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I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgements and Observations

First, the team thanks Dean Mark Roberson, Assistant Professor Susan Duemer, and many others for creating a well-organized team room, providing complete program and course information, and facilitating an effective and informative visit. Their hard work prior to the visit helped make our time at California Baptist University (CBU) productive and enjoyable.

Vice Provost and Accreditation Liaison Officer Dr. DawnEllen Jacobs and Dean of the College of Engineering Dr. Anthony Donaldson also generously shared their time and insights into the new architecture program at CBU. It is clear that the administration and other departments share the goal of establishing an architecture program that is united with the university’s vision.

The team has been astonished to witness the remarkable creation of an architecture program quite literally from scratch. Since his hiring as the founding dean of the College of Architecture, Visual Arts, + Design in 2011, Dean Roberson has created an approved curriculum, initiated the NAAB accreditation process, hired faculty, recruited students, and developed plans for a new college headquarters building. In addition to these nuts-and-bolts tasks, he has created a concrete vision of how the architecture program aligns with the core tenets of the university.

It is clear that the program enjoys the full support of the administration, faculty, students, and professional community toward the shared goal of a quality, Christian-based, professional architecture degree program. At every turn, resources, whether financial, personnel, equipment, or facility, are committed. By fulfilling the expectations of the administration and the educational desires of the students, by promoting the enthusiasm and dedication of the faculty, and by involving all these groups in the planning of the program, Dean Roberson has set the program on a course for success.

At the time of our visit, a cohort of 15 third-year students had been established as the presumptive Class of 2018. The student body is impressively diverse in terms of gender, race, and ethnicity. Students are articulate, authentic, and invested. The program appears on track to offer all required NAAB criteria, and the students appear on track to embrace these learning opportunities and make them their own. The program has made solid progress in addressing Conditions Not Met, Conditions Not Yet Met, and Causes of Concern that were identified in the Initial Candidacy Visit.

Many stakeholders, including both faculty and students, have voiced their excitement at the opportunity to help shape this architecture program from the very beginning. In this effort, the faculty may be able to provide valuable critical commentary on not only the direction and growth of the program, but also on the direction and growth of architectural education in general.

Challenges abound in the years ahead as a full body of students is enrolled, additional faculty are hired, workloads are redistributed, the curriculum and course content is refined, various program policies are fleshed out, and alumni become involved. The interim relocation of the architecture program to what is now the College of Engineering Building on Adams Street and the college’s ultimate move into its new headquarters building (still being planned and funded) will create many opportunities for collaboration and exposure. One key to success will be the program’s ability to keep all stakeholders unified around the original shared vision with the same commitment that has brought the program this far.
### Conditions Not/Not Yet Achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Not Yet Met</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity</td>
<td>I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates</td>
<td>III.2 Interim Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1 Pre-Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2 Site Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3 Codes and Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4 Technical Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5 Structural Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6 Environmental Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7 Building Envelope Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.8 Building Materials and Assemblies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.9 Building Service Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.10 Financial Considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1 Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2 Evaluation and Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3 Integrative Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2 Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3 Business Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4 Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.5 Professional Conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Progress on the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation

The program has made substantial progress in addressing the Conditions Not Met, Conditions Not Yet Met, and Causes of Concern that were identified in the Initial Candidacy Visit. While some of these concerns were related to coursework not yet offered, the program has addressed other concerns by rearranging and reconsidering course content. Since the last visit, the program has also secured better studio space and made plans to relocate to a single, spacious facility (beginning with the fall 2018 semester) that will bring all program spaces under one roof.

The program has faced the added challenge of managing implementation of the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation, which have gone into effect since the Initial Candidacy Visit, and appears to have done this successfully.

At the time of our visit, a total of 48 students in years one, two, and three were enrolled. A cohort of 15 third-year students had been established as the presumptive Class of 2018. This cohort represents a group of students who have dedicated themselves to this educational program, and the administration and faculty have dedicated themselves to ensuring that this group receives a first-class architectural education.

It is clear from the team’s meetings with the university administration, faculty, students, and professional community that the program enjoys full support toward the goal of achieving accreditation.

The program appears on track to offer all required NAAB criteria. In its SPC Matrix, the program has clearly identified the courses that are intended to meet, and show evidence of, these criteria, and, at the time of this visit, some of these course were currently being taught. For the courses not yet taught, curricula have been outlined along with required and suggested texts and resources.

III. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2014)

2009 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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 crystallize that mission.

2016 Team Assessment: See Condition I.1.1 History and Mission for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity (Culturally Rich Environment): 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: See Condition I.1.2 Learning Culture and Condition I.1.3 Social Equity for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 I.1.3. 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.
Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: The five perspectives were changed in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation to Condition I.1.4 Defining Perspectives, which no longer includes Architectural Education and the Academic Community. See the 2016 Team Assessment of Condition I.1.4 Defining Perspectives for information on what is currently demonstrated in relation to this condition.

2009 I.1.3. 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: The five perspectives were changed in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation to Condition I.1.4 Defining Perspectives, which no longer includes Architectural Education and the Students. See the 2016 Team Assessment of Condition I.1.4 Defining Perspectives for information on what is currently demonstrated in relation to this condition.

While this condition no longer exists, the team notes that there is evidence of great progress in this area since the last visit. The architecture program now has a total of 48 students enrolled. All of them have opportunities for engagement through the local AIAS chapter, which has been very active over the last year with leadership meetings and social events. There is a college student leadership council with representatives from each of the major disciplines and their identified class leaders. The college has begun a multi-disciplinary, college-wide, guest lecture series, which has scheduled a number of talented visiting speakers, including architects, artists, photographers, and a Hollywood set designer. The architecture program is also in the process of developing a study abroad program in Italy for the architecture students.

2009 Condition 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.
Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: See Condition I.1.5 Long-Range Planning for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Condition, 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This condition was eliminated in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation. See Condition I.1.6 Assessment, including Program Self-Assessment Procedures and Curricular Assessment and Development, for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Condition I.2.2, Administrative Structure & Governance (Governance): The program must demonstrate that all faculty, staff, and students have equitable opportunities to participate in program and institutional governance.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This condition was eliminated in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation. See Condition I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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 rooms VLG 100, a flat classroom that lacks studio-type workspaces, pin-up 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.

2016 Team Assessment: See Condition I.2.2 Physical Resources for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: See Condition II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.
2016 Team Assessment: See Condition II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 I.3.2, Annual Reports: 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: See Condition III.1 Annual Statistical Reports for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion A.1, Communication Skills: Ability to read, write, speak and listen effectively.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This individual SPC was revised in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and is now merged into SPC A.1 Professional Communication Skills. See SPC A.1 Professional Communication Skills for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: See SPC A.2 Design Thinking Skills for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This SPC no longer exists in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation, as SPC A.3 and A.1 were merged into SPC A.1 Professional Communication Skills. See SPC A.1 Professional Communication Skills for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.


2009 Criterion A.5, Investigative Skills: Ability to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: See SPC A.3 Investigative Skills for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion A.6, Fundamental Design Skills: Ability to effectively use basic architectural and environmental principles in design.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.


2009 Criterion 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.
Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This individual SPC was revised in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and is now SPC A.6 Use of Precedents. See SPC A.6 Use of Precedents for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: See SPC A.5 Ordering Systems for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: See SPC A.7 History and Culture for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This individual SPC was revised in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and is now SPC A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity. See SPC A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity for the 2016 Team Assessment.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion has been eliminated. See SPC C.1 Research for the 2016 Team Assessment of this area.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: See SPC B.1 Pre-Design for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This individual SPC was eliminated in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and is now merged into SPC B.3 Codes and Regulations. See SPC B.3 Codes and Regulations for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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 may be an insufficient course for achieving ability in this criterion.

2016 Team Assessment: This SPC no longer exists in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation. Sustainability is now reflected in Condition I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: D. Stewardship and the Environment and is embedded across multiple SPC. See Condition I.1.4 Defining Perspectives for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This individual SPC was revised in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and is now SPC B.2 Site Design. See SPC B.2 Site Design for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion B.5, Life Safety: Ability to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This SPC no longer exists in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation. Former SPC B.2 and B.5 have been merged into SPC B.3 Codes and Regulations. See SPC B.3 Codes and Regulations for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.2.</th>
<th>Design Thinking Skills</th>
<th>B.3.</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.5.</td>
<td>Investigative Skills</td>
<td>B.5.</td>
<td>Life Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This individual SPC was eliminated in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and is now SPC C.3 Integrative Design. See SPC C.3 Integrative Design for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This SPC has been revised and re-numbered to become SPC B.10 Financial Considerations. See SPC B.10 Financial Considerations for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This SPC has been revised, raised to the demonstration level of "Ability," and re-numbered to become SPC B.6 Environmental Systems. See SPC B.6 Environmental Systems for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This individual SPC was revised in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and raised to the level of "Ability." See SPC B.5 Structural Systems for the 2016 Team Assessment.
2009 Criterion 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.

**Previous Team Report (2014):** 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.

**2016 Team Assessment:** This individual SPC was revised in the 2014 *Conditions for Accreditation* and is now SPC B.7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies. See SPC B.7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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

**Previous Team Report (2014):** 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.

**2016 Team Assessment:** This SPC has been revised and re-numbered to become SPC B.9 Building Service Systems. See SPC B.9 Building Service Systems for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

**Previous Team Report (2014):** 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.

**2016 Team Assessment:** This SPC has been revised and re-numbered to become SPC B.8 Building Materials and Assemblies. See SPC B.8 Building Materials and Assemblies for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion C.1, Collaboration: *Ability* to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.

**Previous Team Report (2014):** 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".
2016 Team Assessment: This SPC no longer exists in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation. These principles are now reflected in Condition I.1.4 Defining Perspectives. See Condition I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: A. Collaboration and Leadership for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This SPC has been revised and re-numbered to become SPC D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture. See SPC D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion C.4, Project Management: Understanding of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This SPC has been revised and re-numbered to become SPC D.2 Project Management. See SPC D.2 Project Management for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This SPC has been revised and re-named to become SPC D.3 Business Practices. See SPC D.3 Business Practices for the 2016 Team Assessment.
2009 Criterion C.6, Leadership: Understanding of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This individual SPC has been eliminated in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and is now expressed as a Defining Perspective. See Condition I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: A. Collaboration and Leadership for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This SPC has been revised and renamed to become SPC D.4 Legal Responsibilities. See SPC D.4 Legal Responsibilities for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: This SPC has been revised and renamed to become SPC D.5 Professional Ethics. See SPC D.5 Professional Ethics for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.
2016 Team Assessment: This individual SPC has been eliminated in the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and is now expressed as a Defining Perspective. See Condition I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: E. Community and Social Responsibility for the 2016 Team Assessment.

2009 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)

Previous Team Report (2014): 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.

2016 Team Assessment: See Part Two (II) Section 4 – Public Information for the 2016 Team Assessment.
IV. Compliance (or Plans for Compliance) with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

PART ONE (I): SECTION 1 – IDENTITY AND SELF-ASSESSMENT

1.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission, and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program’s pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. This includes the program’s benefits to the institutional setting, and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university’s academic plan. This also includes how the program as a unit develops multi-disciplinary relationships and leverages opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.

2016 Analysis/Review: The mission of CBU is to provide a liberal arts education in a Christian environment. Now approaching its 70th anniversary, the university is currently home to almost 8,000 students, with growth expected to continue. The centrality of Christian faith and practice permeates the university in relation to its mission, guiding philosophy, goals, and student outcomes.

Intended to complement the growth of other program areas, such as engineering, the architecture program, CBU Architecture, was designed to equip graduates to meet global challenges in ways that are aesthetic, practical, socially responsive, and ecologically responsible. The university’s decision to begin an architecture program was based on evidence of a strong demand for such a program in the “Inland Empire” area, in general, and the extreme lack of architectural programs at Christian institutions, in particular. The founding dean, Mark Roberson, was hired in fall 2011 to direct the new College of Art, Design, Architecture, and Film, and the program welcomed its first cohort in fall 2013.

The architecture program is the anchor program of the college, which serves the university’s desire to promote cross-disciplinary learning opportunities both within and outside the college. Courses are co-taught by faculty from the architecture, film, art, and graphic design programs, and from other programs.

The mission of the architecture program is to develop architects who demonstrate professional excellence and personal integrity, are servant leaders in their communities, and who live biblically based, missional lives within the profession.

As part of applying a Christian worldview, CBU Architecture hires only Christian faculty to ensure that its principles are strongly upheld and to ensure that these principles are the catalyst for philosophical and academic discussion and exploration. Core principles of service, social and environmental responsibility, interdisciplinary collaboration, and missional focus were developed to guide the program.

The university has a strong record of commitment to successfully establishing professional programs in a range of disciplines (such as allied health and engineering) through the accreditation process. The university is committed to assuring continuous program quality even in the face of an aggressive growth agenda.

1.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages 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.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy that also includes a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition to the matters identified above,
the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.

- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include, but are not limited to, participation in field trips, professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

2016 Analysis/Review: The visiting team found that, in just 2.5 years since the architecture program enrolled its first students at CBU, there is already a strong and vibrant learning culture that has developed within the College of Architecture, Visual Arts, + Design. The very nature of CBU as a Christian faith-based institution reinforces a positive and respectful learning environment, where mutual respect, sharing, peer mentoring, and constructive criticism of ideas are welcome. The students report—and it was made clear to the team members through their observation of instruction in the studio courses—that innovation is encouraged among faculty and students and that students enjoy a safe learning environment where they can explore the iterative design process. The level of enthusiasm and optimism embodied by both students and faculty is evident in the hard work demonstrated in the team room and in meetings on site.

The team found that a studio culture policy had been adopted by the program, which was provided in the APR and was clearly posted in the studio classrooms. The team also found a healthy dialogue taking place among both faculty and students around work-life balance, time management, and health and well-being. The architecture program had instituted a 2:00 a.m. curfew in the studios during the 2014-2015 academic year to encourage better time management and better sleep habits; however, at the time of the team visit, the program was experimenting with 24/7 access to the studios during the 2015-2016 academic year.

The team found that the program has a number of opportunities for student growth and learning outside of the prescribed curriculum, including university-sponsored mission service programs, studio field trips to significant architectural sights in the greater southern California area, and activities of student organizations, which offer leadership opportunities. These organizations include the AIAS, a newly formed NOMAS chapter, and a college Student Advisory Council. Additionally, the program will launch its first international study opportunity this summer, which will send 13 students to Italy for more than 30 days to study in a rich, architecturally significant context. This program, through a tuition fee structure, will become a required part of the curriculum for all students.

I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students as compared with the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution during the next two accreditation cycles.

- The program must document that institutional-, college-, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

2016 Analysis/Review: Overall, the visiting team found that issues of social equity and diversity are being addressed by the College of Architecture, Visual Arts, + Design (CAVAD) architecture program at CBU. The rate of diversity of race and ethnicity in student enrollment in the architecture program is well above the rates seen in university-wide undergraduate enrollment. Additionally, there are high rates of student gender diversity both at the program and university levels. As a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), according to the Higher Education Act (HEA) definition, there is a diverse student body in the university context and even more so in the context of the program. As part of the increased service to low-income and Hispanic students, the university was eligible to receive Title III and Title V funding in 2010. The APR
and appendix material made available to the team on site provided evidence of policies on diversity and inclusion, as well as non-discriminatory policies.

However, despite the diverse student population, CBU historically has struggled to attract a diverse faculty and staff (as acknowledged by the program in the APR) in spite of multiple efforts and plans to make openings known to a diverse pool of applicants. The architecture program faculty currently have a moderately diverse make up with respect to race/ethnicity and gender, but the team notes that the diversity of the faculty as it grows could continue to be improved to better reflect the diversity of the student population.

The team found that the program currently has a plan for maintaining and increasing diversity as outlined in the APR. This includes the program's continued advertisement of faculty positions on the NOMA website and through other sources that reach a diverse pool of applicants. Regarding student enrollment diversity, the program has relationships with a number of local community colleges and high schools through AVID and ACE Mentoring programs. These relationships increase the visibility of the program to potential future students and help maintain and continue to build student diversity.

In the APR and in materials made available in the team room, the team also found evidence of institutional and program policies for EEO/AA and non-discriminatory policies.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Collaboration and Leadership. The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders.

B. Design. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multi-dimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed at addressing increasingly complex problems, engaging a diverse constituency, and providing value and an improved future.

C. Professional Opportunity. The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and career paths for architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings, and in local and global communities.

D. Stewardship of the Environment. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and the natural resources that are significantly compromised by the act of building and by constructed human settlements.

E. Community and Social Responsibility. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens that are able to understand what it means to be a professional member of society and to act on that understanding. The social responsibility of architects lies, in part, in the belief that architects can create better places, and that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program's response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to positively influence the development of, conservation of, or changes to the built and natural environment.

2016 Analysis/Review: The program is still growing in terms of responding to all these perspectives, but noticeable results are emerging.
Collaboration is taught, modeled, and practiced through several required courses that are specifically designed to include team projects. In ARC 310 Design Studio 3 (Urban Design), students have the opportunity to work with political leaders and other stakeholders through the programming and design process. Students are encouraged to take courses in other disciplines, and the curriculum design permits them to do so. A formal Student Advisory Council was established this semester to provide regular feedback to the dean. An AIAS chapter was also recently established, and the chapter's student officers are already planning activities such as "Freedom By Design."

Design thinking is introduced in the first year of the program beginning with DES 110 Design Thought Foundations I and DES 112 Design Thought Foundations II, which focus on generative strategies, the design process, ideation, idea communication, and the evaluation of design ideas. The students then proceed through eight distinct design studios that are each focused on different aspects of design, which culminate in several integrative design projects.

Professional opportunities are provided in several ways. Dean Roberson has leveraged his professional network to involve area practitioners in the teaching of Professional Practice courses. These practitioners also participate in critiques and offer office tours. Students benefit from the input of an Architect Licensing Advisor (ALA), who connects students to information and resources concerning the NCARB and the Intern Development Program (IDP).

Faculty and students understand stewardship of the environment not only as a professional mandate, but also as a faith imperative of man as caretaker of the earth. Several systems courses and upper-level studios are planned to integrate sustainable strategies and philosophy throughout the curriculum. However, at the time of this visit, only one of these courses, ARC 380 Sustainable Systems 1, had been offered.

Community and social responsibility is understood and embraced by faculty and students in terms of a greater purpose. Both see their professional lives as an opportunity to live their Christian purpose to impact the world in meaningful ways. The university provides opportunities for extracurricular service projects; several students have participated in these and other activities such as Habitat for Humanity. Much discussion has occurred between the program and other entities regarding ministerial design work opportunities, but these have yet to be realized. As the program matures and becomes more visible to the public and allied organizations, there will no doubt be many more meaningful opportunities for students to engage with the community.

1.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement with a ratified planning document and/or planning process. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources, to identify patterns and trends so as to inform its future planning and strategic decision making. The program must describe how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college, and university.

2016 Analysis/Review: As is appropriate during the candidacy period, the program is committed to long-range planning and has demonstrated this commitment by clearly established protocols and documents. Functional and operational planning for the program is grounded in an Architecture Assessment Portfolio that connects Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). The SLOs, based upon the program's mission, and the NAAB Student Performance Criteria provide a rich data set for planning program growth and assessment, and facilitate self-reflection and quality assurance relative to a 5-year planning cycle. The SLOs also appear in the program's Annual Assessment Report for Architecture.

At the same time, strategic planning takes place within the college and at the university level as evidenced by the College of Architecture, Visual Arts, + Design Strategic Goals and the Academic Affairs Division Strategic Goals, which are part of the overarching CBU Strategic Goals. With particular regard to the development of the program in the context of its candidacy for NAAB accreditation, the dean notes the program's ambition to build upon the institution's current growth and momentum through short term (up to 5 years) and long-term (more than 5 years) goals, which are articulated in the CBU Architecture Long-Range Planning Priorities document. The APR makes clear that the architecture program's faculty,
staff, and students, together with the university administration and external peers in the profession, are engaged in these planning activities. Students' voices are heard through regular course evaluations, student forums, and focus and advisory groups.

I.1.6 Assessment:

A. Program Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated objectives.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives.
- Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

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

B. Curricular Assessment and Development: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments, and must identify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

2016 Analysis/Review:

A. Program Self-Assessment Procedures
As noted in Condition I.1.5 Long-Range Planning, the program benefits from clearly defined planning practices at the college and university levels, which provide a solid framework for assessing the program's progress toward its mission and stated objectives. Throughout the course of the program's candidacy, clearly defined multi-year objectives have guided curricular planning and implementation, faculty hiring and development, and student recruitment, advising, and retention to move the program toward a successful application for NAAB accreditation in 2018. With strong support from the university administration, the program is progressing well in realizing these objectives and has satisfactorily addressed deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit. An established pattern of peer review through the inclusion of external participants from both academia and the profession in studio reviews and curricular discussions contributes to this positive trajectory.

The strengths of the program include the strong commitment of the CBU administration to its success; the expertise of its faculty and their demonstrated commitment to building the program; a diverse and engaged student body; and the unique perspectives for architectural education created by the faith-based context of the institution. Challenges that the program may face relate to its desired (and necessary) growth in faculty and student cohorts as the 5-year program is fully realized. Currently, faculty have high teaching loads as well as responsibilities for curricular development. Student retention in the first year of the program has an unavoidable impact on reaching enrollment goals related to the long-term viability of the program. As one of only a few professional programs in architecture situated within Christian universities, the program's greatest opportunities may stem from the special audience of students that it attracts and the pedagogical potential for bringing an ethically and service-driven perspective of shaping the made environment to the learning experiences it offers.

B. Curricular Assessment
In accordance with university protocols and faculty input, the program generates metrics for curricular assessment based upon its articulated SLOs. A subset of SLOs is looked at closely every year with the goal of examining all SLOs in a 5-year cycle. The SLOs address significant measures of curricular efficacy for the professional program, including critical thinking, communication skills, the influence of
ideas based upon research and analysis, developing design sensibilities and problem solving skills, comprehending building technology, appreciating the role of professional practice, and, in keeping with the institution’s faith-based mission, ethical practices and service relative to the profession. Since the architecture program is small with little committee structure, the architecture faculty frequently meet formally and informally to assess curricular efficacy and demonstrate awareness of learning experiences in the courses that they teach, thereby contributing to a holistic approach to curricular assessment and evolution. In addition, the architecture administration and faculty meet for curriculum development workshops to support course and program development. As the program grows in size as it reaches its full complement of students and course offerings, more defined and structured protocols relative to setting curricular agendas and initiatives will emerge.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has 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.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and the teacher that promotes student achievement.
- The program must demonstrate that an Architect Licensing Advisor (ALA) has been appointed, is trained in the issues of IDP, has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the ALA position description, and regularly attends ALA training and development programs.
- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including, but not limited to, academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

[X] In Progress

2016 Team Assessment: Examination of the APR, scrutiny of team room documents (General Policies and Procedures) addressing policies and faculty matters, and meetings with the faculty and administrative leadership demonstrated that the program is making progress toward assembling the appropriate human resources to fully support student learning and achievement; however, the program will have to grow the depth and breadth of these resources incrementally as candidacy and full delivery of the program curriculum progress.

The faculty members are to be commended for their high level of commitment to the program and its students as faculty work with demonstrated dedication to bring the full program curriculum to fruition, to critically assess and improve existing courses, and to advise, mentor, and inspire students. The typical faculty contract for CBU faculty is 24 credit hours per academic year, a metric that produces a relatively heavy teaching load. Full-time faculty are carrying heavy course loads and unusually heavy service loads during the candidacy period, which leaves little time for the requisite personal professional development that will allow them to keep current in their fields and advance in accordance with the university’s protocols for tenure and promotion. Although CBU policy stipulates that a typical faculty load is 60% teaching/20% research-creative practice/20% service, the team observed that, in practice, most faculty commitments differ from this metric.

A cohort of adjunct faculty, from peer units on campus to local practitioners, is also essential to the delivery of the curriculum. The adjunct faculty role in program development may warrant further examination until the faculty cohort required to deliver the entire curriculum is in place.

Discussions with students indicated that they value their faculty and their dean highly, as well as the effectiveness of the faculty, particularly in design studio teaching. At this time, one faculty member is responsible for all formal academic advising. It will be necessary to change this model for advising as enrollment grows.

Assistant Professor Susan Duemer has been designated as the CBU ALA and is engaged in keeping students informed regarding the path to licensure, with special attention to the IDP process and preparation for it. Professor Duemer attended Architect Licensing Advisors Summits in 2014 and 2015. Discussions with the dean and the vice provost demonstrated that the program and the university are eager to support faculty professional development that contributes to program improvement. Faculty members are making every effort to pursue creditable scholarship and creative practice, as evidenced by
documentation of faculty research, scholarship, and creative activities. In addition, faculty take full advantage of CBU faculty development funding and micro-grant funding. Again, the team expresses concern about the faculty’s ability to sustain the very active and rigorous level of engagement in teaching, research, and creative practice to which the faculty members aspire. The team also notes the integrated scholarship of teaching that distinguishes the program and the curriculum development in which the full-time faculty is so fully involved.

The university’s commitment to supporting its students through a variety of overarching academic services is made apparent in the APR and verified through inspection of the CBU website. This commitment includes well-established programs for academic tutoring in its Academic Success Center, opportunities for students to participate in the tutoring of the community’s students, and academic workshops. Within the program, academic advising by a faculty member ensures that curricular decisions, including general education options and the carefully structured professional program courses, are well informed. While CBU provides resources to its students through a central Career Center, it was clear through discussions with students that they understand the important role of the dean and the faculty in making connections for them with local practitioners. Adjunct faculty, drawn from practice, also play an important role in this early but significant professional development process.

1.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including labs, shops, and equipment.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- Information resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program’s pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

[X] Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: Fulfillment of this condition was demonstrated through a tour of the main campus facilities and other facilities, as well as through briefings on future building and growth plans.

The majority of the architecture program classrooms and studio environments are located on CBU’s West Campus (the Health Science Campus). This small campus of buildings includes indoor teaching spaces, outdoor learning environments, food services, an auditorium, additional ancillary spaces, and separate parking. The West Campus buildings are located across the street from the main campus. The heart of the main campus is accessible via a safely lit and controlled 10- to 12-minute walk from the West Campus. There, students can access the larger main campus dining facilities, the main campus library, the offices of their architecture program faculty, and other key university resources. The current design studios on the West Campus have ample desk, storage, and critique space for all students. These studios appear to be of high quality and function well for the student population. Many of them have new furniture.

In summer 2018, the architecture program is slated to move into the building currently occupied by the College of Engineering, at which point another university department will move into the current West Campus location being vacated by the architecture program. The College of Engineering building is on the east side of the main campus across the street from the West Campus. This building is currently equipped for both laboratory and classroom-style teaching, and, following some very minor modifications,
it will have the capacity to house 250 students of architecture, their necessary studio and pinup spaces, faculty offices, and other ancillary spaces.

Currently, students in the architecture program share wood, metal, and concrete shop facilities with the College of Engineering at a satellite location near campus, which is accessible via a regularly scheduled campus shuttle. Students reported no difficulty in sharing these spaces and materials with the engineering students, and it is evident that a strong partnership exists between the two programs. After the College of Engineering relocates, and into the foreseeable future, this sharing of space and opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration will continue. There is also an opportunity for the two programs to share some new shop spaces that are planned for development. In addition, 3D fabrication labs are available to architecture students from within the College of Engineering. The College of Architecture, Visual Arts, + Design operates a gallery space in downtown Riverside that holds a number of opportunities for the architecture program students.

The program administration shared future university development plans with the visiting team. They include the construction of a new CAVAD building adjacent to what will be the new College of Engineering building. The land for the CAVAD building is being reserved for the college by the university until the necessary funding can be secured. It is thought that there will be a number of opportunities in this new building for interdisciplinary collaborative efforts among the different programs of the college.

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: The program has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement as demonstrated through meetings with the university and college administration and a review of budget data provided in the APR, including the college’s 2015-2016 “budget form” and the Master of Architecture “Pro Forma Budget,” which outlines actual and projected costs for the entire candidacy period.

The program currently derives most of its finances from the university, and the dean engages in an annual budgeting process through which the program’s operating budget is determined, subject to university approval. Discussions with the college and university administration indicated that the California Baptist University Budget is stable. This was supported by an Annual Audit Report that verifies the accuracy of the budget’s financial information. The Comprehensive University Plan outlines revenue forecasts as part of the financial decision-making process, taking into account donor development, resource planning, and FTE enrollment information. The commitment of the provost’s office to investing in faculty development, with particular emphasis on cultivating the scholarship of teaching, is a strength of the institution from which the program and its faculty benefit. Faculty development opportunities include a year-long program for new faculty focused on teaching, annual allocations to faculty for research and creative activity (faculty development funding), and “micro-grant” seed funding for special projects.

Examination of the program budget indicates the high degree to which revenue is tuition based and enrollment driven. Although external (donor) support does not play a significant role in program finances at this time, it is apparent that the dean seeks to cultivate relationships with local and regional practitioners and industry to develop additional financial resources for the program, particularly in the area of student support. Some funds for student scholarships are already derived from private donors. The dean is also looking ahead to the external funding that will be required for the desired (future) construction of the new building for CAVAD.

Discussions with students revealed that the majority of them depend on financial assistance to support their architectural education, and they expressed satisfaction with the assistance that they receive from the university financial aid office as they seek support. The program provides program-specific scholarships to architecture majors, which, at this point, are funded largely by the university budget and awarded competitively.
1.2.4 Information Resources: The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

Further, the program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architectural librarians and visual-resource professionals who provide information services that teach and develop the research, evaluative, and critical-thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

[X] Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: Fulfillment of this condition was demonstrated through a scheduled library tour and through the APR, where reporting from the program included information on digital catalogs and the total volumes maintained.

The Annie Gabriel Library is one of the two oldest buildings on the CBU campus. It already existed on the campus when the university moved to Riverside in 1955. The building has served as the central library for the entire university population since the late 1950s. The library maintains a strategic plan, part of which is a collection development and acquisition plan for increasing the total number of volumes available to students.

Currently, the library houses 4,575 architectural volumes—a mix of both physical and digital e-books. The library director, Steve Emerson, and the collection development librarian have worked with the program administration regarding collection growth and continuing to meet the needs of the students in the growing architecture program, and they continue to engage one another in pursuit of this goal on a regular basis.

In addition to housing the architectural volumes, the library subscribes to a number of online journal databases that are available to students and faculty via their online login. The databases include the Avery Index to architectural periodicals, which gives students access to 184 architecture-specific journals, and Art Source, which provides access to hundreds of additional periodicals focusing on related subject matter in the arts.

The total CBU catalog at the Annie Gabriel Library includes over 325,000 physical and digital monographs, and this collection expands to over 1 million when including the volumes available via the Camino interlibrary loan system, which is made up of other regional university libraries, of which the Annie Gabriel Library is a part. In their first year at the university, all students participate in an information literacy program through their English general education courses. It includes instruction on using the university library system and time spent in the library completing a research project related to their degree majors.

As the university and architecture program both continue to grow, there are plans in place, as stated in the APR, for the continued growth of the number of library volumes and other visual resources available to the students. Additionally, the program administration made it clear to the team that it has not had trouble acquiring additional volumes or other resources specific to architecture that have been sought by the administration.
I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

- **Administrative Structure**: The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and the school, college, and institution.

- **Governance**: The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[X] Demonstrated

**2016 Team Assessment**: The administrative structure and governance protocols that support the program were clarified in the APR, in a team room folio of data on "general policies and procedures," in meetings with members of the provost's staff—Vice Provost and Accreditation Liaison Officer Dr. DawnEllen Jacobs, and Vice Provost and Accreditation Liaison Officer designee Dr. Elizabeth Morris—and in discussions with Dean Roberson and the faculty. At the university level, structure and governance protocols are determined, first, by the California Southern Baptist Convention (CSBC), which owns and operates the university. The university president reports directly to the CSBC’s Board of Trustees while the dean of CAVAD reports to the university provost, one of eight vice presidents who are accountable to the president. Dean Roberson, who also serves as the chair of the architecture program, oversees programs in visual arts, graphic design, film studies, and photography. A program faculty cohort of three full-time assistant professors and one half-time assistant professor (jointly appointed in art history), plus one administrative assistant, report to the dean/chair. Dean Roberson noted that discussions are underway to add a program chair for architecture and/or an associate dean for the college, positions that are increasingly necessary as the academic unit grows.

Given the very small size of the faculty, consensus-based decision making has been practiced, with all faculty members engaged directly in decisions concerning program and curriculum development, faculty development and hiring, and policy articulation. CAVAD holds one seat on the CBU faculty senate, and faculty members have opportunities to participate in campus committees. Student participation in governance begins with studio leaders, who provide a conduit between architecture program students and the administration. There is an active AIAS chapter, and there are indications that a NOMAS chapter will form soon. Students also can seek leadership roles in campus student government. Discussions with the full student body and with student leaders demonstrated that the dean and the faculty are accessible to students and responsive to their concerns and interests.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE – EDUCATIONAL REALMS AND 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: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

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

A.1 Professional Communication Skills: Ability to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARC 310 Design Studio 3 (Urban Design).

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

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARC 310 Design Studio 3 (Urban Design).

A.3 Investigative Skills: Ability to gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARC 212 Design Studio 2 (Program) and ARC 310 Design Studio 3 (Urban Design).

A.4 Architectural Design Skills: Ability to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.
2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for DES 122 3D Visual Expression, ARC 210 Design Studio 1 (Spatial), and ARC 380 Sustainable Systems 1.

A.5 Ordering Systems: Ability to apply the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for DES 122 3D Visual Expression and ARC 210 Design Studio 1 (Spatial).

A.6 Use of Precedents: Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARC 212 Design Studio 2 (Program) and ARC 310 Design Studio 3 (Urban Design).

A.7 History and Culture: Understanding of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, and regional settings in terms of their political, economic, social, and technological factors.

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARC 240 Architectural History 1 and ARC 242 Architectural History 2.

A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity: Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to buildings and structures.

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in upper-level design studio courses that have not yet been taught.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The team found sufficient evidence to indicate that all but one of the SPC under Realm A are being met. Overall, the level of student ability and understanding for these criteria is to be commended, as it is clear that the program has exerted a great deal of effort over the last 2.5 years to develop a strong curriculum rooted in foundational design and arts that will provide the students with a strong basis for their education and practice in architecture and design. The program is continuing to strive for the excellence in outcomes that is already evidenced for these criteria by the student work displayed during the visit.
Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. Additionally, the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately.

B.1 Pre-Design: Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in upper-level design studio courses—ARC 511 Thesis Research/Preparation and ARC 410 Design Studio 5—that have not yet been taught.

B.2 Site Design: Ability to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation in the development of a project design.

[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in upper-level design studio courses that have not yet been taught.

B.3 Codes and Regulations: Ability to design sites, facilities and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in upper-level design studio courses that are either currently being taught—ARC 312 Design Studio 4—or that have not yet been taught—ARC 410 Design Studio 5.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in upper-level design studio courses—such as ARC 420 Digital Fabrication—that have not yet been taught.
B.5 **Structural Systems:** *Ability* to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravity, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system.

[X] Not Yet Met

**2016 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level of ability to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems was found in student work prepared for ARC 390 Structural Analysis. Some evidence of the ability to apply select structural systems was found in student work prepared for ARC 310 Design Studio 3 (Urban Design), but evidence of ability to select appropriate structural systems was not found in any courses. In the future, this ability may be demonstrated in upper-level design studio courses that have not yet been taught.

B.6 **Environmental Systems:** *Understanding* of the principles of environmental systems' design, how systems can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This must include active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[X] Not Yet Met

**2016 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Not Yet Met. The team found evidence at an introductory level for portions of this criterion in ARC 380 Sustainable Systems 1, but not to a satisfactory level that addressed the full criterion. The program has identified ARC 385 Environmental Systems—being taught at the time of this report—as another primary course for demonstrating this criterion.

B.7 **Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies:** *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Not Yet Met

**2016 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in upper-level design studio courses that have not yet been taught.

B.8 **Building Materials and Assemblies:** *Understanding* of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components, and assemblies based on their inherent performance, including environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Not Yet Met

**2016 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in upper-level design studio courses that have not yet been taught.

B.9 **Building Service Systems:** *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems, including mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation security, and fire protection systems.

[X] Not Yet Met

**2016 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in ARC 385 Environmental Systems, which is being taught at the time of this report.
B.10 Financial Considerations: Understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met. The program has identified ARC 570 Professional Practice—not yet taught—as the primary course that will demonstrate this criterion.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The criteria under Realm B are Not Yet Met. In its SPC Matrix, the program has clearly identified which courses are intended to meet, and show evidence of, these criteria, and, at the time of this visit, some of those courses are currently being taught. For the courses not yet taught, curricula have been outlined along with required and suggested texts and resources.

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.
- Responding to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.
- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.

C.1 Research: Understanding of the theoretical and applied research methodologies and practices used during the design process.

[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in ARC 511 Thesis Research/Preparation, which has not yet been taught. ARC 242 Architectural History 2, which introduces research through the writing of a research paper, sets a foundation for an understanding of a broader range and application of research later in the curriculum.

C.2 Evaluation and Decision Making: Ability to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in upper-level design studio courses that have not yet been taught.

C.3 Integrative Design: Ability to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

[X] Not Yet Met
2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in upper-level design studio courses that have not yet been taught.

Realm C: General Team Commentary: The criteria under Realm C are Not Yet Met. In its SPC Matrix, the program has clearly identified which courses are intended to meet, and show evidence of, these criteria. For the courses not yet taught, curricula have been outlined along with required and suggested texts and resources.

Realm D: Professional Practice: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction.
- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.
- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture: Understanding of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect, and other key stakeholders, such as user groups and the community, in the design of the built environment, and understanding the responsibilities of the architect to reconcile the needs of those stakeholders.

[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met. The program has identified ARC 570 Professional Practice—not yet taught—as the primary course to demonstrate evidence of this criterion.

D.2 Project Management: Understanding of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams; identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements; and recommending project delivery methods.

[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met. The program has identified ARC 570 Professional Practice—not yet taught—as the primary course to demonstrate evidence of this criterion.

D.3 Business Practices: Understanding of the basic principles of business practices within the firm, including financial management and business planning, marketing, business organization, and entrepreneurialism.

[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met. The program has identified BUS 505 Entrepreneurship—not yet taught—as the primary course to demonstrate evidence of this criterion.

D.4 Legal Responsibilities: Understanding of the architect’s responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.
[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met. The program has identified ARC 570 Professional Practice—not yet taught—as the primary course to demonstrate evidence of this criterion.

D.5 Professional Conduct: Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice, and understanding the role of the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

[X] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level is expected to be demonstrated in upper-level design studio courses that have not yet been taught.

Realm D. General Team Commentary: The criteria under Realm D are Not Yet Met. In its SPC Matrix, the program has clearly identified which courses are intended to meet, and show evidence of, these criteria. For the courses not yet taught, curricula have been outlined along with required and suggested texts and resources.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation:

In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. 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).

2. Institutions located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The APR includes documentation that verifies the accreditation of California Baptist University by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) pursuant to commission action of February 18, 2011 (see also http://www.wascsenior.org/institutions/california-baptist-university). The WASC approved CBU’s M. Arch degree through an action letter dated November 21, 2013 (see APR, Appendix 25, WASC Approval Memorandum).

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs with the following titles: 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 optional studies.

The B. Arch, M. Arch, and/or D. Arch are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch, M. Arch, or D. Arch for a non-accredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Every accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The institution offers an M. Arch program that requires a minimum of 168 semester credit hours in academic coursework, of which 30 semester credit hours are at the graduate level. CBU, rooted deeply in a faith-based tradition of liberal education, requires a robust general education core for all of its undergraduates that exceeds the 45 hours of general studies required for the M. Arch degree. Judicious course substitution that allows architecture students to fulfill general education requirements with courses from the architecture curriculum reduces the overall unit load for architecture students while still allowing them to complete the 45 units of non-architecture curriculum. Also, within the 168 semester credit hours required for the M. Arch degree, 39 semester credit hours in upper division coursework (300- and 400-level courses) are required, with 30 semester credit hours at the graduate level (500-level courses). Requirements for a minimum of 10 semester credit hours of optional studies also are met. In addition to the materials provided in the team room, evidence documenting the degree paths and curricular structure was available through the California Baptist University Advising webpage.
(https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DKvRoQJQ3QrFeRilya25v7uNg-FTqNIR8P3PLeFenI/edit?pref=2&pli=1#gid=0) and the website of CAVAD (see especially "Path to the M. Arch," http://cavad.calbaptist.edu/media/docs/CAVAD%20Architecture%20Path.pdf).
PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB Student Performance Criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.

- In the event that a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate that it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.

- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: A thorough and equitable process for evaluating the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the M. Arch program is in place, which is made clear in the Architecture Program Report.

In accordance with university policy, students who transfer in coursework are held to institutional transfer policies and procedures that require "students who have completed 24 or more units from a regionally accredited college or university to be evaluated on the basis of their official college transcripts." Further, students may transfer in no more than 100 semester units toward degree requirements, and only coursework completed with a grade C- or better is accepted in transfer (see California Baptist University Catalog, 2015-16, pp. 19-20).

In instances where courses are being transferred to replace courses that contribute to the fulfillment of NAAB SPC, these courses will be evaluated by the program according to evidence of work in the courses that meets NAAB criteria for the designated SPC at the levels of achievement and understanding required. Additionally, the program will require a portfolio of work from any student wishing to transfer an architecture design studio or other design or design-related course into the program. These courses are evaluated according to course descriptions and syllabi from the architecture program for quality and appropriateness as well as evidence that the work in the courses meets NAAB criteria for the designated SPC at the levels of achievement and understanding required. This policy is articulated in the APR (p. 53) but does not appear in the university catalog.

To facilitate the evaluation of transfer students, the program has established articulation agreements with a number of regional community colleges that offer pre-architecture programs, including Mount San Antonio College, East L.A. College, Citrus College, and L.A. Harbor College.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 — PUBLIC INFORMATION

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the general public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online.

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 1, in catalogs and promotional media.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The team found that the exact language required, per the NAAB 2014 Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 1, appears in the following locations:

- "Curriculum path to a degree in architecture" informational coursework guides provided to students at: http://cavad.calbaptist.edu/media/docs/CAVAD%20Architecture%20Path.pdf
- The "Accreditation" tab (which at the time of this report was easily found) of the architecture program website at: http://cavad.calbaptist.edu/architecture/accreditation/
- Recent undergraduate course catalogs available online at:
  - 2014-2015:
  - 2015-2016:

The team noted that the required language is not currently found in graduate course catalogs; however, at the time of the visit, the program had not yet taught or offered any graduate level courses.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty, and the public:

- The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
- The Conditions for Accreditation in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004, depending on the date of the last visit)
- The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The team found that each of the required documents noted above were located under the “Accreditation” tab of the architecture program website (http://cavad.calbaptist.edu/architecture/accreditation/), which is available for download by any student, faculty member, or member of the public.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.

[X] Met
2016 Team Assessment: The architecture program page of the College of Architecture, Visual Arts, + Design website (http://cavad.calbaptist.edu/architecture/) provides a visible link (http://cavad.calbaptist.edu/architecture/career-opportunities/) for those who wish "to learn more about career opportunities available to individuals with advanced architecture degrees." The California Baptist University Career Center's website (http://www.calbaptist.edu/explore-cbu/offices/career-center/) provides additional information in support of career development.

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 electronically available to the public:

- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- All NAAB Responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB.
- The most recent APR. ¹
- The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The IPRs and NAAB Responses to the IPRs are not applicable, as the program is in the candidacy phase. The team was able to find evidence of the most recent decision letter from the NAAB, the most recent APR, and the most recent VTR on the "Accreditation" tab of the architecture program website (http://cavad.calbaptist.edu/architecture/accreditation/). Additionally, the program states the following on its website: "The latest Architecture Program Report (APR) and NAAB Visiting Team Report (VTR) are available for view in the CAVAD Office at CBU, Room J446."

¹ This is understood to be the APR from the previous visit, not the APR for the visit currently in process.
II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates:

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their websites to the results.

[X] Not Applicable

2016 Team Assessment: With the program still in candidacy for accreditation and having not yet produced its first cohort of graduates, ARE pass rates are not applicable.

II.4.6 Admissions and Advising:

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions.
- Admissions requirements, admissions decision procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing.
- Forms and process for the evaluation of preprofessional degree content.
- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships.
- Student diversity initiatives.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: All relevant information concerning applications and admissions is available on the "Future Students" page of the California Baptist University website (http://www.calbaptist.edu/future-students/why-cbu/applying-cbu/), which provides links to an online admissions process. Undergraduate admissions counselors follow up with students who initiate this online process. Protocols and requirements for discrete cohorts of entering students—including traditional first-year students (high school students and home-schooled students), college transfer students, international students, and returning students—are articulated (see http://www.calbaptist.edu/future-students/why-cbu/applying-cbu/application-requirements/). A discussion of student life, including spiritual life and community life, addresses student diversity (see http://www.calbaptist.edu/future-students/why-cbu/student-life/), as does the Office of Leadership and Transitions (see http://www.calbaptist.edu/explore-cbu/offices/office-of-leadership-and-transitions). Two publications, "the CBU Freshman Academic Advising Syllabus" and "the CBU Transfer Academic Advising Syllabus," also facilitate entry and assimilation into the university and the college.

II.4.7 Student Financial Information:

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.
- The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

[X] Met
2016 Team Assessment: Information concerning financial aid opportunities, tuition and fees, and related costs attendant to pursuing the M. Arch degree are detailed on the "Financial Aid" page of the California Baptist University website (http://www.calbaptist.edu/future-students/why-cbu/financial-aid/). The page includes an undergraduate "price calculator" that enables prospective and matriculated students to estimate costs of attendance accurately. It is noted that approximately 85% of CBU students receive some form of financial aid.
PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit Annual Statistical Reports in the format required by the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation.

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.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The team found evidence in the APR that all statistical data submitted to the NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) of the National Center for Education Statistics standards.

Additionally, while not required, the program has implemented an added step of transparency by making the NAAB Annual Statistical Reports available for download on the "Accreditation" page of the architecture program website.

III.2 Interim Progress Reports: The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (see Section 10, NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2015 Edition, Amended).

[X] Not Applicable

2016 Team Assessment: This condition is not applicable to programs in candidacy.
V. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

None.
### Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation: California Baptist University 2016 Team Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A 2</th>
<th>A 4</th>
<th>A 6</th>
<th>A 8</th>
<th>B 1</th>
<th>B 3</th>
<th>B 5</th>
<th>B 7</th>
<th>B 9</th>
<th>B 10</th>
<th>C 1</th>
<th>C 3</th>
<th>C 5</th>
<th>D 3</th>
<th>D 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPC expected to have been met in preparatory education</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC met in NAAB-accredited program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Realm A</th>
<th>Realm B</th>
<th>Realm C</th>
<th>Realm D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DES 110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES 112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES 122</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 210</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 220</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 310</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGR 254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHY 115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, representing the Profession
Lisa M. Chronister, AIA, LEED®AP BD+C
Principal Planner
City of Oklahoma City
420 W. Main St.
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
(405) 297-1628
(405) 297-1631 fax
lisa.chronister@okc.gov

Representing the Academy
Ethel Goodstein-Murphree, Ph.D.
Associate Dean
Fay Jones School of Architecture
University of Arkansas
309 Vol Walker Hall
Fayetteville, AR 72701
(479) 575-3805
(479) 575-7099 fax
egoodste@uark.edu

Representing the NAAB
Tyler Ashworth, AIA, LEED®AP BD+C
Architect
HKS, P.C.
1250 I Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005
(702) 595 9775
tashworth.aias@gmail.com
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa M. Chronister, AIA, LEED®AP BD+C
Team Chair

Representing the Profession

Ethel Goodstein-Murphree, Ph.D.
Team member

Representing the Academy

Tyler Ashworth, AIA, LEED®AP BD+C
Team member

Representing the NAAB