

**California Baptist University
College of Architecture, Visual Arts and Design**

Initial Candidacy Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture (M. Arch) (Minimum 171 credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
9 April 2014

The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1940, is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture. Because most state registration boards in the United States require any applicant for licensure to have graduated from an NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Team Findings	
1. Team Comments	
2. Conditions Not Yet Met	
3. Causes of Concern	
4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	
II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation	
1. Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	
2. Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	
III. Appendices:	
1. Program Information	
2. Conditions Met with Distinction	
3. Visiting Team	
IV. The Visiting Team	
V. Confidential Recommendation and Signatures	

I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The architecture program within the California Baptist University (CBU) College of Architecture, Visual Arts and Design (CAVAD) has embarked on challenging effort of building an M. Arch program quite literally from the ground up, both in terms of personnel, students, facilities and resources. The demand for an architecture program emerged through a groundswell of student requests, regional demand, and a broader interest from young adults searching for an architectural education rooted into the ethos of a Christian-based institution and culture. The visiting team received near-unanimous affirmation of this demand from those students in the program at the time of the visit, as well as a frequently-expressed interest from students, faculty and administration to build an identity of the program around the tenets of regional and global outreach and the principles of a Biblically-rooted framework. Furthermore, the program is symbolically indicative of its parent institution in that the program, like CBU as an institution, is working to shape itself in the midst of massive growth in terms of facilities and student body.

At the time of the team visit, the program is still in an embryonic stage of development, given that no students have advanced beyond the sophomore level of matriculation. Very little of the core architectural education that is applicable to demonstrating ability or understanding of the student performance criteria (SPCs) have been offered to date. Though the following team report presents a range of conditions that are largely not yet met, those observations bely a vibrant energy displayed by all involved towards the future of an architecture program that is expected to become a frontispiece for the institution. In addition, program faculty and staff demonstrated a keen spirit of inquiry in assessing where the program stands today in an effort to make the course adjustments in resources, curriculum and foci that may be more easily accomplished while the program is in such a young and malleable state.

The CBU architecture program has committed itself to being firmly rooted within the realm of professional practice, both in terms of a source for program faculty, an avenue for student practicum education, and an element of the program's identity. That practice-based focus aligns well with the heritage of the institution, and has been embraced by local professionals of the Inland Empire of Southern California. Yet, the observed pace of growth in the number of faculty raises uncertainties towards the program's ability to match its permanent faculty corps to the needs of a rapidly-expanding cadre of students. Concerns have also been raised about what impact the lack of a permanent home may have upon student retention, learning effectiveness, and quality of the studio environment. Based upon the current short- and long-term relocation plans, at the same time as the program is working to define its identity and recruit new students, will be doubly challenging when coupled with the issues of managing multiple space relocations. That said, the program has the financial support of the institution, which will be a vital resource during these initial years of program development.

The members of the visiting team ask that the Board extends our appreciation to the program faculty, staff, students, and institution leadership for their kind hospitality and cooperation in this initial candidacy visit.

2. Conditions Not Met

- I.1.1 History and Mission
- I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity (Culturally Rich Environment)
- I.1.3.A Architectural Education and the Academic Community
- I.1.3.B Architectural Education and Students
- I.1.4 Long-Range Planning
- I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures
- I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance (Governance)
- I.2.3 Physical Resources
- II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

Conditions Not-Yet Met

I.3.2 Annual Reports

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria:

- A.1. Communication Skills
- A.2. Design Thinking Skills
- A.3. Visual Communication Skills
- A.4. Technical Documentation
- A.5. Investigative Skills
- A.6. Fundamental Design Skills
- A.7. Use of Precedents
- A.8. Ordering Systems Skills
- A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture
- A.10. Cultural Diversity
- A.11. Applied Research
- B.1. Pre-Design
- B.2. Accessibility
- B.3. Sustainability
- B.4. Site Design
- B.5. Life Safety
- B.6. Comprehensive Design
- B.7. Financial Considerations
- B.8. Environmental Systems
- B.9. Structural Systems
- B.10. Building Envelope Systems
- B.11. Building Service Systems Integration
- B.12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration
- C.1. Collaboration
- C.3. Client Role in Architecture
- C.4. Project Management
- C.5. Practice Management
- C.6. Leadership
- C.7. Legal Responsibilities
- C.8. Ethics and Professional Judgment
- C.9. Community and Social Responsibility

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

3. Causes of Concern

- A. Graduate Curriculum** – The visiting team observed evidence indicating a lack of awareness by both the program and institution towards the rigors of architectural graduate education. This is best summarized by an excerpt from Page 36 of the APR-IC in regards to the program's response to Condition II.3: "As CBU's architecture program is a 5 year, undergraduate program resulting in an M. Arch." In addition, the current course plan prescribes (2) 18-credit semesters for the fifth year of the curriculum. Should this fifth-year course plan become a reality, then either graduate courses would be less rigorous than the level of effort expected to be realistically completed, or the expectation of completing two 18-credit semesters of graduate work would be improbable and unattainable in a single academic year. Furthermore, the visiting team did not observe any admission review procedures in place by the program by which undergraduate students would be evaluated by the program for entry into graduate-level coursework.

- B. Facilities** - While the spatial provisions planned for the short- and long term appear sufficient to support the program, the visiting team is concerned about the detrimental impact of the relocation plan upon student retention, learning effectiveness, and quality of the studio environment. During a time where the program will be working to crystalize its identity, the program will be doubly challenged with the issues of managing multiple space relocations. Even more concerning, by locating the program at the long-term "River Springs" site that has been proposed by the institution, the program will be largely isolated from the balance of student life, including residential, and allied discipline synergies that would be afforded by the program remaining on the core of the campus. This relocation could further insulate future cadres of architecture students – whose curricular activities inherently make them a more insular group and isolate them from the balance of the CBU student body.
- C. Human Resources** - Efforts during the current academic year by the program to further grow the faculty corps have been unsuccessful. The Dean is prepared to utilize adjunct faculty to a degree higher than anticipated for the short term. That said, the use of a higher percentage of adjunct faculty may adversely affect the program's ability to provide a balanced workload and opportunities by the permanent faculty to pursue professional development. Participation in architectural academic or professional opportunities (such as AIA, ACSA, ACADIA, ARCC, EDRA, SAH, and others) is key for faculty in a young program to learn, develop and collaborate with peer educators and practitioners.
- D. Compatibility of Curriculum and SPCs** – The visiting team observed a disconnect between the information presented through the course syllabi and the SPC assessment matrix. Additionally, in several instances there was no primary location indicated for any courses on the assessment matrix for a particular SPC.
- E. Non-Architectural Core Curriculum** – A total of five courses – EGR 254 – Materials Engineering, MAT 245 – Analytic Geometry & Calculus I, PHY 115 – Physics for Architects, BUS 357 – Small Business Management, and BUS 505 – Entrepreneurship have been identified by the program as non-architecture courses that contribute to the students' ability or understanding of student performance criteria (SPCs). These courses would fall outside the curricular control of the program, and therefore the program will be limited in ensuring that student achievement of the SPCs occurs. In the case of BUS 357 and BUS 505, a review of existing course curricula indicates that these courses would not include instruction in architecture-specific business matters such as legal matters (e.g. licensure laws or agreements for design services and construction) or the nuanced elements of design firm management.
- F. Electives** - Within the currently-adopted M. Arch curriculum, the sum of core architectural courses and institution-mandated general education courses leaves no flexibility or opening in the curriculum for students to pursue special interests or minors in the form of non-architectural electives. The institution indicated that their model for general education courses is currently under review, and will likely be modified in the future to permit greater elective flexibility. At present, any elective course outside of general education or architecture would be in addition to the 171-173 credits necessary for the approved curriculum.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

This section is not applicable to the IC-VTR.

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 not fulfilled this requirement for narrative or evidence

2014 Team Assessment: While the program clearly draws upon both the history and ethos of the institution, as well the University Student Outcomes (USOs) and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) already prescribed by CBU, there is little evidence demonstrated of developing an explicit mission for the program that expands beyond the broad-stroke mission, USOs and SLOs of CBU to develop architecture-specific objectives tuned precisely for the program. The visiting team recognizes that the development of such a specific mission is challenging task ahead for the program. Furthermore, the program is still in the mode of discovery at this early point of development in identifying particular areas of interest, curricular focus, and directions of outreach that it may integrate into its curriculum – any of which may go far in defining both identity and mission of the program. Institution and program representatives have verbally indicated to the visiting team during the visit various visions of what a specifically-tailored mission for the architecture program could be, but the program must work further to crystalize that 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.

[X] The program has not demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2014 Team Assessment: The underlying culture of CBU values a positive and respectful learning environment. The expectation from the university is that this ethos continues throughout the architecture program. The program is presently in its initial semesters with a faculty and student cohort that have demonstrated a respectful learning environment, but it is too early to tell if they will provide a culturally-rich environment, that is equitable in learning, teaching and working. The evidence provided in the APR-IC suggests a positive environment across campus, but it is too early to assess the culture of the program.

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

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

[X] The program is not responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: With a totally new program, the Dean (who serves the concurrent role of Chair) will need some time to more fully integrate his faculty and students into the community of CBU. The program benefits from the high level of popularity enjoyed by this new program recognized by institutional leadership and students alike. The Dean is encouraged to continue to educate the academic community on the benefits and value of architects and the architectural profession. With having to deal with a heavy teaching load, the existing faculty are somewhat disadvantaged already in participating in research, scholarship and creative activity to develop new knowledge for the benefit of the program and institution.

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

[X] The program is not responsive to this perspective.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Although the visiting team witnessed aspects of the program that could potentially be solid foundational elements that respond to this Perspective, the architecture program is still in its infancy, and as such is not currently responsive to this perspective. Student organizations have barely been able to evolve. The development of a larger student body as existing cohorts advance into upper-year stages of the M. Arch. curricular plan will provide greater evidence of this condition than as it currently exists with only freshmen and sophomores.

- 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.

2014 Team Assessment: Although the visiting team did not find team room documentation on this matter, the students interviewed indicated that they had been briefed on the IDP, and demonstrated an understanding of the architectural licensure process, IDP process, and enrollment eligibility. The program has recently named an IDP Educator Coordinator from the faculty, and that faculty member has started immediately into the efforts of informing students of the IDP and licensure process, and is taking advantage of informational resources such as attending the annual NCARB IDP Conference.

- 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.

2014 Team Assessment: The program has clearly stated that it will be firmly rooted in the architectural profession, and when possible, to draw from the profession through the development of a faculty cadre with working experience in the profession. During the period where the program continues to build its faculty corps, it is relying upon local architectural professionals to redress the balance as adjunct faculty. In addition, the faculty, students, and even institutional administration such as the Director of Facilities have initiated a grassroots effort to further expose students to the issues and demands of the profession through firm and professional shadowing. The planned upper-year curriculum for the program includes a fourth-year ARC 491 – Architecture Internship course, and the program has already introduced a range of lectures offered by local practitioners, as well as allied-profession lectures in areas such as civil and structural engineering.

- 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.

2014 Team Assessment: CBU embraces throughout the education of their student body the concept of service to the global community. A basic and underlying student outcome exists where students are learning academically while in the service of others. Because of these foundational values, the institution and program demonstrate that students and faculty alike regard service to their communities as an essential part of their professional charge and leadership role to the public.

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 do not meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2014 Team Assessment: In the supplemental information provided to the visiting team at the time of the visit, the program has outlined a long-range plan for improvement. The program has yet to establish a platform for engagement of multiple sources or perspectives to continuously re-evaluate the improvement of the program. Establishment of this platform will be an essential aspect of a program in its infancy to inform a preferred vision and growth of its student body, curriculum and projection into the future. Additionally, the program's projected student enrollment plan, as evidenced in Appendix 7 of the APR-IC, indicates an obsolete model of enrollment attrition, and does not reflect either a contemporary emphasis on retention of students or the emerging culture of the program that was observed by the visiting team.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: *The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:*

- *How the program is progressing towards its mission.*
- *Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.*
- *Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.*
- *Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:*
 - *Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.*
 - *Individual course evaluations.*
 - *Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.*
 - *Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.*

The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.

[X] The program's processes do not meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2014 Team Assessment: The visiting team applauds the program's plan for assessment of specific student learning outcomes (SLOs) based on existing institution procedures, and this Condition includes multiple layers of self-assessment. That said, the program had yet to identify the specific means to show how these additional aspects are progressing towards its preferred mission and vision. Specifically, what is the assessment procedure for CAVAD or the Architecture Program, and who and how will the multi-year objectives of the long-range plan be rigorously assessed through solicitation and review? This Condition should respond explicitly to the architecture program and not generically to the requirements of the institution.

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 descriptions².*
 - *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

2014 Team Assessment: Although faculty resources are sufficient for the curricular needs of the program at present, the visiting team expresses concern toward the program's existing faculty search and recruitment process. The program's hiring plan is dependent on the increased matriculation of students, which raises the risk that if the search is unsuccessful in one year, the program may be short-staffed. The Dean is prepared to utilize adjunct faculty to a degree higher than anticipated for the short term. In addition, the institution's policy is for the primary function of faculty to be teaching, which is in conflict with expressed interest of the program to hire licensed faculty who have the opportunity to fulfill part-time opportunities to work in the profession. The teaching demands of existing faculty are such at present that faculty do not have the opportunity to pursue practice-based or research activities. Should faculty have the opportunity for future promotion and rank, they will need access and opportunity to engage in scholarly and creative activities, such as participation in architectural academic or professional opportunities (such as AIA, ACSA, ACADIA, ARCC, EDRA, SAH, Society of Building Science Educators, or the Building Technology Educators Society).

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

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

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.

2014 Team Assessment: Numerous student services are provided to the program by institution-wide resources, including admissions and financial aid. Currently, architecture students are voluntarily advised from a central advising office. Program faculty are seen as professional mentors and not as academic advisors, and have little interaction with the institution advising office. With the anticipated future growth of the student body, the lack of a dedicated central academic advisor to the architecture program may limit the ability to advise students on progressing effectively through the M. Arch curriculum.

Departmental faculty for the time being will serve a crucial role as mentors and professional advisors to the program's growing student body.

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

2014 Team Assessment: In visiting team meetings held with the institution Provost and Vice Provost, both administrators confirmed that they allow the Dean to set broad parameters of the program. The university and school organizational chart was provided in the APR.

- **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 inadequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: With little more than one student cohort in place, only one staff member, two full-time and two part-time faculty are in place for the program. A formal governance structure that allows faculty, staff and students to equitably participate in the life of the program has yet to be established.

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 inadequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The program presently has minimally sufficient facilities in place to support the needs of the currently enrolled freshman and sophomore classes. Instructional space for those design courses in-place - DES 110, 112, 120 and 122 – utilize room VILG 100, a flat classroom that lacks studio-type workspaces, pinup surfaces or lockers for students. Funds have been budgeted by the program for new studio furnishings (30 desks, chairs and lockers per year) to accommodate incoming cohorts for the next several years as more students advance through the program. Beginning in fall 2014, the program will begin the program will set requirements for students to purchase laptops prior to 2014-2014 academic year. The bookstore intends to make laptops, with architectural software already loaded, available for purchase. "Major Equipment" in the form of new 2D plotters, 3D epoxy printers and other peripherals have been approved by the institution for purchase and implementation beginning in fall 2014.

The visiting team's primary concern regarding physical resources involves the current institutional plan for renovating existing CBU facilities as short-term and long-term homes for the architecture program. James Hall, the current, primary program home, is a spatially-limited concrete structure that does not support studio-format instructional spaces. The institution intends for the program to be relocated to a former church site now owned by CBU located on the south perimeter of the campus for a short-term period. Though the short-term site would only be designed to hold first- through third-year students, statements from institution representatives raised visiting team concerns that the short-term site would remain a home to the program past fall 2016, or beyond a point where fourth-year studio space would be needed. Regardless, this 10,600 s.f. facility renovation would only be a short-term location for the program, as the existing church site will be demolished in late 2016 to make room for a future campus parking structure.

While the program would temporarily occupy the short-term site, the institution will separately renovate and potentially add new building construction on the site of the River Springs Charter School, a former church also owned by CBU and located across Magnolia Avenue a half-block west of the western corner of the campus. Immediate renovation to the River Springs site is not an option given that the charter school will continue to lease the site through 2015. This project would involve renovating nearly 20,000 s.f. of existing space as well as the potential construction of an additional, 37,000 s.f. new building as a long-term home for both architecture and potentially other CAVAD programs. While the spatial provisions envisioned within the River Springs site development plan appear sufficient to support the program, the visiting team is concerned of the detrimental impact of the relocation plan upon student retention, learning effectiveness, and quality of the studio environment. During a time where the program will be working to crystalize the program's identity and recruit new students, they will be doubly challenged with the issues of managing multiple relocations.

Of even greater concern, locating the program at the River Springs site, risks isolating the program from the balance of student life, on-campus, residential, and allied discipline synergies that would be afforded by the program remaining on campus. This would include distancing the program from future interdisciplinary resources like the College of Business and planned "Engineering Hall". The future College of Engineering facility, which will house architectural, engineering and construction technology is to be built on the opposite end of campus from the River Springs site. This relocation could further insulate future cadres of architecture students – a group of students whose curricular activities inherently make them an insular group, and isolate them from the balance of the CBU student body.

Based on evidence gathered by the team, it does not seem that the institution has sought a critical level of planning input from the program in regards to the potential synergistic effects or cultural impact of isolating the architecture program, and potentially CAVAD in general, by relocating them to the River Springs site.

1.2.4 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

2014 Team Assessment: Income resources for the program are based upon the combination of a percentage-of-tuition contribution to the program, in addition to an \$800 per student program fee calculated for those students enrolled from the sophomore year onwards. A rapid increase in enrollment is anticipated resulting from new cohorts entering the program from fall 2014 onwards, as well as a planned increases in program tuition compensation in 2014-2015. Though the target is for program expenses not to exceed 20% of gross income, which is not feasible until a full program cohort is assembled, the institution is committed to meet startup budgetary needs for the program in the meantime. Furthermore, all anticipated facility costs for the renovation of short-term and near-term spaces for the program to occupy (see 1.2.3) outside of furniture and minor equipment costs shall be paid for by institutional capital expenditures, and not as a supplemental expense responsibility of the program. The

only potential issue observed by the visiting team was that the financial projections included the APR-IC Appendix 06 "ProForma Budget – Architecture" for computer software does not account for the increased cost of CAD, BIM, visualization or other software licenses calculated based on the rapid projected increase of the student body.

1.2.5 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

2014 Team Assessment: The Annie Gabriel Library (AGL) at CBU meets the current needs of the developing architecture program and provides appropriate student access. Further development of the library's architecture collection appears to have an appropriate scope, direction and level of financial resources. Volume count has notably increased in just the short time since the drafting of the program's APR-IC last year. However, the library's physical resources are currently a challenge due to overall lack of space, a situation that will only be exacerbated with the architecture program's growth in informational resources. Furthermore, the visiting team observed that there is no strategic approach to how the AGL, CAVAD and the CBU's information technology group will cooperatively work to address the increasing technological needs of the developing program.

PART I: SECTION 3 –REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports³. 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

2014 Team Assessment: The available student characteristics were provided to the visiting team. Information such as “time to graduation” is not yet available and therefore not applicable to the condition. Program faculty characteristics were provided.

I.3.2. Annual Reports: The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2011 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

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

transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

[X] Annual Reports and NAAB Responses were not provided (see team comments below)

2014 Team Assessment: This condition is not applicable given that the program has not been required by NAAB to file an annual report to date. Therefore, the visiting team regards this condition as “Not Yet Met.”

1.3.3 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 exhibit⁴ 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.

2014 Team Assessment: The visiting team found the faculty to be diverse, talented, qualified and passionately engaged in architectural education. This was consistently evident throughout from part-time to full-time faculty. The faculty is cohesive group, respectful of one another, and committed to the overall vision and culture of CBU and the architecture program.

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

2014 Team Assessment: All documents listed in Appendix 3 of the *Conditions for Accreditation* were provided by the program in the team room.

FINAL DRAFT

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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found in DES 110, which states that the course is “an introduction to 2D thinking, as applied to the interrelated, interdisciplinary fields of design . . .” Evidence of understanding of this criterion was found, but not an ability. Other courses indicated in the SPC matrix as demonstrating ability of this criterion are not yet offered to students at the time of the visit.

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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found in course work already being offered, including DES 110 and 112. In those courses, evidence of understanding of this criterion was found, but not an ability. Other courses indicated in the SPC matrix as demonstrating ability of this criterion are not yet offered to students at the time of the visit.

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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: One course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion – ARC 220 – Computer Modeling - has not yet been offered. Although the other courses indicated in the SPC matrix as demonstrating student ability of this criterion –DES 120 – 2D

Visual Expression and DES 122 – 3D Visual Expression begin to demonstrate understanding of criterion A.3, yet the evidence presented does not substantiate student ability.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion has not yet been offered. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that the intended course for demonstrating this criterion – ARC 220 – Computer Modeling – may be an inappropriate or inadequate course for this, given the conditions outlined in criterion A.4.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of intent of much of this criterion is shown in ARC 350 – Theory I, which has not yet been offered. In addition, the visiting team observed that syllabi in other courses listed in the SPC matrix do not specifically indicate an ability of investigative skills as they relate to design processes.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion has not yet been offered. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that one of the primary courses for demonstrating this criterion – ARC 392 – Advanced Structural Systems – may be an insufficient course for this, given the range of ability outlined in criterion A.6.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion has not yet been offered. Evidence of intent of this criterion is shown in ARC 212 – Design Studio II and ARC 462 – Architecture and Urbanism Abroad.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Thorough evidence of this criterion was not found in course work of ARC 122 – 3D Visual Expressions, and the other course indicated by the program to develop student understanding of this criterion – ARC 210 – Design Studio I – is not yet offered.

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 Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the courses indicated by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion - ARC 240 - Architectural History I, ARC 242 - Architectural History II, and ARC 462 - Architecture and Urbanism Abroad - have not yet been offered. Syllabi in other courses listed in the SPC Matrix do not specifically indicate an understanding of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional and national settings in all of the hemispheres.

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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found as several of the courses indicated by the program, which would demonstrate student understanding had not yet been offered. Evidence of intent of this criterion is shown in ARC 460 - Seminar Abroad. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that two of the intended courses for demonstrating this criterion – ARC 240 - Architectural History I, and ARC 310 - Design Studio III did not reflect A.10 in the syllabi for these classes.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding of this criterion has not yet been offered. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that the primary courses for demonstrating this criterion – ARC 511 – Thesis Research/Preparation, may be inappropriate or inadequate courses for this, given the range of understanding outlined in criterion A.11. In addition, the visiting team expresses concern that the intended courses for demonstrating this criterion - MAT 245 – Analytical Geometry and Calculus 1 and PHY 115 – Physics for Architects may be insufficient courses for this given the inability of the program to control curriculum development and ensure alignment with the range of understanding outlined in criterion A.11.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: It is clear that development of student ability or understanding of much of the Realm A criteria is dependent upon second-year architectural curriculum that has not yet been offered by the program. Furthermore, while the DES 110, 112, 120 and 122 courses provide a broad introductory education to Realm A SPCs, the curriculum and rigor of those courses do not result a level of ability to those Realm A criteria based upon what syllabi and student work that was reviewed by the visiting team.

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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the courses indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding of this criterion have not yet been offered.

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 Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the courses indicated as secondary sources by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion have not yet been offered. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that no primary location was indicated by the program in the SPC matrix as to where this evidence would be found.

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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding of this criterion has not yet been offered. Evidence of intent for understanding for this criterion was found in course ARC 380 – Sustainable Systems, however the visiting team expresses concern that the intended course maybe an insufficient course for achieving ability in this criterion.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the courses indicated as secondary sources by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion have not yet been offered. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that no primary location was indicated by the program in the SPC matrix as to where this evidence would be found.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given that no indication was provided by the program per the SPC matrix provided in the APR-IC. The visiting team expresses concern that the SPC matrix did not specify which course, if any, would demonstrate student ability of this criterion.

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

A.2. Design Thinking Skills

A.4. Technical Documentation

A.5. Investigative Skills

A.8. Ordering Systems

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

B.2. Accessibility

B.3. Sustainability

B.4. Site Design

B.5. Life Safety

B.7. Environmental Systems

B.9. Structural Systems

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion has not yet been offered. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that the intended courses for demonstrating this criterion – ARC 410 – Design Studio V (Comp.) and ARC 412 – Design Studio IV (Topic) - may be insufficient courses for this. Given the range of abilities outlined in criterion B.6, and the sum of all SPCs integrated into this criterion, student ability would require a course work whose level of completion higher than the 100% schematic design level indicated in syllabi for ARC 412.

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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the courses indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding of this criterion have not yet been offered.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding of this criterion has not yet been offered. Evidence of intent found in ARC 385 – Environmental Systems and ARC 480 – Sustainable Systems II.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion has not yet been offered. Evidence of intent are shown in ARC 290 - Statics & Strengths of Materials; ARC 390 - Structures I; and ARC 392 - Structures II.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the courses indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding of this criterion have not yet been offered.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding of this criterion has not yet been offered. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that the intended course for demonstrating this criterion – ARC 410 – Design Studio V (Comp.) – may not fully provide the range of understanding outlined in criterion B.11 based upon syllabi reviewed by the visiting team.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, as the courses indicated by the program, which would demonstrate student understanding had not yet been offered. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that the intended courses for demonstrating this criterion – ARC 312 - Design Studio IV, ARC 385 - Environmental Systems, and ARC 420 - Digital Fabrication did not reflect any component of criterion B.12 in the model syllabi for these classes.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The visiting team observed that the planned instruction of either ability or understanding of Realm B criteria is often not located in a logical or effective curricular location within the planned curriculum plan, based upon the SPC matrix provided in the APR-IC. In addition, criteria B2 and B4 only indicated secondary opportunities for developing student ability in the third, fourth or fifth year of matriculation, while there was no indication, primary or otherwise, in the SPC matrix or model syllabi for criteria B5 ability. Since all three aforementioned criteria are integrative elements to criteria B.6, there is concern that the modeled curriculum may not effectively support the overall range of Realm B criteria.

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 Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found in DES 112. While students in this course come from several disciplines within the college, the assignments seem to be very individualized to help them learn and understand design thinking. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that an additional intended course for demonstrating this criterion – ARC 205 *Introduction to the Profession*, a lecture course – may be difficult given that in this criterion students should gain an “ability to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects”.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was found in course ARC 242 - Architectural History II. However, the visiting team expresses concern that an intended course indicated in the SPC Matrix for demonstrating this criterion – ARC 350 – Theory 1 - may be an insufficient course for this, given the range of understanding outlined in criterion C.2.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the courses indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding of this criterion have not yet been offered.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding of this criterion has not yet been offered. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that an intended course for demonstrating this criterion – ARC 491 – Internship - may be an inappropriate or inadequate course for this, given the inability of the program to control the student's work experience and therefore ensure alignment with the range of understanding outlined in criterion C.4. The visiting team also expresses concern that an intended course for demonstrating this criterion – ARC 510 – Design Studio VII (topic) - may be an insufficient course for this, since the ARC 510 syllabus only requires students to complete work equal to 100% schematic design, which does not constitute comprehensive project management.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion has not yet been offered. Evidence of intent of this criterion is shown in ARC 570 - Professional Practice.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion has not yet been offered. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that the intended course for developing an understanding of this

criterion – ARC 512 – Thesis Studio – is an insufficient venue for this, given that thesis students will likely function in an insular state, and not in the collaborative spirit of criterion C.6.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding of this criterion has not yet been offered. Furthermore, the visiting team expresses concern that the intended course for demonstrating this criterion – BUS 357 – Small Business Management - may be an improper venue for this, given the inability of the program to control curriculum development of a course offered by the College of Business and ensure alignment with the range of understanding outlined in criterion C.7.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the course indicated by the program that would demonstrate student ability of this criterion has not yet been offered. Evidence of minimal intent of this criterion is shown in ARC 570 - Professional Practice. Ethics is expressed in the "purpose of the course", but not in the "assignments overview" of the course.

- 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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was not found, given the courses indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding of this criterion – ARC 312 – Design Studio IV and ARC 380 – Sustainable Systems I - have not yet been offered.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The majority of courses indicated by the program that would demonstrate student understanding or ability in Realm C have not yet been offered. Based on model syllabi provided, the visiting team has identified evidence of intent for some SPCs. However, the visiting team expresses concern that some courses (in their outline form) fall outside of the program's curricular control and therefore the program is unable to direct their development and ensure alignment with the range of student accomplishment outlined.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of current WASC accreditation presented and verified electronically. WASC Interim Approval Memorandum for the M. Arch program implementation was also presented.

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] Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: Based on the Architecture Curriculum Path, revised January 2014, the program contains (38) general studies credits, which are less than the number required by NAAB. The curriculum requires an additional 13 credits outside of the college, which currently satisfy Professional Studies requirements for the program. The SPC Assessment Matrix cites these 13 credit hours as criteria that also fulfill SPC's, and therefore not eligible to satisfy the general studies requirements at this time.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Based on supplemental evidence provided to the visiting team at the time of the visit, the program has more clearly explained how the curriculum is evaluated, modified and includes professional assessment to the student's professional program of study. In this Condition, the program should respond specifically to the departmental program review and not generically to the university's conceptual review of curricula.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The visiting team was provided evidence that delineates an admissions review program. Institution admissions staff reviews general studies coursework, and has an articulated matriculation agreement with two community colleges in the region for several lower division professional courses. On a case-by-case basis, a program faculty member who provides mentorship to students in the academic advising process (see Part I.2.1), or the Dean himself will review and assess the equivalency of the student performance criteria in professional coursework for transfer students from other universities or colleges.

FINAL DRAFT

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] Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: The 2013-2014 CBU Catalog does not contain required language; Dean Roberson indicated that as of the date of printing the current course catalogue, the school had not achieved Initial Eligibility and therefore could not include the applicable NAAB-mandated verbiage. Subsequent drafts of the catalog will have the required language incorporated. A draft version of the 2014-2015 catalog was reviewed and the required language was found, though this document is not public as of yet.

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] Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: The CAVAD website provided access via links at: <http://cbucavad.com/architecture/overview/>, but some links on the website are broken and therefore not available.

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.aia.org

www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence of access to career development information at the following online link: <http://cbucavad.com/architecture/overview/>.

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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: Though the program had no prior VTR to display, the APR-IC and the APR-IC is not required to be made available until after the decision letter is received by the program.

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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: At this stage of program development, there are no students in this program that have taken the ARE, and therefore this condition is not yet met.

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 California Baptist University, *APR-IC*, pp. 3-5

B. History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)

Reference California Baptist University, *APR-IC*, pp. 5-6

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference California Baptist University, *APR-IC*, pp. 16

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference California Baptist University, *APR-IC*, pp. 16

FINAL DRAFT

2. **Conditions Met with Distinction**
(list number and title; include comments where appropriate)

None.

FINAL DRAFT

3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the Academy
Brian H. Griggs, AIA
Corporate Associate / Architect
Parkhill, Smith & Cooper, Inc.
1001 S Harrison, Suite A
Amarillo, TX 79101
(806) 376-8600
bgriggs@team-psc.com

Representing the Profession
Amaya C. Labrador, EDAC, LEED GA
Intern Architect
HKS
1250 I Street NW, Suite 600
Washington DC 20005
(202) 315-1138 direct
(202) 682-6289 office
alabrador@hksinc.com

Representing the NAAB
Wendy Ornelas, FAIA
Associate Dean & Professor
The College of Architecture, Planning & Design
Kansas State University
115 Seaton Hall
Manhattan, KS 66506-2902
(785) 532-1119
wornelas@k-state.edu

IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Brian H. Griggs, AIA
Team Chair

Representing the Academy

Amaya C. Labrador, EDAC, LEED GA
Team member

Representing the Profession

Wendy Ornelas, FAIA
Team member

Representing the NAAB

FINAL DRAFT