - Weightless Studio

#### Exhibitions, Wedge
- **February**
  - **Drawn: New Works**
- **March**
  - **Aquifer: Exhibition V**
- **January**
  - **Subterranea: Drawings**
- **March**
  - **Drylands Design Exhibition (A+D Museum)**
  - Jennifer Gilman
  - Rick Gooding

**SPRING 2012**

- **April**
  - **Architects Beyond Architecture (AIAS)**
  - Won Ju Lim, visual artist
  - Brett Farrow, architect/developer
  - Yeekai Kim, Cognoscenti Coffee
  - Natasha Case, Coolhaus
  - Carmen Salazar, sculptor/glassblower
  - Sebastian Munoz, designer, Arkura
  - CROstudio
- **March**
  - **Tatiana Bilbao**
  - Tatiana Bilbao S.C., Mexico City
- **February**
  - **Freedomland**
  - Keith Krumwiede
- **January**
  - **Hollywood Urban Planning Pop-Up Shop**
  - James Rojas
- **April**
  - **The Algorithms of Event**
  - Student Exhibition
- **March**
  - **Aquifer: Exhibition V**
- **February**
  - **Drawn: New Works**
- **January**
  - **Subterranea: Drawings**
  - Jennifer Gilman
- **March**
  - **Drylands Design Exhibition (A+D Museum)**
  - Rick Gooding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beth</th>
<th>Abels</th>
<th>Steven</th>
<th>Christensen</th>
<th>Jeff</th>
<th>Garrett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Abiva</td>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>Ahbe</td>
<td>Mario</td>
<td>Cipresso</td>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>Gavrila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana</td>
<td>Ahmadi</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Coates</td>
<td>Shawn</td>
<td>Gehle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>Ahrens</td>
<td>Cristophe</td>
<td>Cornubert</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Gerod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlo</td>
<td>Aiello</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Cortez</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Gilman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Matias</td>
<td>Cremer</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Gilmartin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Alfaro</td>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Crowell</td>
<td>Javier</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkan</td>
<td>Alkanoglu</td>
<td>Arlene</td>
<td>Cuevas</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Gooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Cuff</td>
<td>Marcelyn</td>
<td>Gow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Radames</td>
<td>Culqui</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Grandjacques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Anderton</td>
<td>Joakim</td>
<td>Dahlqvist</td>
<td>Thurman</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naseem</td>
<td>Asif</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Daines</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Atwood</td>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>Dalder</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Griffith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Auld</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Daly</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Groh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Aykanian</td>
<td>Chava</td>
<td>Danielson</td>
<td>Ravi</td>
<td>GuneWardena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orhan</td>
<td>Ayyuce</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>Azulay</td>
<td>Stefano</td>
<td>de Martino</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Haas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Bair</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Deleiden</td>
<td>Reem</td>
<td>Habib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Ball</td>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Denari</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Hale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germane</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Kishani</td>
<td>Desiva</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Hamner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Devereaux</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Hart (Steinberg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td>Ramiro</td>
<td>Diaz-Granados</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Hartley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yohannes</td>
<td>Baynes</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Diracles</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Belknap</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Durfee</td>
<td>Mira</td>
<td>Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliette</td>
<td>Bellocq</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Enright</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Henton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagy</td>
<td>Belzberg</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Epperly</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Herman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Bergren</td>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>Erickson</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Erlandson</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Hodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinayak</td>
<td>Bjarne</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Erni</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Hodgetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janek</td>
<td>Bielski</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Escher</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Hogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can</td>
<td>Bilsel</td>
<td>Kemi</td>
<td>Esho</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>Xarene</td>
<td>Eskandar</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Holmquest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Fajkus</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Holz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiko</td>
<td>Blikian</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Farrow</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Bonner</td>
<td>Ashle</td>
<td>Fauvre</td>
<td>Coy</td>
<td>Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Borrowman</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td>Alvin</td>
<td>Huang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Bouwmans</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Ferrier</td>
<td>Georgina</td>
<td>Huljich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo</td>
<td>Bravo</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>Hisako</td>
<td>Ichiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>Brink</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Inaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Flaig</td>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Jeevanjee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanna</td>
<td>Brugh Libourel</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Fleischmann</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Jennings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Burdick</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria</td>
<td>Campi</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>Dora</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Carse</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>Frankel</td>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wil</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Freeland</td>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>Jubany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Kahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Cheung</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Frink</td>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>Kahveci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Chiu</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Gannon</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kaliski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raveevan</td>
<td>Choksombatchai</td>
<td>Anabel</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>Christof</td>
<td>Kapeller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Kappe</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neren</td>
<td>Karin</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>McCadden</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Schnyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Kavanagh</td>
<td>Duane</td>
<td>McLemore</td>
<td>Ari</td>
<td>Seligman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Kemp</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>McMartin</td>
<td>Mohamed</td>
<td>Sharif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Kerwin</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>McVay</td>
<td>Po-Wen</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Killen</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Sheine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Kimm</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Noel</td>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>Shimizu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Kochanowski</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Siegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Koerner</td>
<td>Brendan</td>
<td>Muha</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Silva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Kollar</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Mulcahy</td>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina</td>
<td>Krunic</td>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>Munoz</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Ku</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Myers</td>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>Kuhle</td>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>Navarro</td>
<td>Kirby</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Neimark</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Leach</td>
<td>Gaston</td>
<td>Nogues</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Ogosta</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Rasmussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Olah</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Smith-Clementi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>Lehrer</td>
<td>Sasha</td>
<td>Ortenberg</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Sofi Holst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lehrer</td>
<td>Yo</td>
<td>Oshima</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Somol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Ley</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Osman</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Speaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Liang</td>
<td>Dwayne</td>
<td>Oyler</td>
<td>Marcello</td>
<td>Spina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonju</td>
<td>Lim</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Paige</td>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>Spitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeekai</td>
<td>Lim</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Pang</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Sprinkling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juintow</td>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>Kyong</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Stayner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Lindley</td>
<td>Jose</td>
<td>Parral</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Stempel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Stolz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Loescher</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Pawlak</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Loew</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Pollari</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Lohrmann</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Stott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Loomis</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>Predock</td>
<td>Gabie</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesia</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>Pusey</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Suisman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Lopez-Perez</td>
<td>Irma</td>
<td>Ramirez</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Lor</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Bo</td>
<td>Sundius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Lorenzen</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Regn</td>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>Sung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Lowry</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Reich</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Sweeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Lubell</td>
<td>Deborahah</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Swischuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cici</td>
<td>Luong</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Roberge</td>
<td>Takako</td>
<td>Tajima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moshik</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Tensho</td>
<td>Takemori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Madden</td>
<td>Damian</td>
<td>Robledo</td>
<td>Aleksander</td>
<td>Tamm-Seitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Rotondi</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Tate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Manalo</td>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>Rowen</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Tate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>Manferdini</td>
<td>Kati</td>
<td>Rubinyi</td>
<td>Kagan</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Mangurian</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Rucinski</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Tecentin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>Rutenberg</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Testa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>Matatyaou</td>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td>Russel</td>
<td>Thomsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Mather</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Samuels</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Timme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Mayne</td>
<td>Marcos</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>Mary Jean</td>
<td>Timms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaria</td>
<td>Mazzoleni</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Scarpa</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Tims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Axel</td>
<td>Schmitzberger</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Toam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Tolkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier</td>
<td>Touraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Trussler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gee-ghid</td>
<td>Tse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>Urgola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Uriu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Van Grunsven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Varner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Verabian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola</td>
<td>Vezzulli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland</td>
<td>Wahlroos-Ritter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Wen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Wickersham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew O.</td>
<td>Wilcox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>Yeh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Yoder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Yoo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Zago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi</td>
<td>Zeiger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hraztan</td>
<td>Zeitlian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Zellner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 20, 2013

Luis Calingo
President
Woodbury University
7500 Glenoaks Boulevard
Burbank, CA 91510-7846

Dear President Calingo:

At its meeting by conference call on June 25, 2013, a panel of the Interim Report Committee convened to consider the Interim Report submitted by the Woodbury University (WU) on March 1, 2013. The panel reviewed your Interim Report and the Commission’s action letter of June 24, 2010. I apologize for the tardiness in getting this letter to you.

The panel appreciated the opportunity to discuss the report with David Dauwalder, Executive Vice President and Provost; Victoria Liptak, Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs and Accreditation Liaison Officer; and Bruce Feinstein, Institutional Researcher. The conversation was informative and very honest in helping the panelists better understand your institution’s challenges and progress on meeting the areas cited in the Commission’s letter.

The panel found many areas of commendation for Woodbury University including:

1. The major work that has been done in implementing the recommendations of the Commission.
2. The inclusive process used by administration in involving faculty in developing solutions to the areas of concern.
3. The revised Program Review process developed by the Educational Planning Committee based on best practices which focus on student learning to improve each program and to help determine budget allocations.
4. The successful crosswalks developed between programmatic accreditation and WU’s program review in order to take advantage of the focus of each review process.
5. The considerable work completed on revising the General Education program through an Integrative Learning model which enables more intentional learning through scaffolding both inside and outside the classroom.
6. The development of an assessment group which oversees the evaluation of educational effectiveness.
7. The formalization of the Faculty Financial Analysis Committee which uses benchmarking salary data with peer institutions.
8. The increase of fulltime faculty from 48 in 2008 to 83 in 2013.

The Commission action letter identified three areas for the Interim Report’s attention:

1. **Student Learning and Program Review.** The Commission asked WU to develop clearer guidelines for Program Review with a consistent schedule for utilizing the results for program improvement and resource allocation. The panel found that WU took this recommendation very seriously by developing and approving new Program Review guidelines based on best practices and resources from WASC. In the new process: 1) student learning is regularly assessed; 2) assessment informs program planning and curricular change; and 3) program plans and evidence-based claims influence budgeting. Co-curricular programs are now included in the review cycle. The panel is concerned that the schedule may be overly aggressive and difficult to implement with so many scheduled in each year. The panel recommends that WU reconsider the schedule in order to be more realistic about implementation. The panel also recommends that WU continue refining and expanding their program review system with a focus on integrating student learning assessment, making use of the results, and ensuring follow through with transparent action planning. A careful monitoring by WU of the implementation of what appears to be a very sound plan will be essential. The panel expects a thorough report to be included in the institution’s Self-Study being prepared for its Offsite Review in Fall 2017.

2. **General Education.** The Commission urged WU to place a priority on completing a revision of General Education which had been discussed for many years. WU was encouraged to have clearly outlined and measurable outcomes for General Education. WU has taken this recommendation very seriously by remodeling its General Education program to ensure that students achieve a new set of integrated, mission-centered,
institutional learning outcomes throughout all four years of their experience. A new Integrated Learning program enables more intentional learning by scaffolding student experience level and types and by providing learning opportunities both inside and outside the classroom. The very commendable *Woodbury Experience* provides further strength outside the classroom. An Assessment Group has been appointed with representatives from all schools to begin a quality control effort. The panel urges WU to begin the assessment of student learning in the General Education program and to invest resources in supporting faculty development to ensure professional institutional research and assessment capacity in order to fully engage in the difficult work embodied in the Integrated Learning model. The panel has concerns that this ambitious but laudatory model may be so complex that sustainability could become an issue in upcoming years. Curriculum maps were still to be developed at the time of panel review. Program review will be essential to continue identified strengths and to make modifications based on evidence of the assessment of the stated outcomes. The panel expects that by the time of the Offsite Review in Fall 2017, a thorough analysis will be presented of how this new program has been fully implemented and assessed for its strengths and weaknesses.

3. **Faculty Compensation and Workload.** The Commission asked WU to address the ongoing issue of the equity of compensation, work load, employee performance standards, and evaluation, transparency, consistency, and promotion policies for both fulltime and adjunct faculty. In response, WU made the Faculty Financial Analysis Committee a standing committee rather than an *ad hoc* committee and created a new Adjunct Faculty Pay Scale Committee. The dramatic increase of fulltime faculty has already been noted earlier in this letter. Compensation has also been increased for fulltime and adjunct faculty at a time when many institutions have continued pay freezes. The panel finds that WU is on the right track in these areas of concern. Further, they support WU’s aim to continue its analysis of faculty workload in order to ensure equity for salaries, stipends, course release, and professional development.

After extensive discussion about the significant progress that has been made by Woodbury University in addressing these areas, the panel acted to:

1. Receive the Interim Report with recommendations and commendations.

2. Encourage Woodbury University to include a continuing focus on the three areas of concern as it prepares for the upcoming reaffirmation of accreditation with the Offsite Review scheduled in Fall 2017 and the Accreditation Visit in Spring 2018.

WASC looks forward to working with you and wishes you every success as you proceed toward the next stages of accreditation review. As your staff liaison, please let me know how I can be of further help.

Sincerely,

Richard Osborn
Vice President

cc: David Dauwalder, Executive Vice President and Provost
    Randy Stauffer, ALO
    Members of the Interim Report Committee