July 21, 2009

David M. O'Connell, C.M., President
Nugent Hall
The Catholic University of America
620 Michigan Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20064

Dear President O'Connell:

At the July 2009 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the board reviewed the Visiting Team Report for the Catholic University of America, School of Architecture and Planning.

The board noted the concerns of the visiting team regarding studio culture, human resources, physical resources, professional degrees and curriculum, non-western traditions, site conditions and building systems integration.

As a result, the professional architecture program:

Master of Architecture

was formally granted a six-year term of accreditation with the stipulation that a focused evaluation be scheduled in three years to review the following Conditions and the progress that has been made in each area:

5. Studio Culture
6. Human Resources
8. Physical Resources
12. Professional Degrees and Curriculum (M. Arch. only)

The accreditation term is effective January 1, 2009. The program is scheduled for its next full accreditation visit in 2015. The focused evaluation is scheduled for calendar year 2012. For more information on focused evaluations, please see Section 6 of the 2009 Procedures for Accreditation.

Continuing accreditation is subject to the submission of Annual Reports. Annual Reports are submitted online through the NAAB's Annual Report Submission system and are due by November 30 of each year. These reports have two parts:

Part I (Annual Statistical Report) captures statistical information on the institution in which a program is located and the degree program.

Part II (Narrative Report) is the narrative report in which a program responds to the most recent Visiting Team Report (VTR). The narrative must address Section 1.4 Conditions Not Met and Section 1.5 Causes of Concern of the VTR. Part II also includes a description of changes to the program that may be of interest to subsequent visiting teams or to the NAAB.

If an acceptable Annual Report is not submitted to the NAAB by January 15, 2010, the NAAB may consider advancing the schedule for the program's next full visit. A complete description of the Annual Report process can be found in Section 10 of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2009 Edition.
Finally, under the terms of the 2009 Procedures for Accreditation, programs are required to make the Architecture Program Report, the VTR, and related documents available to the public. Please see Section 3, Paragraph 8 (page 18) for additional information.

The visiting team has asked me to express its appreciation for your gracious hospitality.

Very truly yours,

Douglas L. Steidl, FAIA
President

cc: Randall Ott, RA, Dean
Bradley D. Schulz, AIA, LEED® AP, Visiting Team Chair
Visiting Team Members
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The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1940, is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture. Because most state registration boards in the United States require any applicant for licensure to have graduated from an NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.
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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments

The team found the architecture program at The Catholic University of America exciting, creative and committed to quality. Since the last visit, Randal Ott has been appointed dean of the school. Working with the faculty, staff, students and administration, significant changes have taken place and continue to be implemented. The program has formally adopted a 61-credit curriculum for individuals with a pre-professional degree and a 111-credit curriculum for students with an undergraduate degree in another discipline; both leading to the M.Arch. Additionally, the graduate program has developed areas of focus including digital fabrication technologies and sacred places and, provides outstanding study abroad electives. The team found energy and dedication within the program. The students are bright, engaged and talented. The students appreciate the rigor and richness of their school's program, but did express concern over excessive workload and the facilities.

The team saw a professional program in transition. It is transforming from a five year B.Arch program to a 4+2 M.Arch and has not fully taken advantage of the potentials available within the new 4+2 structure. This has led to an unusually high amount of required credit hours and leads to semester loads of up to 22 credits. This also limits outside opportunities for study and personal commitments.

The student enrollment has increased dramatically over the past few years. The increase in students, faculty and programs has put tremendous pressure on the existing facilities. These increases, combined with the number of studios required, have created overcrowded conditions throughout the building. The overcrowding has led to a breakdown in literally all functions of the building, from its IT infrastructure to adequate space for students and faculty. The program is faced with either providing new, expanded or alternate facilities or to reduce the numbers.

The team was impressed with the strategic commitment of the president and provost to the architectural program. Their engaged interest and support of the dean and his initiatives, the faculty, and the shared concern of the facilities lead the team to believe present concerns can be overcome in a timely fashion.

2. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

Condition 7, Physical Resources (2003): The program must provide physical resources that are appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each full-time student; lecture and seminar spaces that accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space.

Previous Team Report (2003): The open space of the building, a remodeled gymnasium, is a great interactive learning environment. Studio spaces are crowded, especially with the necessary increasing number of student computers occupying desk space. The recent removal of the bookstore from the 2,438 m² (8,000 ft²) lower level of the building to a new student center provides the opportunity for expanding the school's facilities and relieving studio crowding.

This condition is unmet, however, due to the lack of an elevator, which makes the mezzanine level inaccessible. As the school expands into the lower level, accessible vertical circulation will become even more important to full, accessible use of the building. Deferred maintenance also must be addressed to correct roof leaks and reduce lighting ballast noise.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: Since the last visit an elevator has been installed, which solves many of the primary accessibility concerns. The elevator connects the main
and second floor with the basement. The studios on the mezzanine level of the great hall are still not handicapped-accessible. However, this problem has been addressed by providing accommodation to any handicapped student or faculty since spaces provided on the mezzanine are not unique and equivalent spaces can be found on other, more accessible floors.

Serious attempts have been taken to repair the roof. Leaks have been reduced but not totally eliminated. Because the leaks have been mitigated, further repair will not be attempted unless the leaks increase.

Students and faculty are very proud of their unique facility. The president includes the architecture building on his campus tours because of the history and positive emotional energy found in the building. The building however is showing significant stress because of aging and intense use due to record enrollments.

Concerns regarding the building are discussed in Condition 8 Physical Resources of this report.

Criterion 12.3, Research Skills (2003): Ability to employ basic methods of data collection and analysis to inform all aspects of the programming and design process

Previous Team Report (2003): Research skills don’t go beyond a level of understanding. While general research questions are addressed in a number of courses, we did not see any course that provides the type of research skills required by Criterion 12.3. ARCH 436/538, Research History, is a good approach to providing strong research skills in the History/Theory concentration; a similar research focus for the M. Arch. programs needs to be developed.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: There has been improvement in this criterion since the last visit.

Criterion 12.7, Human Behavior (2003): Awareness of the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationships between human behavior and the physical environment

Previous Team Report (2003): The team did not find adequate evidence that this criterion had been met in the M. Arch. 2-year and M. Arch. 3-year programs.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: There has been improvement in this criterion since the last visit.

Criterion 12.11, Non-Western Traditions (2003): Awareness of the parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

Previous Team Report (2003): Various elective courses offer excellent opportunities for the development of awareness of parallel and divergent traditions of Architecture and Urban Design. The team did not find evidence of an inclusive approach to developing this awareness in the required course work.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion remains unmet. Lecture and reading material demonstrate awareness within this area, but little is shown which demonstrates understanding.

Criterion 12.14, Accessibility (2003): Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities
Previous Team Report (2003): There are indications of a basic-awareness level of achievement, but there is no demonstration of a systematic meeting of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements at the ability level. There appears to be an opportunity to advance this issue through a careful integration of the information in lecture/seminar courses (such as ARCH 315/715) and integrating the information into specific design studios and written program documents.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: There has been significant improvement in this criterion since the last visit and the criterion is now met. However there is still concern on consistently designing site accessibility.

Criterion 12.15, Site Conditions (2003): Ability to respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and design of a project

Previous Team Report (2003): The criterion is minimally met in two of the M. Arch. programs (4 + 1.5 years and 2 years) with regard to natural site conditions. The team did not find evidence in the remaining M. Arch. program (3 years) that this criterion had been met. While the team noticed some projects that addressed site conditions adequately, there is concern that many projects do not convey the impact of site conditions on project design.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion remains unmet.

Criterion 12.26, Building Economics and Cost Control (2003): Understanding of the fundamentals of development financing, building economics, and construction cost control within the framework of a design project

Previous Team Report (2003): The team did not find evidence this criterion had been met, although there was awareness of life-cycle costing. There was no evidence that students understand building economics and cost control within the framework of a design project. (Note: The "2002 Addendum" changed the level of accomplishment of this criterion from "awareness" to "understanding.")

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: There has been significant improvement in this criterion since the last visit and this criterion is now well met.

Criterion 12.27, Detailed Design Development (2003): Ability to assess, select, configure, and detail as an integral part of the design appropriate combinations of building materials, components, and assemblies to satisfy the requirements of building programs.

Previous Team Report (2003): The team did not find adequate evidence of work in this area.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: This is no longer an individual criterion of NAAB.

[Causes of Concern taken from the VTR dated April 2, 2003]:

A. Curricular Concerns: Studio Coordination

The school has excellent courses in building systems, environmental systems, materials and assemblies, and professional practice, the content of which is not adequately integrated into studio work. There is the opportunity, through careful integration of the information in lecture/seminar courses into design studios, to have robust, comprehensive studio education. The success of this endeavor is dependent on active coordination—both horizontally and vertically—of studios with the content of lecture/seminar courses. In order to realize this potential, specific assessment procedures need to be put in place, based on student learning outcomes recently
developed for the undergraduate curriculum and under development for the graduate
curriculum. Studio faculty members need to realize their roles and responsibilities for
integration.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found improvement with better integration
of building systems and materials and assemblies into studio. There is still room for
improvement however to fully integrate the excellent coursework in environmental
systems into studio.

B. Formal Governance and Communications

While the faculty appears to have the autonomy and authority to formulate policies and
procedures, develop and refine curricula, and develop programs, there are no school-
specific bylaws or governance documents that set out rights and privileges,
responsibilities, and modes of conduct for the faculty to address its affairs. There is no
formal mentoring system for new faculty, no organizational chart, and no individual
position responsibility statements. Administrative policies need to be developed and
documented to address administrative structure and responsibilities; committee
assignments and responsibilities; individual faculty responsibilities and requirements for
advancement; and grievance procedures.

While rapport and informal communications between students and faculty members are
very positive and the administration is open, there are indications from some students
that formal communication venues regarding academic and career advising need
improvement.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The Team found that areas of formal governance
and communication were addressed through all school meetings, regular faculty
meetings and an open administration. However due to very recent restructuring within
the school's administration, administrative policies, structure and responsibilities are
again of concern to the Team. Teaching assignments, academic advising, course
scheduling and coordination of due dates continue to be of concern.

C. Financial Resources and Reporting

The leadership of the school has been resourceful and creative in stretching its financial
resources to deliver very good programs in Architecture. Chronic underfunding remains;
for the base funding level of faculty salaries that are 10 to 15 percent below peer
averages, for faculty development support, and for additional needed support staff.

The team found that the perception of both the faculty and students is that the school is
underresourced. Of particular concern is the apparent low rate of return to the school as
a percentage of gross tuition revenues. It is noted that available data did not conclusively
quantify the School of Architecture and Planning's rate of return in comparison with those
of other schools in the university. The issue of the perceived unfair distribution of
assessed tuition surcharges for the School of Architecture was also raised. There
appears to be a problem in ongoing maintenance funding for the physical plant, and there
is no evidence of an effective development program at the university or school level.

The perception of underfunding may be even worse than the reality and is exacerbated
by poor financial reporting mechanisms and documentation. Easily comprehensible data
does not seem to be available. The school would be well served by conducting some
benchmarking exercises, including peer comparisons (both external to other Architecture
programs and internal to other CUA academic units), to discover and document costs per student, costs per FTE, costs per student credit hour, and other typical fiscal measures.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The school has improved its financial resources significantly from the prior visit. The dean has worked with the president to create off-campus programs which generate significant funds for the school. Because the funding is generally entrepreneurial it has taken some time to establish a predictable income flow.

Conversations with the dean and the president have confirmed the school has resources available to support initiatives which strengthen the program and support the school's and university's mission. Data was provided demonstrating comparable funding with the other schools at the university.

The dean has bi-annual meetings with an advisory council which assists with resource development. Alumni and the profession expressed strong support for the program including financial commitments.

D. Facility Maintenance and Accessibility

An elevator needs to be added to the building to make the mezzanine level accessible to the physically disabled. As the school expands into the lower level, accessible vertical circulation will become even more important to full use of the building. Deferred maintenance also must be addressed to correct roof leaks and reduce lighting ballast noise.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The elevator has been added, but the team has concern regarding ongoing building maintenance.
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5. Causes of Concern
   Formal governance and Communications

Due to very recent restructuring within the school's administration, the lack of a clear organization chart and individual faculty and staff responsibilities are of concern to the Team. Consistent teaching assignments, academic advising, course scheduling and coordination of due dates is also of concern.

Site Design Including Accessibility

There is a lack of site integration into studio. Site designs are not developed as fully as building design. This also includes site accessibility.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

Schools must respond to the interests of the collateral organizations that make up the NAAB as set forth by this edition of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Each school is expected to address these interests consistent with its scholastic identity and mission.

1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it benefits from and contributes to its institution. In the APR, the accredited degree program may explain its academic and professional standards for faculty and students; its interaction with other programs in the institution; the contribution of the students, faculty, and administrators to the governance and the intellectual and social lives of the institution; and the contribution of the institution to the accredited degree program in terms of intellectual resources and personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is met. The team finds the School of Architecture is strongly supported by the university administration. The president and provost are very supportive of the dean and the School of Architecture. The university administration expressed confidence in the School of Architecture and its future. They fully recognized the challenges of growth and the need for additional facilities unless enrollment is managed. The university administration appeared willing to work with the School of Architecture in managing growth if facility expansion is not feasible within the near future. Overall, the team is impressed by the strong level of mutual support and respect between the school (faculty and administration) and the university (administration and institution).

1.2 Architecture Education and Students

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides support and encouragement for students to assume leadership roles in school and later in the profession and that it provides an environment that embraces cultural differences. Given the program's mission, the APR may explain how students participate in setting their individual and collective learning agendas; how they are encouraged to cooperate with, assist, share decision making with, and respect students who may be different from themselves; their access to the information needed to shape their future; their exposure to the national and international context of practice and the work of the allied design disciplines; and how students' diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is well met. The School of Architecture adequately provides students the opportunity to pursue leadership positions within the program. This is demonstrated in dynamic studio environments, as well as extracurricular student involvement. Coursework promotes research, encourages independent thinking, and teaches collaboration skills within a team setting.
The Professional Practice course is exceptional, utilizing the rich cultural fabric of Washington, DC as a backdrop for educating students on the diverse leadership opportunities available within the profession.

The Comprehensive Building Studio establishes working teams that reflect the collaborative efforts found in an architectural office environment. Students are then challenged to work together to produce one vision. The course proves to be an effective and creative way to teach leadership.

Students benefit immensely from the well established study abroad programs. They provide stable environments for students to engage diverse cultures.

Graduate studios encourage students to pursue independent paths of interest based on the five concentrations provided.

Additionally, the AIAS, NOMAS, and CSI chapters are actively engaging the student body. The faculty and administration have supported this leadership development by allowing students to participate on active committees, which help to govern the school.

1.3 Architecture Education and Registration

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides students with a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure. The school may choose to explain in the APR the accredited degree program’s relationship with the state registration boards, the exposure of students to internship requirements including knowledge of the national Intern Development Program (IDP) and continuing education beyond graduation, the students’ understanding of their responsibility for professional conduct, and the proportion of graduates who have sought and achieved licensure since the previous visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is met. Knowledge of IDP, registration and continuing education are provided to the students by special seminars. The faculty is an example to the students with 50% of the full time faculty and 42% of visiting instructors being licensed architects. One additional faculty member is currently in the process of taking the ARE.

1.4 Architecture Education and the Profession

The accredited degree program must demonstrate how it prepares students to practice and assume new roles and responsibilities in a context of increasing cultural diversity, changing client and regulatory demands, and an expanding knowledge base. Given the program’s particular mission, the APR may include an explanation of how the accredited degree program is engaged with the professional community in the life of the school; how students gain an awareness of the need to advance their knowledge of architecture through a lifetime of practice and research; how they develop an appreciation of the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; how they develop an understanding of and respect for the roles and responsibilities of the associated disciplines; how they learn to reconcile the conflicts between architects’ obligations to their clients and the public and the demands of the creative enterprise; and how students acquire the ethics for upholding the integrity of the profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Met Not Met
M. Arch. (4 + 2 years) [X] [ ]
M. Arch. (3 years) [X] [ ]

This condition is well met. The professional community is integrated into all the major design presentations and some of the course work lectures. In addition the school provides an exciting lecture series in conjunction with international embassies and with world-renowned architectural professionals.

The school Executive Development Board is an advisory to the dean and Office of Development staff members. The board members attend, actively participate in meeting of the board and provide financial support.

The school is developing the knowledge, understanding and skills of the professional practice of architecture through the outstanding Arch 717 Professional Practice course. The professionals practice coursework and the comprehensive design studio provides an awareness, appreciation and respect of all members of the design team. This program emphasizes the high ethics and integrity of the profession.

1.5 Architecture Education and Society

The program must demonstrate that it equips students with an informed understanding of social and environmental problems and develops their capacity to address these problems with sound architecture and urban design decisions. In the APR, the accredited degree program may cover such issues as how students gain an understanding of architecture as a social art, including the complex processes carried out by the multiple stakeholders who shape built environments; the emphasis given to generating the knowledge that can mitigate social and environmental problems; how students gain an understanding of the ethical implications of decisions involving the built environment; and how a climate of civic engagement is nurtured, including a commitment to professional and public services.

M. Arch. (4 + 2 years) [X] [ ]
M. Arch. (3 years) [X] [ ]

This condition is met. The program, tied to the schools mission statement "Building Stewardship", focuses on preparing architects and designers to assume personal responsibility for the welfare of the world stressing the interdependence of the words 'building and stewardship'. The CUAdc design collaborative provides pro bono design services to non-profits and community groups.

2. Program Self-Assessment Procedures

The accredited degree program must show how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives and how it assesses the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The assessment procedures must include solicitation of the faculty’s, students', and graduates' views on the program’s curriculum and learning. Individual course evaluations are not sufficient to provide insight into the program's focus and pedagogy.

M. Arch. (4 + 2 years) [X] [ ]
M. Arch. (3 years) [X] [ ]

This condition is met. The school has gone through two major cycles of strategic planning in the last six years. The 2004 strategic plan was accomplished and the 2007
strategic plan established a mission for the school which is more closely aligned with the university’s. However, because of numerous changes initiated or envisioned within the school it is imperative the school monitor attitudes and expectations of all constituents at regular intervals.

3. Public Information

To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is met. The language has been found in their catalogs and promotional media.

4. Social Equity

The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with an educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. The school must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources. Faculty, staff, and students must also have equitable opportunities to participate in program governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is met. The school has made significant strides improving the ethnic diversity of the faculty. The school has also recognized that in spite of hiring two additional female faculty members since the last visit, the percentage of female faculty who are tenured or tenure-track remains at 20%. The school has temporarily addressed this issue through visiting faculty and is committed to address this issue in a more concerted basis.

5. Studio Culture

The school is expected to demonstrate a positive and respectful learning environment through the encouragement of the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff. The school should encourage students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is not met. A first attempt at a Studio Culture Policy has been provided, but there is no consistent understanding among the faculty and students of the
document's existence, nor its importance. A more interactive practice for educating the students about the positive aspects of the policy should be established.

The traditional culture of studio is strongly embedded within the program however contemporary issues regarding studio culture need to be addressed in a systemic way. The culture has been negatively impacted by the combination of the high number of required hours and the limitations of the facilities.

6. Human Resources

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, and adequate administrative, technical, and faculty support staff. Student enrollment in and scheduling of design studios must ensure adequate time for an effective tutorial exchange between the teacher and the student. The total teaching load should allow faculty members adequate time to pursue research, scholarship, and practice to enhance their professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is not met. Overall, there is a very good student/faculty ratio. The support staff is hard working but minimal for the size of the program and does not provide for growth. Students, faculty and staff expressed strong concern over the lack of administrative clarity within the school. Frustration over organizational structure and the decision making process was evident. Additionally, students expressed strong concerns over advising effectiveness, timeliness, faculty assignments, course scheduling, and consistency.

Both students and faculty expressed concern over excessive time delays in receiving feedback from course evaluations. This adversely affected the quality of course effectiveness and communication. Additionally, the team has concern over the lack of the critical nature of the course evaluation questions which may inhibit the quality of the feedback.

7. Human Resource Development

Schools must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth inside and outside the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is met. The school has an outstanding lecture series, and study abroad program contributing to the quality of the architectural program.

The faculty has a record of strong creative activity which positively affects the students and their projects. Overall, faculty and staff have adequate support for travel and reasonable teaching loads to maintain currency. With the School of Architecture increasing its focus upon research additional funds will be required to support faculty activities.
8. Physical Resources

The accredited degree program must provide the physical resources appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class; lecture and seminar space to accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space. The facilities must also be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and applicable building codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is not met. Although every student, except the freshmen, has a dedicated desk space, there is not adequate layout or pin up space or adequate space at each station. The desk space is so tight it hampers the proper execution of a design problem. The freshmen share a desk. Even in this area there is a problem with adequate space for proper seating and alignment to drawing boards.

The faculty has adequate office space, however many offices do not have windows and there is no room for additional faculty.

The areas for the IT network, printing, plotting and laser cutting are not properly ventilated. The heat generated by the equipment provides temperatures higher than acceptable for either people or the equipment itself.

The woodworking shop is adequate and safety precautions are observed and students are being trained on the use of the equipment. However, the ventilation and dust exhaust system is a concern.

The storage in the building is not adequate.

9. Information Resources

Readily accessible library and visual resource collections are essential for architectural study, teaching, and research. Library collections must include at least 5,000 different cataloged titles, with an appropriate mix of Library of Congress NA, Dewey 720–29, and other related call numbers to serve the needs of individual programs. There must be adequate visual resources as well. Access to other architectural collections may supplement, but not substitute for, adequate resources at the home institution. In addition to developing and managing collections, architectural librarians and visual resources professionals should provide information services that promote the research skills and critical thinking necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is met. The Architecture Library is part of the Engineering, Architecture and Mathematics Library. It has a budget of approximately $18,000 for purchasing titles within architecture. Individual faculty members make requests for purchases or review books sent to the library for approval. There has been some concern expressed by both faculty and students that the library is “falling behind” in meeting their needs. With the addition of areas of focus (e.g., planning, sustainability, and digital fabrication), the
program lacks a plan for information resource development to meet the increasing demand for historical perspective and currency.

The visual resources of the program have been enhanced through the recent purchase of two digital image libraries. The school has indicated access to images will be accessible through the internet. The scanning of the current chemical slide collection is ongoing.

10. Financial Resources

An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is met. The school has improved its financial resources significantly from the prior visit. The dean has worked with the president to create off-campus programs which generate significant funds for the school. Because the funding is generally entrepreneurial it has taken some time to establish a predictable income flow.

Conversations with the dean and the president have confirmed the school has resources available to support initiatives which strengthen the program and support the school's and university's mission. Data was provided demonstrating comparable funding with the other schools at the university.

The dean has bi-annual meetings with an advisory council which assists with resource development. Alumni and the profession expressed strong support for the program including financial commitments.

11. Administrative Structure

The accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The accredited degree program must have a measure of autonomy that is both comparable to that afforded other professional degree programs in the institution and sufficient to ensure conformance with the conditions for accreditation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is met. The institution has regional accreditation and the program has both autonomy and the support from the university to ensure conformance with the conditions for accreditation.

12. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general
studies, and electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is not met. The track for students with a pre-professional degree is a professionally intensive curriculum requiring 198 credits for the CUA students. The curriculum leading to the architecture degree must include at least 45 credit hours outside architectural studies either as general studies or as electives with other than architectural content. The team identified only 39 credits outside of architectural studies as a requirement.

There are many outstanding electives offered within the School of Architecture. Especially notable are the foreign study programs and all areas of concentration. However, the number of required credit hours within architecture inhibit students from either pursuing special interests beyond the School of Architecture or completing minors or developing areas of concentration outside the program.

13. Student Performance Criteria

The accredited degree program must ensure that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the criteria set out below. The knowledge and skills are the minimum for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice.

13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills

Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The team found evidence of reading and writing ability in student work in Arch 600 Thesis Research and Arch 609 Thesis Design. Verbal skills are required in all studio presentations.

13.2 Critical Thinking Skills

Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test them against relevant criteria and standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The Team found evidence of critical thinking skills ability specifically in work presented in the competition, comprehensive design and thesis studio.
13.3 Graphic Skills

Ability to use appropriate representational media, including freehand drawing and computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The team found evidence of graphic skills ability in first year studio work emphasizing the necessary skills of freehand visual representation which are carried into the following design studios.

13.4 Research Skills

Ability to gather, assess, record, and apply relevant information in architectural coursework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The team found evidence of research skills ability in student work in Arch 402/503 Architectural Design, CBDS Studio or equivalent Arch 402 Architectural Design IV, Arch 600 Thesis Research and Arch 608 Research Methodologies.

13.5 Formal Ordering Skills

Understanding of the fundamentals of visual perception and the principles and systems of order that inform two- and three-dimensional design, architectural composition, and urban design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The team found evidence of formal ordering skills understanding in student work in Arch 101a Architectural Foundations I, 102a Architectural Foundations II and in Arch 501.

13.6 Fundamental Skills

Ability to use basic architectural principles in the design of buildings, interior spaces, and sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is well met. The Team found substantial evidence of Fundamental Skills ability in student work throughout the curriculum.
13.7 Collaborative Skills

Ability to recognize the varied talent found in interdisciplinary design project teams in professional practice and work in collaboration with other students as members of a design team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is well met. The team found substantial evidence of collaborative skills ability in student work in Arch 402/503. The comprehensive studio is collaborative both between groups of students and the use of outside consultants.

13.8 Western Traditions

Understanding of the Western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape and urban design, as well as the climatic, technological, socioeconomic, and other cultural factors that have shaped and sustained them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. Team found evidence of Western traditions understanding in Arch 135 History of Architecture I, Arch 136 History of Architecture II, Arch 235 History of Architecture III and overall studio work. Student work indicated evidence of the western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape and urban design.

13.9 Non-Western Traditions

Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is not met. While there is evidence of awareness through lectures, the team did not find evidence of the understanding of the canons and traditions of the architecture and urban design in the non-Western world. Elective courses continue to offer outstanding opportunities to explore architecture and urban design in the non-Western world.

13.10 National and Regional Traditions

Understanding of national traditions and the local regional heritage in architecture, landscape design and urban design, including the vernacular tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This criterion is met. The Team found evidence of national and regional traditions understanding in student work throughout the program.

13.11 Use of Precedents

Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The team found evidence of use of precedents ability in student work in Arch 101a, 102a, 501,502 and 503.

13.12 Human Behavior

Understanding of the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationship between human behavior and the physical environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is well met. The team found substantial evidence of human behavior understanding. Specific design problems emphasize high density human habitation on restrictive sites. Interaction with prospective clients and contributors during design provide a unique opportunity for understanding the relationship between human behavior and the physical environment. There is evidence that human behavior is discussed, analyzed and a critical part of the design process.

13.13 Human Diversity

Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical ability, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The team found evidence of human diversity understanding in studio work that examined differences between rural and urban requirements, lifestyle and ethnic diversity. Cultural diversity among staff along with trips to European and non-Western cities provide the opportunity for discussion and exploration of human diversity.

13.14 Accessibility

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This criterion is met. The team found evidence of the ability to provide accessible interior spaces in student work. There is concern however that there was no consistent demonstration of accessible sites, parking and routes.

### 13.15 Sustainable Design

Understanding of the principles of sustainability in making architecture and urban design decisions that conserve natural and built resources, including culturally important buildings and sites, and in the creation of healthy buildings and communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is well met. The team found substantial evidence that a sustainable design understanding has been built into the curriculum through the foundation courses Arch 209/509 Introduction to Sustainability, Arch 358/758 Environmental Systems I and Arch 457/757 Environmental Design II. The student work produced in the Comprehensive Building Studio also demonstrates a basic understanding of sustainable design concepts.

### 13.16 Program Preparation

Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The team found evidence that program preparation ability is satisfied through student work in Arch 315 Pre-design and Arch 402 Architecture Design IV - Comprehensive Building Studio. This includes the inventory of space, analysis of the relationship of spaces, site conditions and equipment requirements.

### 13.17 Site Conditions

Ability to respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and the design of a project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is not met. The team has found little evidence that site concerns are addressed in an analytical and comprehensive fashion in student work. Upper level undergrad and graduate student work does not consistently demonstrate site relationships to the same level as building design.
13.18 Structural Systems

Understanding of principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The Team found evidence of structural systems understanding in student work in special structural courses Arch 321 Structures I, Arch 322 Structures II, and 421 Structures III.

13.19 Environmental Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of environmental systems, including acoustical, lighting, and climate modification systems, and energy use, integrated with the building envelope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is well met. The team found substantial evidence of environmental systems understanding in student work in courses Arch 358 Environmental Systems and Arch 457 Environmental Design. Strong student homework in daylighting, heating costs and heat loss calculations are evidence of an overall understanding of these systems.

13.20 Life Safety

Understanding of the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The team found evidence of life safety understanding in student work analyzing exit requirements, exit widths, exit travel distances and fire resistance ratings.

13.21 Building Envelope Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building envelope materials and assemblies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The Team found evidence of building envelope systems understanding in student work in Arch 316 Building Assemblies.
13.22 Building Service Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The Team found evidence of building service systems understanding in student work in Arch 402 Comprehensive Building Studio and Arch 457 Environmental Design II.

13.23 Building Systems Integration

Ability to assess, select, and conceptually integrate structural systems, building envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is not met. Though shown in classwork, the team could not find consistent demonstration of building systems integration ability in the studio work.

13.24 Building Materials and Assemblies

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The team found evidence of building material and assemblies understanding in student work relative to precast construction, interior wall assemblies, exterior masonry wall construction and roof systems has been presented.

13.25 Construction Cost Control

Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The team found evidence of construction cost control understanding. Students have developed building costs based on RSMeans. Evidence of life cycle costs was also presented as it relates to environmental systems.
13.26 Technical Documentation

Ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The team found evidence of technical documentation ability demonstrated in student work in Arch 261 Digital Construction Documents, Arch 661 and studio work. There is a concern that there was no evidence of outline specifications.

13.27 Client Role in Architecture

Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and resolve the needs of the client, owner, and user

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is criterion is well met. The team found substantial evidence of the client role in architecture understanding in student work in Arch 717 Professional Practice. This course is presented by Fellows of the American Institute of Architects and lawyers.

13.28 Comprehensive Design

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The Team found evidence of comprehensive design ability in student work in the comprehensive studio Arch 402/407 and 503/518.

13.29 Architect’s Administrative Roles

Understanding of obtaining commissions and negotiating contracts, managing personnel and selecting consultants, recommending project delivery methods, and forms of service contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is met. The Team found evidence of architect’s administrative role understanding by student work in Arch 315 Pre-design and Arch 717 Professional Practice.
13.30 Architectural Practice

Understanding of the basic principles and legal aspects of practice organization, financial management, business planning, time and project management, risk mitigation, and mediation and arbitration as well as an understanding of trends that affect practice, such as globalization, outsourcing, project delivery, expanding practice settings, diversity, and others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is well met. The Team found substantial evidence of architectural practice understanding in student work in Arch 717 Professional Practice.

13.31 Professional Development

Understanding of the role of internship in obtaining licensure and registration and the mutual rights and responsibilities of interns and employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is well met. The Team found substantial evidence of professional development understanding in student work in Arch 717. Students are taken to the AIA National Headquarters where they meet with various department heads. They also discuss IDP and architectural registration with the NCARB national staff.

13.32 Leadership

Understanding of the need for architects to provide leadership in the building design and construction process and on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics in their communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is well met. The team found substantial evidence of leadership understanding in student work in Arch 717 Professional Practice and Arch 518 Comprehensive Building Studio Supplement.

13.33 Legal Responsibilities

Understanding of the architect's responsibility as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, historic preservation laws, and accessibility laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This criterion is **well met**. The Team found substantial evidence of legal responsibilities understanding in student work in Arch 717 Professional Practice with participating lawyers and Arch 509 Introduction to Sustainable Design and Arch 209 Introduction to Sustainability.

### 13.34 Ethics and Professional Judgment

Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment in architectural design and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (4 + 2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is **well met**. The team found substantial evidence of ethics and professional judgement understanding in student work in Arch 717 Professional Practice, Arch 407 Comprehensive Building Studio Supplement, Arch 209 Introduction to Sustainability Arch 509 Introduction to Sustainability Design and Arch 518 Comprehensive Building Studio Supplement.
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III. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

1. History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2009 The Catholic University of America Architecture Program Report.

The decision to found The Catholic University of America was made by the bishops of the United States on December 2, 1884, Pope Leo XIII, who was a source of encouragement from the beginning, gave the decision his formal approbation on April 10, 1887, the anniversary is commemorated annually as Founders Day. A certificate of incorporation was registered in the District of Columbia on April 21, 1887, after papal approval of the university's first constitutions was given on March 7, 1889, and what is now called Caldwell Hall was completed, the university opened with thirty-seven students of the sacred sciences on November 13 of the same year.

At the time, the modern American university was still in its infancy. The opening of The Johns Hopkins University in 1876 had marked its beginning. This institution in Baltimore was the first in the country to dedicate itself not only to the preservation of learning and to teaching, as universities had been doing since the Middle Ages and as American institutions had been doing since the founding of Harvard College on an English model in 1636, but also to the advancement of knowledge through research. In this it was following the example of the Prussian universities of the nineteenth century. Very soon the conduct of research and the training of graduate students to carry it on became the hallmark of university status. By 1900, fourteen institutions offering instruction for the doctorate, The Catholic University of America among them, considered themselves ready to form the Association of American Universities, which is now a sixty-member body. Until 1904, undergraduate programs were not offered by the university.

As the article in its name suggests, The Catholic University of America was founded when it was thought that for some time to come, American Catholics would be able to maintain only one institution of university standing. There had been occasional demands for such an institution for several decades. Meeting in their Second Plenary Council, in 1866, the bishops, who were interested especially in the higher education of the clergy, had expressed a desire to have under Catholic auspices a university in which "all the letters and sciences, both sacred and profane, could be taught." Although some Catholic colleges of the period had announced graduate offerings in the 1870s, they had defined them by adding courses rather than by the pursuit of investigation that graduate work is understood to entail.

Bishop John Lancaster Spalding of Peoria, Illinois, became the principal champion of the Catholic university cause. In the Third Plenary Council of the bishops, in 1884, he was able to persuade a majority that so long as they would "look rather to the multiplying of schools and seminaries than to the creation of a real university;" the progress of American Catholics would be "slow and uncertain;" "A university," he said, "is the great ordinary means to the best cultivation of mind." A gift from Mary Gwendoline Caldwell of Newport, Rhode Island, made possible the foundation of a faculty of the sacred sciences as the nucleus around which a university could develop.

Seen in the context of the development of American higher education as a whole, the institution that began with the decision of the bishops in 1884 became the principal channel through which the modern university movement entered the American Catholic
community The life of The Catholic University of America has been more or less co-
terminous with the movement, which now extends on an international scale. A particularly 
visible contribution of the university to the Church in the United States and to the nation at 
large has been its preparation of teachers, many of them diocesan priests or members of 
religious communities of men and women, for service in schools, seminaries and colleges 
throughout the country,

The expansion of the university into the arts and sciences began in 1895 with the opening 
of what were called at the time the "faculties for the laity." Instruction in law and technology 
were included. A structural evolution led to a comprehensive academic reorganization in 
1930. In that year, in accord with patterns that had become general in the United States, the 
College and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences were established. The School of 
Engineering and Architecture was also a product of this reorganization. The School of Law 
had been established early in 1898, in the third year after its beginning as a department

The addition of several professional schools since 1930, which incorporated the National 
Catholic School of Social Service in 1947 and the former Columbus University in 1954; 
the consolidation that resulted in the establishment of the School of Religious Studies in 
1973; the integration of the College and Graduate School into a single School of Arts and 
Sciences in 1975; and the return of the School of Education to departmental status in 
1986 have resulted in a complex of eleven Faculties or Schools in Architecture and 
Planning, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Law, Library and Information Science, Music, 
Nursing, Philosophy, Religious Studies, Social Service and Metropolitan College.

Undergraduates are admitted to the Schools of Architecture and Planning, Arts and 
Sciences, Engineering, Music, Nursing and Philosophy. A common admissions authority 
applies the same general standards to all six schools. Metropolitan College also admits 
undergraduates and employs admission criteria appropriate for the non-traditional student. 
To a considerable extent, undergraduates participate in the same classes in general 
subjects, share in other features of undergraduate life, and are governed by common 
regulations.

The composition of the university's student body has changed several times during its first 
century. At present, it resembles more than ever before what would be regarded as a 
typical American institution. About forty-five percent of all students are undergraduates. Of 
the other fifty-five percent who are post-baccalaureate students, roughly two-thirds are in 
professional schools. The latter have gained in proportion as the number of clerics and 
religious, who once constituted a large segment of students in arts and sciences, has 
decreased.

When the university was established, its governance was delegated by the bishops to a 
board of trustees of seventeen members. An act of Congress in 1928 amended the 
original certificate of incorporation to allow, among other things, an increased in the 
membership of the board. Lay membership, however, was minimal until 1968. Under 
bylaws that it adopted in that year, the board, which now has fifty members, has equal 
numbers of clerical and lay members.

An official statement of the aims of the university that the trustees promulgated in 1970 
transmits consistently the goals of the founders of a century ago. The first rector, Bishop 
John Joseph Keane, gave succinct form to these goals when he portrayed the institution 
that he was chosen to head as "a living embodiment and illustration of the harmony 
between reason and revelation, between science and religion, between the genius of 
America and the church of Christ."
His words have been a guide for a century and will be a continuing challenge as long as the university endures.

2. Institutional Mission

The following text is taken from the 2009 The Catholic University of America Architecture Program Report.

As the national university of the Catholic Church in the United States, founded and sponsored by the bishops of the country with the approval of the Holy See, The Catholic University of America is committed to being a comprehensive Catholic and American institution of higher learning, faithful to the teachings of Jesus Christ as handed on by the Church. Dedicated to advancing the dialogue between faith and reason, The Catholic University of America seeks to discover and impart the truth through excellence in teaching and research, all in service to the Church, the nation and the world.
(approved by the Board of Trustees, December 12, 2006)

STATEMENT AIMS AND GOALS OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

AIMS OF THE UNIVERSITY

The Catholic University of America is a community of scholars, both faculty and students, set apart to discover, preserve and impart the truth in all its forms, with particular reference to the needs and opportunities of the nation. As a university, it is essentially a free and autonomous center of study and an agency serving the needs of human society. It welcomes the collaboration of all scholars of good will who, through the process of study and reflection, contribute to these aims in an atmosphere of academic competence where freedom is fostered and where the only constraint upon truth is truth itself.

As a Catholic university, it desires to cultivate and impart an understanding of the Christian faith within the context of all forms of human inquiry and values. It seeks to ensure, in an institutional manner, the proper intellectual and academic witness to Christian inspiration in individuals and in the community, and to provide a place for continuing reflection, in the light of Christian faith, upon the growing treasure of human knowledge.

As a member of the American academic community, it accepts the standards and procedures of American institutions and seeks to achieve distinction within the academic world.

Faithful to the Christian message as it comes through the Church and faithful to its own national traditions, The Catholic University of America has unique responsibilities to be of service to Christian thought and education in the Catholic community as well as to serve the nation and the world.

GOALS OF THE UNIVERSITY

The Catholic University of America was founded in the name of the Catholic Church in the United States by Pope Leo XIII and the bishops of this country as a national institution of learning. Given its origins and the historic role of its ecclesiastical faculties, this university has a responsibility to the Church in the United States that is special to it:
It is called to be an intellectual center of highest quality, where the relation between revealed truth and human truth can be examined in depth and with authority. It seeks, moreover, to do this in the light of the American experience. It is for this reason that, from its inception, the university has enjoyed a unique relationship with the Holy See and the entire Catholic community.

Established as a center for graduate study, The Catholic University of America has evolved into a modern American university, committed not only to graduate but also to undergraduate and professional education and to the cultivation of the arts. At every level, the university is dedicated to the advancement of learning and particularly to the development of knowledge in the light of Christian revelation, convinced that faith is consistent with reason and that theology and other religious studies themselves profit from the broader context of critical inquiry, experimentation and reflection.

The university aims at achieving and maintaining in higher education a leading place among Catholic and other privately endowed, research-oriented institutions of comparable size, purpose and tradition. In particular, it seeks to maintain a position of special excellence in the fields of theology, philosophy and canon law.

The Catholic University of America gives primacy to scholarship and scientific research and to the training of future scholars through its graduate programs, not only in order to advance scientific work but also because it recognizes that undergraduate and professional education of high quality also demands the presence of a faculty that combines teaching and professional activity with fundamental scholarship.

The university seeks the advancement of knowledge within a context of liberal studies, a context which reflects both its concern for the whole person and the distinctive wisdom to which it is heir as a Catholic institution. This dimension of learning is reflected particularly in its undergraduate programs where religious studies and philosophy are regarded as integral to curricula that include requirements in the arts and humanities, language and literature, and the natural and social sciences. Through its professional programs, the university seeks to educate men and women who can represent their respective professions with distinction and who are formed by the learning and values inherent in its academic and Catholic traditions.

In selecting disciplines or fields of specialization to be supported at an advanced level of study and research, the university accords priority to religious and philosophical studies and to those programs which advance the Catholic tradition of humanistic learning and which serve the contemporary and future needs of society and the Church. In supporting particular programs the university takes into account the present and potential quality of programs, making an effort to maintain present academic strengths, especially when these are not represented elsewhere.

The university recognizes that its distinctive character ultimately depends on the intellectually and moral quality of its members. To create an environment that is intellectually stimulating and characterized by the generosity and mutual support required for collegial life and personal growth, the university seeks men and women who are not only professionally competent but who also can contribute to its Catholic, moral and cultural milieu. The university seeks to preserve its tradition of collegial governance, fostering a climate within which all members of the university community have sufficient opportunities to influence deliberation and choice.

Though a research and teaching institution, the university recognizes that it is part of a larger community to which it has certain obligations consistent with its character. Its presence in the nation's capital and its unique relationship with the Catholic Church in
America provide it with opportunities for influencing the resolution of the crucial issues of our time. In providing information and criteria by which public policy is shaped and measured, the university seeks to be of special service to the nation. Similarly, it seeks to be of service to the Church, not only through the preparation of clergy and other leaders for specific roles in the Church, but also through factual investigations and discussions of principles which influence policy. Thus, in dialogue and cooperation with contemporary society, The Catholic University of America sees itself as faithful to the challenge proposed by the Second Vatican Council for institutions of higher learning, namely, to put forth every effort so that "the Christian mind may achieve ... a public, persistent, and universal presence in the whole enterprise of advancing higher culture" (Gravissimum educationis, n.10).

(approved by the Board of Trustees on June 21, 1980)

3. Program History

The following text is taken from the 2009 The Catholic University of America Architecture Program Report.

1911-1940
At the turn of the century the gifted architect Frederick Vernon Murphy returned to Washington from the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris and introduced himself to the Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, fourth rector of The Catholic University of America. In 1911, impressed with Fred Murphy's drawings, Rector Shahan found a place in the unused attic space at McMahon Hall for a small but lofty Department of Architecture. Together, these two great friends planned the early campus, building Gibbons and Maloney Halls, the University Center, the John K. Mullen of Denver Memorial Library, and the old gymnasium, an immense structure that would play a pivotal role in the unfolding saga of architecture at CUA.

A faculty of one, Professor Murphy taught drawing, design, painting, history and construction to a small but devoted contingent of students. The department remained in the attic of McMahon Hall until after World War I, when returning veterans forced a growing department to move into the Social Center on the top floor of the old gymnasium. High above the basketball games, the lights were never out as inspired faculty and students captured two national Paris prizes, two American Academy in Rome prizes, four Fontainebleau prizes, and 14 Beaux Arts Institute of Design prizes. In 1928, Thomas H. Locraft won the Paris Prize. He subsequently became the second chair of the department in 1949, following Professor Murphy's retirement.

1940-1961
World War II reduced the department from 50 to six students, but returning veterans in 1947 swamped the one-room studio, forcing a second move to the remodeled Navy Barracks. Faculty and courses were greatly expanded and a new five year degree program was introduced. Enrollment and programs continued to grow, and the search for larger and improved facilities continued. In 1961 the temporary Navy Barracks building was finally demolished and the department was moved to the third floor of Pangborn Hall. With further increases in enrollment requiring more space, increasingly weary faculty and students shifted back and forth between Pangborn, St. John's Hall, and the Archbishop's Chancery on Rhode Island Avenue, the latter two sites being slated for demolition.

1959-1980
During the tenure of the third chair, Dr. Paul A. Goettelmann, from 1959 through the early 1970s, anti-Vietnam War and environmental concerns affected college campuses nationwide. During these critical times, Dr. Goettelmann served as a calming influence in
his department. His leadership and talent as an educator convinced architecture alumni and benefactor Benjamin T. Rome to establish the Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle Foreign Studies Program in 1970, and more recently to endow this important program in perpetuity. Dr. Goettelmann led the department through difficult years with wisdom and charm.

Succeeding chairs, professors Forrest Wilson and Peter Blake, developed innovative programs such as the nationally known Summer Institute for Architecture and the four-year Master of Architecture program for students holding non-architectural degrees. Other programs included the four-year preprofessional degree, with subconcentrations in design, history, planning, and construction management. During the terms of the chairs Wilson and Blake, enrollment in architecture continued to increase.

1980s - 1996
In the mid 1980s, the university president, the Rev. William J. Byron, S.J., made available the recently abandoned old gymnasium to the department. An ingenious plan to restore and transform the old gymnasium into a new center for architectural studies was developed by graduate students under the guidance of Professor John VYanik and transformed into buildable form by professors Yank and Walter D. Ramberg. Once considered impractical, the proposal was given a new chance for life in the form of a small but dramatic demonstration project constructed in a portion of the old gymnasium, championed by the newly appointed Associate Dean and Chair Stanley Ira Hallet and Professor VYanik.

A series of exhibits, lectures, and events held in the demonstration project rallied alumni support. A strong Executive Alumni Council was formed, and the entire departmental structure was reorganized by the new chair. Course offerings and programs grew as an expanded faculty brought in new talent and energy.

With the assistance of the university's Office of Development, a major campaign to develop funds to renovate the old gymnasium and other support facilities was initiated. The Clarence Walton Media Center was developed and a Model Shop was installed for the construction of furniture and architectural models. The fully equipped Leo A. Daly, Jr., Computer Aided Design Laboratory was implemented through private support, primarily that of the office of his son, Leo A. Daly III, a CUA alumnus, as was his father.

The dedication of the renovated former gymnasium as the Edward M. Crouch Center for Architectural Studies on Oct. 19, 1989, brought the history of the architecture program at CUA full circle. The $4 million renovation provided a physical presence and sense of community appropriate to an academic unit that had long served the university.

On May 19, 1992, the Board of Trustees voted to separate the architecture and planning program from the School of Engineering and establish the School of Architecture and Planning, effective Sept. 1, 1992. Stanley Ira Hallet, FAIA, was appointed dean and James O'Hear II, RA, was made associate dean of the school. Professor Hallet served as dean until 1996, when he was succeeded by Gregory K. Hunt, FAIA.

1997 - THE PRESENT
In keeping with the spirit of renovation that had earlier given an impressive new identity to the architecture program, a partial renovation of the lower floor of the Crouch Center was initiated to provide new studio, shop, and classroom space for the school. Completed in the spring of 1997, this latest building project demonstrated yet again the university's continued commitment to providing the best facilities for the study of architecture on the CUA campus.
Under the leadership of Dean Hunt, the school embarked on several new initiatives, including additional foreign study opportunities, extensive curriculum revisions, innovative design-build programs and explorations in applied digital design technology. Dean Hunt focused his attention on the formulation of a school strategic plan and on revisions to the structure and content of both the undergraduate and graduate curricula. He founded a new spring semester abroad program in Rome and implemented several unique initiatives involving active architectural service to the local community and the D.C. government. Under Dean Hunt’s stewardship, the school has replaced the former four-year M.Arch. program for students without previous degrees in architecture to an accelerated three-year M.Arch. program. He championed the introduction of two new graduate concentrations: one in Urban Design and one in Urban Conservation.

In 2003, Randall Ott, AIA, joined the School of Architecture and Planning as dean. With his administrative team of Ann Cederna (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies), Barry Yatt, FAIA (Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies), Michelle Rinehart (Assistant Dean for Administration), Dean Ott continues to advance the school in many ways. Since 2004, eight new tenure-track faculty have joined the school with a range of expertise. The undergraduate program has been revised and streamlined to address current trends in architectural education, as well as a broadening of the curriculum that emphasizes the liberal arts and sciences as a necessary foundation for the study of architecture. Within the graduate program, the number of concentrations has been increased to five and responds to CUA’s traditional mission, as well as new trends and needs within the profession (Cultural Studies/Sacred Space, Design Technologies, Digital Media, Real Estate Development, and Urban Design). These concentrations allow students to explore areas of research and design in greater depth and specificity. In fall 2008, the school launched two new graduate programs: Master of City and Regional Planning and Master of Science in Sustainable Design.

**CHRONOLOGY**

1895 Technology courses first offered through the School of Sciences

1911 The first architecture degree program, including a four-year Bachelor of Science in Architecture and Bachelor of Architecture, was founded.

1915 The first Bachelor of Science in Architectural Engineering and the first Bachelor of Architecture degrees awarded.

1930 The School of Engineering was formed, composed of the Departments of Civil, Electrical and Mechanical Engineering, and the Departments of Architecture, Drawing and Mechanics.

1931 The first doctoral degree was awarded.

1935 The name of the school was changed to the School of Engineering and Architecture. Master of Architecture and doctoral degrees in architecture were added to the curriculum.

1947 The five-year Bachelor of Architecture degree replaced the original four-year Bachelor of Architecture degree.

1956 The Bachelor of Science in Architectural Engineering degree was phased out.
1964 The degree programs Master of City and Regional Planning and Master of Architecture in Urban Design were added to the curriculum.

1970 The four-year Bachelor of Science in Architecture degree and the two-year Master of Architecture first professional degree (4+2) replaced the five-year Bachelor of Architecture first professional degree.

1975 Known as the Fast Track Program, a four-year Master of Architecture, a first professional degree for students holding degrees in fields other than architecture, was inaugurated.

1978 An undergraduate program, leading to a Bachelor of Science in Architecture degree, for students holding two-year Associate degrees in architectural technology was initiated.

1980 The Master's degree program in City and Regional Planning and Urban Design were discontinued.

1981 Undergraduate sub-concentration options, in design, history, city and regional planning, and building construction were introduced.

1984 The 4+2 professional degree program was changed to a 4+1 program, with a Bachelor of Science in Architecture awarded after four years and the first professional Bachelor of Architecture degree awarded after an additional year.

1986 The doctoral program was suspended.

1989 The first Bachelor of Architectural Studies (post-professional) degree was awarded. The Edward M. Crough Center for Architectural Studies was inaugurated.

1992 The Department of Architecture and Planning became the School of Architecture and Planning.

1999 The five-year Bachelor of Architecture degree program was terminated and replaced with a 4+1.5 year Master of Architecture program. Two graduate concentrations in Urban Design and Urban Conservation were implemented. The four-year Fast Track Master of Architecture program for students holding degrees in fields other than architecture was terminated and was replaced with a three-year Master of Architecture program.

2005 The sub-concentrations in the Bachelor of Science in Architecture were eliminated. The graduate concentrations were revised to include the following: Cultural Studies/Sacred Space, Design Technologies, Digital Media, Real Estate Development and Urban Design.

The Real Estate Development concentration offers all of its required courses in the evening and students can enroll either full- or part-time.

2007 The 4+1.5 year Master of Architecture program is eliminated and replaced with the 4+2 professional program.

2008 The Master of City and Regional Planning program is reinstated and a Master of Science in Sustainable Design is introduced.
4. Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2009 The Catholic University of America Architecture Program Report.

Our school's mission, Building Stewardship, focuses on preparing architects and designers to assume personal responsibility for the welfare of the world, stressing the interdependence of the words 'building' and 'stewardship.'

We focus on how stewardship itself must be designed and constructed, as process and result — how humanity must actively envision and build a collective ethos of stewardship. Experienced in the integrative, creative and holistic process of design, architects and planners are uniquely positioned to help forge a compelling contemporary attitude toward stewardship for society at large. In addition, our school focuses on how we must be capable stewards when we indeed do physically build. We must care deeply about the impact our projects will have upon past and future human efforts and upon the fragile natural wonder of our globe.

We interpret stewardship broadly: it encompasses understanding the built and natural environments and protecting and preserving these resources. It promotes social justice and respect for the quality of human life for fellow citizens. It treasures the vitalizing potential of aesthetics. This broad humanistic interpretation of stewardship encompasses a variety of aims, including ethical responsibilities, beauty, community involvement, responsible development, preservation of the urban fabric, appropriate technological innovation and livability. All of these influence our school's attitude toward our traditional tasks of teaching, research and service.

In keeping with The Catholic University of America's mission of service to the Church, to the community and to the nation, our school educates future architects and designers to be engaged and active citizens in their communities and the world at large. To embrace this holistic approach, CUArch emphasizes:

- **Design Excellence**: We focus on design methodology as a model for stewardship efforts. We emphasize exemplary design through the exploration of projects at a variety of scales, programs and cultural settings using a balance of theoretical/technical knowledge and hand/digital craft. Our belief is that good design means good stewardship.

- **Interdisciplinary Study**: Researchers and practitioners must be good observers and listeners. Our school broadens students' understanding of the world around them and the challenges of stewardship. We engage other campus disciplines in the work of the school, so that students understand architecture's place within a larger, interconnected, dynamic context.

- **Washington, D.C., as a Design Laboratory**: Our mission resonates powerfully within our nation's capital. We encourage a hands-on immersion in the reality of stewardship. We embrace our city and its diverse metropolitan area through numerous cooperative projects with governmental agencies, funding organizations, arts and museum groups, and local universities. CUAdC, our design collaborative, provides pro bono design services to nonprofit and community groups. For comparative purposes, we augment the experience of Washington with an outstanding array of foreign travel options.

Our belief is that we are all stewards of Earth. Architects and planners have the skills to help forge a true difference in humanity's future.

(adopted by the School of Architecture and Planning faculty, August 2007; presented to
the Provost and University President, September 2007)

5. Program Strategic Plan

The following text is taken from the 2009 The Catholic University of America Architecture Program Report.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The distinctiveness of the architecture program at Catholic University stems from several factors: The unique mission of our larger university community, our vibrant metropolitan region with its national and international links, our programs own strong traditions in design education, our interesting facility, and our progressive approach to digital technologies.

STRENGTHS

University Mission: The University has a nationally unique mission of service to Church and Nation. We are one of only five NAAB programs nationally that exist within an institution having a pronounced and clearly stated religious affiliation. Three of those five programs are at Catholic institutions of higher education (the other two of Catholic affiliation besides Catholic University are Notre Dame and the University of Detroit Mercy). What makes Catholic University unique among Catholic institutions of higher education is that this institution is the only one in the United States founded directly by the Bishops of the Catholic Church in America, thus our institution is truly The Catholic University of America, with a national mission. For our architecture program, one significant outcome of this is that we benefit extensively from the university's national recruitment efforts. Students from all over the country come to study in our program. In addition, the university inherently attracts many international students. This diversity in the student body adds immeasurably to the richness our program. Further, we have developed several unique initiatives in our program to relate to the wider mission of the university, such as our graduate concentration in cultural/sacred studies, our CUAdc service/outreach arm within Washington, and our new offering in sustainability. Also, our program has several specific requirements in its general education roster that are rather unique, including a larger than expected immersion of undergraduates into coursework in philosophy, in theology and in religious studies. These form, in effect, an additional 'core' component within an undergraduate's experience in architecture at Catholic University beyond the typically expected undergraduate core distribution work in social sciences, physical sciences, humanities, and so forth. Due to these, our program has an existential/ethical approach to architecture focusing on human culture and upon how the act of building can transcend instrumental rationality to express humanities ultimate concerns.

Vibrant Location: Washington, our nation's capital, is one the most favorable of places in which one can study architecture. The country's most consciously designed major city, Washington provides an unparalleled backdrop for design education. The combination of cultural, institutional, intellectual, professional, and architectural resources in the city is almost without parallel. In addition to the Octagon, the AIA, the Smithsonian, the National Gallery, the Library of Congress, and a host of other major museums and institutions, the city also possesses the National Building Museum, the nation's foremost institution of the building arts. Our school is located just minutes away on the Metrorail Red Line from the city's cultural core. Our pedagogy takes full advantage of these unique aspects of our location. Studio projects in the city, field trips, sketching courses, lectures at other venues, etc., are a major part of our curricular
efforts to fully immerse our students in this rich cultural environment. The central core of Washington contains many neighborhoods of true distinction: Georgetown, Capitol Hill, Adams Morgan, Chinatown, Dupont Circle, and so forth. Further, despite the concentration of government and cultural activities in the downtown, the overall Washington metropolitan region is unusually polycentric; the central core of the city is ringed by independent urban areas having their own distinct identities and urban forms: Bethesda, Alexandria, Silver Spring, Arlington, Pentagon City, Tyson's Corner, Columbia, and Reston, to name just a few. (Yet another edge city is currently under construction -- the National Harbor project on the shores of the Potomac in Maryland, currently the largest construction project on the entire East Coast.) Each of these peripheral centers forms its own urban study. The broader region's design lessons extend across the entire spectrum, from some of the most monumentally-formed and exemplary urban and landscape spaces in the country: August historical architecture, some truly regrettable but nonetheless instructive examples of 60s urban renewal, extensive and sprawling suburban development, modern mass transit systems, and some of the most extreme roadway congestion in the nation. Metro Washington is an extraordinary urban laboratory.

The Washington metro region's riches have many direct impacts on our architecture program. For example, this dynamic city gives us a large and dedicated cadre of highly skilled and specialized part-time teachers. It would be difficult to conceive of the school's recently expanded roster of varied graduate concentrations without this regional resource. Developers, attorneys, construction experts, government officials, non-profit representatives, and many others offer specialized classes in our concentrations. The region's riches also impact quite particular areas of our offerings, such as our Embassy Lecture Series. Given the sheer wealth of presentations on architecture available in this city (due to the National Building Museum, the national offices of the AIA, other cultural institutions, and four other schools of architecture) we consciously avoid focusing solely on generalist lectures on architecture. We typically partner with an embassy in the city each year to offer programming quite specific to that country's traditions in architecture and design, with many guests flown in from that country. It would be hard to imagine any other city in the nation where such a lecture series could occur.

Another way Washington impacts on our program is with the city's emphasis on internationalism. Students who come to Washington expect a global outlook. Washington represents the world in the US (through embassies, varied cultures, languages, ethnic food) and has outstanding links outward to the world. For our program, this character of Washington means mounting an extensive study abroad effort. With three major airports in the region, our students can -- and do -- easily go anywhere. In the past six years alone we have had foreign programs stationed in Rome, Paris, Barcelona, Milan, Finland, China/Japan, Cuba, India/Bangladesh, Brazil, Jerusalem, Eastern Europe, and other locales. The school's longstanding 'Spirit of Place/Spirit of Design' program, which realizes small sacred structures as design/build exercises in foreign countries, intermingles the religious and international emphases of our program. Projects have been realized in Peru, Ireland, British Columbia, Nepal, the Amazon, and an Italian island off the coast of Africa. Next year's 'Spirit of Place' project is slated for Tibet.

Traditions in Design Education: Our program is known regionally for its design prowess, a distinction that has obvious rewards in cachet and reputation. Students at CUA take more design studios than at many programs nationally. Design became ascendant beginning with the school's innovative Summer Institute of 30 years ago and reached eminence in the early '90s. Design pedagogy at the school remains very agile and
progressive; experiments and considerable risks are taken. A longstanding example of
this would be our storied 'Freshmen Murals' project -- displayed prominently throughout
the Crouch Center. A recent example of this would be our attitude toward
comprehensive design, which involves a large degree of interactive teaming. Our
emphasis on studio education gives our program a pronounced sense of intimacy in its
teaching -- something that many current students comment on and something that we
use extensively in recruitment. We are known for small studio classes and for
outstanding rapport between students and faculty. It is almost impossible in our school
to become 'lost in the crowd.'

Unusual Physical Facility: Another obvious strength of the program is our building -- the
Crouch Center. The facility has a major impact on our pedagogy. The openness and all-
inclusiveness of the space, both in plan and section, facilitate communication between
faculty, students and staff. This gives those in our program a sense of sharing a
common creative endeavor. The facility appears as a giant mixer for creative talent, which
is exactly what an architectural school should be. The facility accommodates the
mounting of exhibits virtually everywhere, which provides a great benefit in advertising to
everyone on campus what our students produce. The fully exposed structural and
mechanical systems make the building an effective tool for hands-on observation of how
building technology can be integrated with design. The central circulation axis, a wide,
30 foot high, skylight walkway leading to the auditorium, causes all who use it to perceive the
essence of a professional school of architecture.

Progressive Technology Agenda: Finally, our school's progressive attitude toward the
digital technologies is a major strength. Two of our five graduate concentrations currently
center around these technology issues. Our students have agreed to a tuition differential
that has greatly enhanced our technology labs. Our output capability has greatly
expanded. We have become a regional leader in computer fabrication technologies in
education, and our building has become a venue for CAD-CAM installations. Several of
our faculty and students' efforts in this regard have been recognized with awards.

CHALLENGES

In addition to these strengths, the program faced a number of challenges, circa 2003,
and while much has been achieved the work on many of these issues is ongoing. Some
of the challenges were curricular, some financial, and some structural in terms of our
school's organization and broader outlook.

In 2003, some remnants of a BArch model still pervaded the curricular attitude of our
school -- such as the single-discipline focus on architecture alone. Related to this, the
school had, as a graduate recruitment device, offered far too many of its own B.S.Arch
students a 5-Y2 year fast track through the M.Arch degree. The graduate program had
for quite some time struggled with enrollment. Our costly private tuition was (and is) a
major problem there. To this day, we must proportionately must accept far too many of
our graduate applicants to make the claim of being elite. The workload emphasis
amongst the faculty was largely placed on teaching, somewhat at the expense of
research or scholarship. Grantsmanship was almost absent. There was a lack of
multidisciplinary links with the campus. Resources had been tight in past decades that
challenged the school, but recently the school's resources have considerably
increased. There was also very little fundraising at the school (this was a campus-wide
issue), though now development activities are fully underway at the school and across
the campus and are showing success. Our facility, while a great recruiter for the
school, was now becoming too crowded and beginning to show its age (for more
extensive commentary, see Physical Resources).
These various strengths and weaknesses had to appear in our strategic planning. Our
efforts at implementing a plan to maximize these strengths and deal with these
going weaknesses have been aggressive. Prior to describing in detail our two recent strategic
planning efforts made since the past accreditation visit, we would like to make some
further commentary on the background against which these recent planning efforts
occurred.

LARGER CONTEXT FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING

Since 2003, the university, its neighborhood, and Washington, D.C., have changed
considerably. In addition, the profession of architecture itself has greatly diversified. Wholly
new opportunities have presented themselves to the school over the past six years -- a
time of great dynamism that likely exceeds any other since the program became fully
independent of Engineering in 1989 and moved into its own freshly renovated facility.
Strategic planning has been key in handling this dynamism.

Major changes in the economic fortunes and in the relative attractiveness and security
of the District of Columbia occurred over the past ten years, with the central city
enjoying a widespread renaissance that spurred much new housing, new cultural
attractions, new job opportunities, and a new sense of safety and commitment to urban
life. While many of the nation's urban cores underwent similar renovation during that
period, the changes in Washington were particularly sudden and far-reaching. An
extraordinarily active real estate market, the definitive completion of the Metrorail
system, new technological industries on the periphery of the city, and a great
expansion in federal government spending carried Washington along faster than most.
A city that had for years a rather staid and quiet reputation at best became, almost
overnight, a 'twenty-something/thirty-something' haven of sorts. The implications for
higher education in the region were largely good, and many universities in the area
underwent rapid growth, encompassing major building campaigns and increases in
disciplinary offerings. Not only were there many more undergraduates of traditional
age wishing to study in the region, but entirely new markets for adult-learners
emerged. Universities in Washington's Northeast quadrant, historically the wealthiest
region of the city, saw major change almost instantly, as did a number of outlying
universities near the Capital Beltway. Changes came somewhat later to the Northeast
quadrant of the city where Catholic University lies. Still, by 2001/2002 the renaissance
in the city's Northeast was indeed underway, with rapidly rising real estate values and
a greater sense of safety and community. Not surprisingly, overall enrollment at the
university at that moment reversed a several decades-long downward trend.
Enrollment bottomed out and slowly began to rise again. The last four or five years
have been ones of constantly record-breaking enrollment numbers in the university's
freshmen classes -- a key financial factor at a tuition-driven institution. The university
has embarked on a major transformation akin to those undertaken a few years earlier
on the western side of town. This began with CUA's purchase of the largest remaining
undeveloped piece of land in the District of Columbia (a heavily wooded parcel of 40
acres lying immediately adjacent to the campus), and continued with a major dorm
building initiative, numerous renovations to historic structures across the campus, and
the launching of a sizable mixed-use development project on an additional 8 acres the
university owned immediately adjacent to the MetroRail stop. For our school, the
renaissance of the university and of the overall District presented great opportunities in
terms of continued growth, programmatic diversification, greater engagement with the
immediate neighborhood, and a potential increase in finances. All of these had
implications for strategic planning.

The unusually small number of seats available in NAAB-accredited programs in the
greater Washington/Baltimore metropolitan region was another key consideration in the
school's strategic planning. In 2004, the school undertook a study showing that greater Washington/Baltimore was one of the least served regions in the country in terms of architectural education. The study showed that the greater DC region had per capita only one-third the number of seats available in Boston, and only half the number available in Philadelphia, Phoenix, Detroit, or Miami. Coverage in Washington/Baltimore was also considerably less than in Minneapolis, Houston, Dallas, and Atlanta. Washington/Baltimore had the fewest number of seats per capita available of any the major urban agglomerations on the east coast. The issue was not so much the number of schools in Washington/Baltimore as the size of those schools. Five architecture programs serve the greater region (Catholic, Maryland, Howard, the Washington/Alexandria Center of Virginia Tech, and Morgan State in Baltimore). All were relatively small to mid-size programs by national standards. Surprisingly, Catholic's program, while by no means huge, has been the largest of the five for as long as anyone can remember. In 2003, when the program stood at 355 students, it was some 25% larger than any of its competitors. For strategic planning, this meant that there was considerable unmet need in the metropolitan region, and that many fully qualified students were available. The longstanding oversupply of students in the metro region had allowed Catholic to maintain, even during the years when the central city was undergoing great stress, a very vibrant and fully enrolled architecture program. The potential for properly managed future growth in architecture was considerable. This fact was coupled with the realization that many related disciplines were similarly underserved. For example, the District of Columbia lacks a program in landscape architecture and in planning; service in these disciplines for the core of the city is completely absent. Several programs in these disciplines exist further out in the metropolitan region by the Beltway, but even those programs are quite small.

In addition, the design professions in general in the region were undergoing a period rapid growth and diversification. Architectural offices were expanding and doing substantive amounts of international work--a relatively new development overall for the region. The need for new graduates was intense, with many firms having great difficulty finding employees. Our strategic planning had to recognize these regional issues.

Related to this was the realization that the practice of architecture itself was rapidly changing--becoming increasingly complex and multi-disciplinary in focus. The bringing together of disparate areas of specialty to make larger teams of professionals was becoming one of the most important aspects of contemporary practice. The school's longstanding roots (and to some degree also its approach to pedagogy in circa 2003) were largely based, however, on a 'generalist' B.Arch model. While the school had transitioned to offering the MAArch degree and had largely phased out the B.Arch degree by 2001, many aspects of the program's curriculum still reflected a model stressing that every practitioner would participate in broad-spectrum practice from the context of a modest-sized office. While the notion of every architect being a 'Renaissance' practitioner who maintains a broad purview over the design of the total built environment still has much to commend it, the profession, and the Washington/Baltimore metropolitan region, had moved considerably beyond that model in size, diversification, and increased specialities. The increasing complexity of buildings over the past several decades made it apparent that students should at least gain awareness of the enlarging degree of specialization occurring out in the field. Important new developments, such as LEED, BIM, AEC integration, global practice, outsourcing, collaborative practice, etc., constantly stress the available space within the standard curriculum. Circa 2003 at Catholic, the 'generalism' of the typical undergraduate experience in architecture largely extended directly into the graduate program. Our approach with graduate students was largely that of one-sizes-fits-all. Anecdotal information suggested that highly qualified students were leaving our program after taking the B.S.Arch degree for other more diversified graduate programs nationally. Those programs offered a greater sense of an independent, targeted identity for their graduate programs and offered other inducements such as dual
degrees and/or add-on certificates. While Catholic's program was the largest within the Washington/Baltimore metropolitan region, it was the only one existing outside of a multidisciplinary school-level configuration. Through the strategic planning process, we had to come to grips with these realities.

Finally, the school had to use its strategic planning efforts to try to address the difficult "rate of return" issue mentioned by the last NAAB team. Architecture, given the relative lack of competition in the metropolitan region, had always had a strong recruitment stream and had not undergone a substantial dip in enrollment during the difficult times the university faced in the 80's and 90's. In fact, enrollment in architecture had remained very strong. There had been resource imbalances on campus before architecture became an independent school, but with independence, and facing continued strong enrollment, the rate of return that architecture received from the campus on the overall tuition it generated gradually eroded. This situation was longstanding and systemic; wholly new and innovative ideas would be necessary to address it. The strategic planning process had to reconsider how the school was being funded and be realistic about what could, or could not, be done to change that fact. Since the entire campus is not large and since architecture forms an unusually sizable percentage of the campus (about 8%), any steps toward resolving this difficult "rate of return" issue would have to be achieved through careful discussion and partnership with central administration. Strategic planning would be key to achieving this.

These deeply interrelated background issues had large impacts on our strategic planning process. Growth, for example, was viable in the current market for students, and would have to be an integral part of any effort to change fundamentally our funding level, given long-established campus allocation realities. The improving overall campus enrollment could help us make financial progress, too. Growth would make abundantly clear the continued potential of the school and thus help make clear that the school's facilities needed enlargement. Programmatic diversification would not only serve the metro region better, but likely would be key to the school's ability to grow somewhat without becoming too big and impersonal of an architecture program. Likewise, M.Arch specializations would not only be more reflective of trends in practice but also enhance the perception of intimacy at the graduate level. Specialization would also assist in faculty grantsmanship and scholarly opportunities. Altering freshmen pedagogy would not only help with space but also help the program transition to more of a true M.Arch as opposed to B.Arch attitude -- which also would help expand faculty focus on research. Expanding foreign studies would continue to build on a preexisting strength and also assist with space concerns. These were completely interlinked opportunities and challenges.

RECENT SCHOOL STRATEGIC PLANS AND MISSION STATEMENT

Since the prior accreditation visit, the school has adopted two successive strategic plans -- in 2004 and in 2007. Both are included in their entirety at the end of this section of the APR. The school's strategic planning committee and administration co-drafted the plans. The faculty at the school's August 2004 faculty retreat passed the 2004 plan unanimously, and the 2007 plan was passed with the only abstention vote at the school's August 2007 faculty retreat. The school is proud to have achieved the majority of the 2004 plan and to have already made significant progress on the 2007 plan.

Both plans were quite concise and targeted. The school's past history of strategic planning had resulted in several documents that were as extensive as they were generalized. The basic thrust of these plans was "to be the best we can be, given our circumstances and given what we have now." While those may have served as an effective summary of where the school had been over a given length of time, and also
an effective statement of what any strong architectural school should always strive to be, it was felt that those plans did not squarely and forcefully present the school with a path for clear, immediate, and measurable action. It was felt that a much less-generalized attitude had to be taken. The process needed to transcend the tendency of much academic strategic planning to pay too much attention to the equal and rote representation of every constituent group and activity in the school ("Hey, where am I or my favorite pedagogy in this strategic plan?"; "Shouldn't subject 'x' be in here, too?"). Strategic planning is really about how a necessarily small amount of a school's resources and energies can be targeted, with a specific aim and/or change in mind. Architectural education has many general needs; most schools cover those broader bases well, and, understandably, use most of their resources toward that effort. A strategic planning effort should not have that same goal -- it should not be a mere reiteration or concatenation of the varied character of the holistic efforts that the school already undertakes. To say that a plan targets everything is to say that it targets nothing. It took time to reassure a variety of the school's stakeholders that not being directly mentioned or lauded in this or that strategic plan did not mean that one's effort was not important to the school.

A further development of our recent strategic planning effort has been the drafting and approval of a new mission statement -- 'Building Stewardship' -- for the School of Architecture and Planning. Our recent strategic steps at the school have been intimately tied to that new mission statement.

The 2004 Strategic Plan: The core of this plan was curricular. The fundamental intent was to strongly differentiate the character of the graduate program from the undergraduate program, and thus let the graduate program achieve its own distinct identity. We needed to: 1) make the full transition from the B.Arch to the M.Arch model, 2) enhance our ability to market and recruit the best potential outside graduate students, 3) retain our own best B.S.Arch students, and 4) reflect changes in the profession toward greater specialization. We decided on a two-pronged approach. The undergraduate program would reinforce the nature of general design education, and the graduate program would focus on specialization. We planned to greatly enhance the school's efforts at 'Comprehensive Design,' and make that course the capstone of the undergraduate experience, while simultaneously expanding and further differentiating across a wide spectrum the degree of specializations being offered in the graduate program. This would give a clearer charge to the undergraduate years (the fully integrated, generalized building) that respected the school's traditions in general design, and would then clearly present students with a decisive change of focus as they entered the graduate program. We felt that with the large numbers of studios already taken by our students, we could achieve an effective 'Comprehensive Design' experience within the undergraduate program, leaving the four semesters of the graduate program open for highly targeted work in an area of concentration. The intensity of focused study on a particular specialization in the graduate years would make more convincing to our own students the need for the M.Arch internal track to be a full four semesters in length. Related to these changes, the plan also proposed the phasing out of a series of largely inactive undergraduate concentrations. It also proposed the development of some short-term certificats related to the new graduate concentrations that might attract adult-learners to the school for short courses of study. Further, the plan proposed we look seriously at evening/weekend formats for creating a regionally unique path for achieving an MAArch degree without having to totally quit one's day job.

Unstated additional byproducts of the graduate component of the 2004 plan were projected to be: encouragement of more faculty interest in research through the process of specialization, greater donor engagement in targeted and defined graduate concentrations, and an enhanced ability to attract more specialized faculty members.
Byproducts of the undergraduate component were projected to be: progress in 'desilicoing' the B.S.Arch program's curriculum through stressing the integrative effects of comprehensive design, and an end to 'senioritis' in the program's final semester by introducing the excitement of a true capstone experience.

Over the 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 academic years, most of this plan was successfully implemented, and the beneficial results were significant. The school made fundamental progress in many respects. For the graduate program, applications and enrollment substantially increased. The school was able to largely eliminate the offering of the 'three-semester MArch deal' to our own students in favor of the four-semester option. All five of our concentrations fulfilled enrollment projections. Students self-selected evenly across the five concentrations. Several donors stepped forward in specific support of several of the concentrations. Retention of strong B.S.Arch students by our own program increased. An 'evening/weekend track' (Real Estate) was developed, and proved to be popular. This alternatively scheduled offering was specially negotiated between the school and the central administration as a Fund 12 offering (see Financial Resources section), returning a much greater percentage of tuition revenue to the school. K. has been profitable for the program. Further, firms have commented favorably upon the new diversity of experience that our graduate students possess as they enter the workforce. Our program now much more closely parallels trends in contemporary practice. For the undergraduate program, the Comprehensive Design Studio became something of a rite of passage for our undergraduates -- a full-immersion experience. Senioritis literally disappeared. Faculty from many bands of the curriculum came together to manage and consult in that studio. Dozens of external consultants were involved each semester. Given the unique 'learning' nature of that studio, collaborative learning suddenly became a major topic of discussion at the school. The prior undergraduate concentrations were eliminated without stress. Other overall benefits for the school from the 2004 plan were noticeable: faculty hiring became much more specialized, faculty saw how research could be directly involved in quite specialized teaching efforts, some faculty could enjoy greater flexibility of schedules due to the evening/weekend coursework, and an even wider range of part-time faculty became involved in the school. The school established seven new administrative titles as a result of the 2004 plan: five Concentration Coordinators were put in place, a Director of Thesis was added to manage the increased complexity of thesis, and a Director of Comprehensive Design was named. Thus, seven more faculty members became intimately involved in the day-to-day administration of the school.

During the 2006/2007 academic year, further benefits of the 2004 plan became clear -- especially regarding thesis. The faculty had greatly revised thesis management due to the new roster of concentrations, enhancing in particular the research component. Thesis now became a process that stretched over three semesters. This would have been difficult if many of our internal students were moving through the M.Arch program in an accelerated, three-semester path (since that would have meant that a student would begin thesis immediately upon entering the graduate program). As a result of the 2004 plan, not only did our thesis projects become more specialized, but they also became much better researched -- and reached a much greater level of analytical study. Further, the depth of detail development learned in Comprehensive Design ultimately made itself quite visible in thesis. Many thesis presentations rose to a higher level of study and elaboration, architecturally, than we had seen in the past. In many respects the dual-pronged approach of the 2004 plan proved to be very mutually reinforcing.

The only aspect of the 2004 plan that still is not in place is the drive toward stand-alone certificates related to several of the concentrations. The curricular planning was done for a certificate related to the Real Estate Concentration, and this offering was approved by the faculty, but the chance to move forward much earlier than expected with the then recently completed 2007 plan took emphasis off of that initiative for the time being. We
still expect to achieve that last piece of the 2004 plan in due course. The 2007 Strategic Plan: Once much of the 2004 plan had been successfully implemented, work began on another strategic planning effort. The 2004 plan was a necessary precondition for what followed. Only the completion of that prior plan could set the stage for the school's 2007 strategic plan. In 2003/2004, the school would not have been ready to contemplate direct steps toward multidisciplinary activity, given that for decades the school's offering was solely architecture -- and a highly generalized version of architecture. It was necessary for the school to see some steps toward more 'specialized/diversified' activity first -- steps that could be taken within the context of a portion of the architecture track such as the graduate concentrations. Once those steps had been accomplished, our attention turned to more far reaching goals. The 2007 plan was more aggressive in all respects, and in fact moved well beyond curricular issues, though it still was highly targeted and measurable. Again, there were two major prongs: programmatic diversification beyond architecture and facilities expansion. The plan also resulted in a new Mission Statement for the school.

Multidisciplinary activity became our fundamental academic goal in the 2007 plan. Additional master's programs were also a goal of the central administration, particularly in new or unique in the region and if having adult-learning potential. Architecture proposed two new professionally oriented graduate degree programs, in Planning and in Sustainability. Well over a dozen other options for programs were studied by our strategic planning committee over the summer of 2007. The school's traditions in planning (several decades ago we did have a planning program, and our name still to this day is The School of Architecture and Planning) and the timeliness of the issue of sustainability were major factors in these choices. Extensive market research was also undertaken, with the help of consultants hired by the central administration. The school was able to move forward in this regard almost immediately -- much more quickly than first anticipated. This, as mentioned above, delayed work related to certificate program offerings built upon our M.Arch concentrations. The totally new degree programs assumed immediate priority. During the 2007/2008 academic year, the two new degree programs were envisioned, approved as curricula, taken through the upper level review process, approved there, and advertised. Application are being received as of this writing. Faculty hiring is underway. Both of these programs are, again, structured as Fund 12 offerings, returning a much greater percentage of tuition revenue to the school. If ultimately successful in enrollment, they will also be profitable for our overall school.

With these efforts at new programs, we hope to fill gaps in the availability of degrees in this region. The District will now have a planning program after a several decade absence, and the entire region will have its first defined offering in sustainability. We anticipate much interest in dual degree seekers between these new programs and with architecture. Our prior lack of dual-degree options has limited our graduate program's appeal to some students. Articulated master's curricula have been formulated making it easy to seek several degrees from CUA at once. These new programs also raise new potentials in the organization of our school; it is likely that some degree of departmentalization will soon occur, with the use of Chairs to direct various programs as opposed to our current model of Associate Deans. At this point, each of the new programs is being managed by a Director. Thus we actually now have, with these two new additions, nine faculty members intimately involved in the day-to-day administration of the school beyond those already serving in the Dean or Associate Dean roles.

Longer-term curricular components of the 2007 plan are an undergraduate design degree in cooperation with Arts and Sciences, and a D.Arch/PhD program. Given the unusual speed of progress on the two new master's programs, work on these other options have yet to become undertaken. The plan has sequential aspects, and the new degree programs should be fully in place before, for example, a PhD program would
be considered. The idea of an undergraduate degree in design stems from the unrelenting increases in undergraduate applicants that our program is facing.

Facility expansion was the other major prong of the 2007 plan. This will be a much more lengthy and involved endeavor, encompassing groups and stakeholders far beyond our immediate school. The plan suggested two models -- either an addition of 50% to the existing Cough Center's space, or an entirely new facility (on the site of the existing Cough Center or elsewhere).

Our primary challenge is space, and the school cannot go much farther under its current facilities constraints. We should envision a progressive built statement providing an example to our students of responsible design strategies -- both environmentally and socially. This attitude is consistent with the original creation of our Cough Center facility - an early example of progressive adaptive reuse. Expansion and technical augmentation is essential for our school to reach its true potential - we have exceeded the capacity of our 40,000 sq. ft. facility. The programmatic diversification being considered in the 2007 plan (and now underway) will also necessitate more specialized spaces. Approximately 20,000 sq. ft. of additional space is necessary -- a 50% expansion just to effectively accommodate the program as it stands today. A recent space study showed that our program is 2nd 'tightest' of the 11 surrounding regional programs (see Physical Resources portion of the APR). Any new growth would require an even more extensive expansion of facilities.

The facilities issue has been extensively discussed with our School’s Executive Development Board, and with the university’s Office of Development. Opinions vary on whether the school is truly ready to launch a major fundraising campaign related to its facilities. The upcoming 100th anniversary of architecture at CUA (in 2011) presents some opportunities. While development work in the school has expanded greatly over the past four or five years, it is doubtful, though, that a sufficient donor prospect list yet exists. Much more cultivation will be necessary. It also has been extensively discussed that the school has, obviously, potential for yet further growth in many disciplines related to architecture, and added tuition could be used to help fund an addition or new facility. It has also been discussed how the school has already grown by 1100 students in the past five years, and those tuition monies are substantial.

As partial steps in working on the facilities issues noted in the 2007 plan, we have moved forward with the full renovation of the basement, aggressive study abroad augmentation, and changes in freshmen pedagogy (see Physical Resources and Curricular portions of the APR). Some of those steps have been very rewarding for the school financially; for example, the new study abroad expansion has also been structured as Fund 12 efforts, returning a much greater percentage of tuition revenue to the school. We now feel we have taken study abroad as far as we can go, however. Over the past five years, the school has aggressively expanded its study abroad options. Instead of sending 30 students each year abroad for the semester, we now send over 80. The programs are very high quality -- CUA now probably has the largest and most impressive array of study abroad options available in an architecture program in the US. The financial recoup from these programs has allowed considerable augmentation of quality across the entire program.

The 2007 strategic plan also made a number of suggestions for 'Immediate Initiatives.' Recognizing that some components of the plan were long ranging, these suggestions were in areas where immediate actions could be taken. In the 'Program Related' areas of these initiatives, thesis is one of the issues cited that the faculty addressed in the 2007/2008 academic year. Allocation of faculty workload in thesis was studied and altered, for instance. Theses have become much more related to the concentrations pedagogies. In the 'Facilities Related' areas, we have already moved forward with further
basement renovations, as mentioned above. In the 'Staffing Related' areas, we have already addressed issues of faculty workload through developing our new Faculty Workload Sheet to facilitate more accurate tracking of faculty activities. Grantsmanship has also been encouraged, and stewardship was a major part of our hiring activities this year.

Mission Statement: The 2007 plan also resulted in a new mission statement for the school: 'Building Stewardship' (see Program Mission section of APR). This focuses on preparing architects and designers to assume a personal responsibility for the welfare of the world. In keeping with The Catholic University of America’s larger mission of service to the Church and to the Nation, our school educates future architects and designers to be engaged and active citizens in their communities and the world at large. The mission notes that we interpret stewardship broadly: stewardship encompasses understanding the built and natural environments, protecting and preserving these resources. It promotes social justice and respect for the quality of human life for fellow citizens. It treasures the vitalizing potential of aesthetics. This broad humanistic interpretation of stewardship encompasses a variety of aims, including ethical responsibilities, beauty, community involvement, responsible development, preservation of the urban fabric, appropriate technological innovation, and livability. All of these impact our school's attitude toward our traditional tasks of teaching, research and service. Our belief is that we are all stewards of this earth; architects and planners have the skills to help forge a true difference in humanity's future. The new mission statement placed the issue of Building Stewardship within the contexts of design excellence, interdisciplinary study, and Washington, D.C., as a design laboratory.

The drive to develop a 'school-specific' mission statement emerged gradually following the successful completion of the 2004 strategic plan. Prior to that time, the school had always been very generalized in defining or articulating its mission, similar to its attitude toward generalism in the architecture curriculum. If faculty were asked if the school had its own mission, oftentimes commentary would be made that the university had its broader mission and that ours is dependent on that. But after the successful strategic planning effort of 2004, many faculty felt we were ready as a school to take more a definitive stand on where we wished to position ourselves in the realm of architectural education. The greater level of specialized activity in the school after the 2004 plan made abundantly apparent to us that there were many options beyond generalism. Our realization that regional and national competitors were defining their own missions very clearly, our desire to market more effectively, and our recognition that our school had the makings of a very specific voice of its own if only this could be specifically articulated spurred us on. Our school did not in any way try to set aside the overall university’s mission: the whole emphasis with our own mission statement was to interpret the university's goals quite specifically in the light of design education. A fairly comprehensive review of dozens and dozens of websites of other programs was made, in the effort to see how many had clearly defined statements. Some did, but the majority made the basic "be the best you can be at teaching students about architecture" statement. We felt we could say something much more specific and noticeable than that. The result is our new mission. Many areas of our 2007 strategic planning effort were directed toward our new mission of 'Building Stewardship.' The plan and the mission grew out of the same discussion. Obviously, our new program offering in sustainability has resonance with this mission, but the area of planning, too, is just as crucial an area of study for this mission if we are going to be truly effective stewards of our human environments on this globe. As regards facilities, we feel our mission of Building Stewardship demands a facility that is a model for solving challenges facing society -- particularly that of sustainability. It is our hope to use this
mission to direct our attitude toward any new facilities opportunities. Our hiring also immediately reflected the goals of the mission. Many other activities related to this mission have already occurred, such as the hosting of the 2007 ACSA Southeast Regional Meeting at CUA with the topic of "Assuming Responsibility: The Architecture of Stewardship." A proceedings volume was also produced as a result of that conference. Another example of use of the mission is that the 2007 Summer Institute's coursework at the school reflected the subject of stewardship.

OTHER CHALLENGES, ACHIEVEMENTS, COMMENTS, AND PLANS

Summer Institute 'Theme' and Journal: The Summer Institute for Architecture (SIA) is our school's array of summer architecture coursework. During the SIA, numerous architecture courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels are offered including design studios and elective courses (including history of architecture, graphics, furniture design, theory and computer-aided design / fabrication.) The faculty consists of selected members of the School of Architecture and Planning and invited faculty from other institutions.

For a considerable time period (mid-'70s to mid-'90s) the Summer Institute for Architecture (SIA) program was truly nationally significant -- with its own lecture series, own progressively themed pedagogy, own funding stream, etc. Unavoidable financial retrenchment at the university dimmed the prospects of this program somewhat, and gradually it became simply a basic offering of typical summer coursework. Beginning in summer 2003, the school made a conscious effort to revitalize this program -- a new full-time faculty director was named, coursework became themed again, a lecture series was reestablished, and a journal was put into production. In 2004, Luis Boza was named the Director of the Summer Institute for Architecture. Boza is currently an Assistant Professor and teaches design studios and electives in Building Technology and Digital Design and Fabrication, and is also the coordinator for the Graduate Concentration in Design Technologies. Our agenda was to ramp this program back up to the being once again nationally significant.

A common research "theme" is investigated each year -- decided through the interactions between students and faculty. The SIA theme is selected and outlined by the Director. The theme described to the SIA faculty in general terms so as to allow each faculty to reinterpret and incorporate the issues into their design studios -- regardless of the studio year being taught. By incorporating the given theme into all studios, it serves as an overarching thread fostering discussions between first year design students and graduate students. This interaction presents students at all levels with the opportunities to expand their understandings of broader social, cultural, technological and aesthetic issues into an integrated, comprehensive understanding of architecture. Past SIA themes have been:

SIA 2007 Assuming Responsibility: Investigating the Architecture of Stewardship
SIA 2006 Material Matters: Re-In_Forming our Material Imaginations
SIA 2005 Transcendence: Framing Human Experience _the Digital Age

During the SIA, the Summer Institute for Architecture Lecture Series is held. During the SIA Lecture Series, a number of architects, designers, and scholars are invited to speak about their perspectives on the given theme. Being one of the only "summer" lecture series in DC, the lectures are very well attended and publicized.
2004, the SIAJournal has been published each summer. The SIAJournal is intended to present the summer's theme, including the student work, lecture series, and the discussion and debates generated between students and faculty. At the end of the Spring academic term, the SIA Director selects the student editors. Typically, one undergraduate and one graduate student are selected to work together as content and production editors for the journal. With minimal interference by the Director (one meeting per week) the SIAJournal is intended to be a student work reflecting the thoughts and beliefs of the editors on the given theme. As a result, the SIAJournal has given our school an internal venue for commentary and scholarship. In recent issues of the SIAJournal, the editors have announced a call for papers and projects. These national calls have been well received and have extended the SIA's theme outside the walls of the School of Architecture.

The Summer Institute has grown considerably over the past four or five years--almost doubling in credit hours sold. In every respect, the initiative has exceeded expectations. The only remaining frustration the school faces regarding the Summer Institute is the budgeting process. For much more detailed comments related to the finances of this program, see Financial Resources section of this APR. Recently, it was possible to greatly enlarge the stipend paid to the Director of this program, which has helped considerably.

Given the space stress on our facility, growth in our summer offerings helps us enormously. The summer is one place where we can expand without further crowding our students. Likely, summer coursework will become increasingly important to the school over the next several years, so the recent success of our Summer Institute is a major plus for our program. Also, the increasing number of students that we send abroad gives added emphasis to our summer program; students how go abroad oftentimes fall out of sequence in one or more required courses, and our summer coursework gives them an opportunity to catch up with their peers who remained in Washington.

Thesis Augmentation: Since the past visit, we have instituted a 'Superjury' for thesis students, as a way of encouraging the best of work and of showcasing for the entire school our top thesis efforts. This event is the last jury to occur during the semester, and follows after the regular thesis reviews. Typically, four or more guests from across the country are brought to Washington to review our top 6-8 thesis projects (as selected by the regular thesis juries). These guests then vote to establish various thesis prizes given at graduation, including 'best thesis.' Several observations prompted the idea of a Superjury. There was a desire to more fully celebrate the results of thesis, given how strongly the work had progressed. There also was a concern that the preexisting process of selecting 'best thesis' had become too politicized amongst the regular faculty (the entire faculty had voted for best thesis, whether or not they had attended the juries), and that an outside jury guaranteed objectivity. Recently, the Superjury has been held at the school in order to make sure as many students as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Willems Massie</td>
<td>Lance Hoyer</td>
<td>Michelle Addington</td>
<td>Cameron Sinclair</td>
<td>Jeffrey Taras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Lawrence Scarpa</td>
<td>Keith Kaseman</td>
<td>Karl Dautmann</td>
<td>John Quale</td>
<td>David Guthrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Frank Vioich</td>
<td>Lindsay Jones</td>
<td>Marc Tsurumaki</td>
<td>John Peterson</td>
<td>L. William Zahner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Brad Cloepfl</td>
<td>Anthony Lawlor</td>
<td>Stephen Roe</td>
<td>Dan Pitera</td>
<td>Brian Mackey-Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travis Price</td>
<td>James Timberlake</td>
<td>Andrew Freear</td>
<td>Nader Tehrani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
possible are exposed to the work. Prior to this, various venues outside the school have been used as well, including the National Building Museum. The event concludes with a reception attended by thesis students and family members.

Study Abroad Augmentation Beyond Europe: Financially and spatially, the large expansion of our study abroad offerings in Europe has been very fortunate for the school. Our students, mostly for reasons related to the overall mission of Catholic University, have an inherent orientation toward Europe. Nonetheless, we felt we had to provide options beyond Europe. One additional trip to Cuba, in the summer of ’03, has been made since the past accreditation visit (the initial trip occurred immediately prior to the past visit). Unfortunately, insurance and political concerns will prevent the School from returning to Cuba again any time in the near future. One additional trip to Brazil was made with students. Since the past visit, the school has sent several small groups of students travel to Japan (with Iris Miller). In addition, the Jerusalem program was launched. While small (four or five students), the Jerusalem program has great relevance to the university’s mission. Also, a three-week excursion to India and Bangladesh was made as a winter break trip over the Christmas Holidays in 2007. That trip focused on the work of Le Corbusier, Kahn, and also the historical architecture of the Indian subcontinent. Our longstanding summer-long traveling program (Graduate Foreign Studies), which takes a group of students to various locales under the supervision of various faculty, has made efforts to move beyond Western Europe; this current summer (2008) it includes substantial portions in Eastern Europe (Romania and Hungary). One winter break trip was proposed to Mexico City in 2003, but, surprisingly, it did not make the projected enrollment and had to be cancelled. Numerous efforts have also been made to explore possibilities in South America -- another logical place that is strongly related to the university’s mission of Catholicism. The school has funded several exploratory trips by faculty members to South America to explore possible exchanges of students and faculty with institutions there. Meetings have been held with universities in Brazil, in Argentina and, most recently, in Peru. Despite these exploratory contacts, no firm plan for a South American option is in place. The major hurdle has been the immense difference in tuitions charged in South America vs. the US.

Student Technology Tuition Differential: In the fall of 2004, the school was allowed to institute a Student Technology Tuition Differential, which costs each architecture student approximately $500 per year. This has been a very important financial development since the past NAAB visit. It affords the school approximately $140,000 per year for direct infusions of technology into our labs. The initiative was co-proposed by the school’s administration and student leadership. The initiative was put up for a student advisory vote and passed overwhelmingly. Only based on this did the university’s trustees approve the initiative (CUA had gone through an extended process of consolidating many fees campus-wide, and this new proposal in architecture was something of a step in the other direction for the campus).

New and regionally unique technology labs have been established in the innovative area of computer fabrication in architecture due to this tuition differential (two laser cutters, digitizer, three-axis milling machine, two 3D printers, etc.). Outside organizations -- such as the Aluminum Association -- have also contributed to the effort. Our school now has the most extensive plotting capacity of any regional school. The added lab resources allowed our required laptop computer purchase of all incoming students to be implemented without any major problems. Enthusiasm amongst the student body about this initiative has been very high. The Dean administers the funds,
but a Student Technology Advisory Group has been established which advises on all purchases. The school's Assistant Dean chairs that advisory group.

CUAdC: The school launched an outreach arm, CUAdC (The Catholic University of America Design Collaborative), which does projects in the local community. Several high profile renovations have occurred, which have garnered extensive press coverage. CUAdC has been instrumental in helping the school reach out to the community.

Papal Furniture: The school produced furniture for use by the Pope during his recent visit to Washington, which have garnered extensive press coverage. The process was run as a design competition, with judging by prominent Catholic Church figures, including the Archbishop of Washington. Over 75 students participated.

Campus Recognition: For two consecutive years, members of the school's faculty have won the campus's James E. Dornan Memorial Teacher of the Year Award. Another faculty member just received the campus's Provost's Award for creative activities. Several books have recently appeared by school faculty, and grantsmanship is now becoming a larger part of faculty efforts.

Development Efforts: Since the past NAAB visit, the school has established a 24-member executive development board to assist with advice and fundraising. The board has been very active and participatory. Giving to the school has risen considerably over the past four or five years. For more information, see the Financial Resources portion of the APR.

Full-Time Development Director: We currently have a half-time development director for our school. For our school to reach its full potential in fundraising, a full-time person is now necessary. The university development office is well aware of this situation. Many schools on campus aspire to having a full-time person dedicated to their school. Discussions on this issue are ongoing.

Further Staff Augmentation: This is one of the critical challenges we face. Staff augmentation is now essential. While we have found innovative ways to expand our faculty numbers, our staff is straining under the stress of processing 120 new students. Many reports requested by the central administration from us are produced late, many student questions go unanswered, etc. Our new initiatives in evening/weekend coursework have greatly stressed staff coverage. The financial proposals for two new graduate programs (planning and sustainability) contained the funds to hire one additional registration/administrative person. Depending on initial enrollment, we are hopeful of soon making that hire.

Graduate Financial Aid: Another challenge is graduate aid. While our graduate program has made major strides recently, its ability to rise into another tier entirely and become truly preeminent in the region will depend on our ability to buy 'some of the strongest students who apply here. To date, we typically lose these very best students to other institutions.

2004 STRATEGIC PLAN PREAMBLE

We should aggressively structure our graduate programs to draw upon our ideal location in the major, unique metropolitan area of Washington DC. We should structure our
programs to make maximum use of the professional skills and distinctive resources available in the region. We should acknowledge changes in the profession that are leading to much greater specialization. And we should exploit our post-professional recruitment advantage of being positioned directly at a Metro stop.

Nonetheless, we should not lose sight of the fact that our School’s traditions and successes are built upon the study of architecture and building as primary concerns. We have a tremendous history in the teaching of design studio as a holistic practice. As a balance to a greater trend toward specialization in graduate offerings, we should also aggressively pursue an integrative comprehensive design semester for all students receiving a professional degree from CUA.

Both these changes are fully in agreement with recent national trends as reflected in NAAB accreditation guidelines. NAAB is seeking to strengthen the idea of a core, integrative design experience and is also seeking to offer students tracking options reflecting specialization within their education.

**SPECIFIC MOTIONS:**

A. An integrated “comprehensive design studio” should be offered, and will become a requirement for anyone to receive the professionally accredited degree (M.Arch).

This course would cut across curricular bands and integrate course material and faculty expertise from other class sequences into the design studio. It would result in a detailed building design that satisfies NAAB’s comprehensive design criterion.

The Curriculum Committee should develop a plan detailing the integration across areas of coursework for this studio, and must look carefully at the positioning of this studio in the various curricula. Consultation with the Dean’s office regarding funding will be necessary.

B. More varied graduate concentrations should be offered which all lead to a Master’s Degree (either M.Arch or M.S. in Arch).

All these concentrations will be based upon architecture as a primary concern. These concentrations (or alternate approved nomenclature) should contain approximately 30 credits of coursework, including two design studios having at core an architectural basis. The notice of the awarding of a “Concentration” would appear on the student’s transcript, and would result in an additional, mountable paper certificate to acknowledge the specialized achievement. These concentrations should be marketed aggressively not only to students in the M.Arch program but also to students who have only the B.Arch, or simply wish added certification.

The Curriculum Committee should develop a plan detailing the positioning of these concentrations in the various curricular options. Consultation with the Dean’s office regarding funding will be necessary.

C. We should take immediate action to get a revised slate of concentrations up, advertised, and running by Fall ’05.

Urban Design and Preservation should be immediately folded into one concentration. Digital Media should be given priority in terms of immediate development as a second concentration. Additional concentrations should be explored from among the following: development, real estate, sacral culture, construction technology,
construction management, etc.

Faculty members are encouraged to form working groups to flesh out curricula in these various areas. The Curriculum Committee must review proposals. The School should strive to make ready and offer at least three of these graduate concentrations by the Fall of FY5. More than three concentrations could be offered, but consultation with the Dean's office regarding funding will be necessary.

D. The Curriculum Committee should look at how these new concentrations could also have brief versions of 15-18 credits leading only to a "Certificate."

There could be marketing potential for such brief programs that give a post-professional student added expertise but do not lead to a Master's Degree. Night coursework could be very popular in this regard.

The Curriculum Committee should give full consideration to various nomenclatures for these types of options, and do national research on what other Schools are calling such options and on the precise number of credits typically involved.

E. The current three-semester post-professional option should be discontinued.

The post-professional option will be replaced with some variation on the 30 credit hour concentration model described above.

All students currently enrolled in such a graduate track must be allowed to complete it as advertised, unless they wish to switch to the new option.

F. The current undergraduate concentrations should be phased out.

The resources currently directed toward offering these concentrations should be redirected to provide an expanded and more varied array of graduate certificate concentrations.

All students currently enrolled in such an undergraduate track must be allowed to complete it as advertised.

2007 STRATEGIC PLAN

PROGRAMMATIC DIVERSIFICATION

In keeping with the mission of Building Stewardship, the school should seek multidisciplinary diversification as a way to encourage the broadest possible approach to stewardship and interdisciplinary activity. Programmatic diversification could be achieved through the following initiatives:

- We should develop a multidisciplinary departmental structure allowing for some growth without enlarging the core professional architecture program. A minimum of two new professionally oriented graduate degree programs should be implemented, giving the School three total departments. New programs should support the goals of stewardship and interdisciplinary activity. Marketing research will be conducted to determine which potential graduate areas have greatest promise.

- We should study how the current collaboration with Arts and Sciences on an undergraduate minor in architecture could move toward a fully-fledged Design...
Studies Program – possibly housed jointly – that would accommodate students having an interest in the environmental design disciplines but not wanting to pursue a professional NAAB degree, graduate training or licensure.

- The School should explore the possibility of a DArch or PhD program, which could encourage greater grant/research activity in the school and greater interdisciplinary collaboration with the larger university community.

The school recognizes that intimacy is one of our strengths. Our goal through diversification is to enlarge from approximately 400 to 500 professional students, not counting undergraduate students on campus who are in a non-NAAB Design Studies track. It is not envisioned that the professional architecture track enlarges beyond its current size.

Facilities Expansion

Our mission, Building Stewardship, demands a facility that is a model for solving challenges facing society – particularly that of sustainability. We should envision a progressive statement providing an example to our students of responsible design strategies – both environmentally and socially. This attitude is consistent with the original creation of our Crouch Center facility – an early example of progressive adaptive reuse. Expansion and technical augmentation is essential for our school to reach its true potential – we have exceeded the capacity of our 40,000 sq. ft. facility. Programmatic diversification will also necessitate more specialized spaces. Approximately 20,000 sq. ft. of additional space is necessary – a 50% expansion. Two options should be explored:

- An entirely new facility of 60,000 sq. ft., either on a new site or on the existing Crouch Center site. Regarding a new site, proximity to Metrorail is preferred.

- A new wing attached to Crouch, increasing its size by 20,000 sq. ft. The Crouch Center’s flexibility and location near Metrorail, and adjacent open land make an expansion possible. A 20,000 sq. ft. expansion could accommodate an enlarged and more diversified graduate program, freeing room in Crouch for our undergraduates to be better housed there.

The expansion should accommodate research and technology labs, non-traditional program models (evening Master’s options, certificates, etc.), on-line learning, and continuing education. We also seek to bring the library’s functions into our building.

IMMEDIATE INITIATIVES

Recognizing the long-term nature of initiatives such as programmatic diversification and new facilities, we will stress the following intermediate steps regarding programs, existing facilities, and staffing issues:

Program-related:

- Consider consolidation or expansion within our current roster of graduate MArch concentrations in light of the mission of stewardship. For example, a concentration in energy or in building technology might be necessary.

- Revise how thesis is directed and implemented with the intent of incorporating aspects of stewardship into proposed projects as a mission-
related ‘capstone experience’ of the graduate program. Determine how thesis effort by faculty could be more fairly allocated.

- Propose post-professional certificate offerings as a natural outgrowth of the graduate concentrations. Market such specialized certificates as a mission-related service to the metro region’s professionals.

- Address the increasingly diverse needs and backgrounds of the metro region’s students by considering the viability of additional graduate concentration offerings in the evening, given the recent success of the real estate evening offering.

- Study how online learning and continuing education can be initiated or expanded – how can such efforts enhance our mission of stewardship?

Facilities-related:

- Reconfigure the space and staffing of our current labs, better integrating the digital media resource center with the computer lab, and the woodshop with the CAD-CAM area. Flexibility in staffing/hiring is critical.

- Study the generation of an architectural technologies lab, as a test model for further specialized lab generation. Stress the procurement of research grants and other external funding for such labs.

- Retrofit and reconfigure the remaining space in the Crough Center’s lower level, with new faculty offices, research labs, and custom-designed areas for comprehensive design studio and/or thesis.

- Study the viability of downtown locations for one or more studio courses. This could relate to the mission of stewardship through outreach, could help us actualize the advantages of our inner-city location over other programs in the region, and could link us with additional downtown institutions and organizations.

Staffing-related:

- Revise faculty load expectations to clearly incorporate and track service activities, with the greatest emphasis given to those activities related to the larger notion of stewardship. Address ongoing issues of faculty load inequities.

- Stress research and graftsmanship as a part of all faculty members’ assessment. Give school priority to the development of scholarship, grants and contracts that are related to stewardship.

- Stress stewardship in faculty hiring decisions. Encourage faculty, staff and student groups to consider undertaking projects and initiatives related to stewardship. Further augment existing efforts such as CUAdc.

- Study the administrative structure of school, such as the Associate Dean vs. the Chairperson systems. Consider adding a dedicated office manager and a dedicated financial person.
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Appendix B: The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
Bradley D. Schulz, AIA, LEED® AP
JMA-Principal
10150 Covington Cross Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89144
(702) 236-7406 mobile
(702) 731-2039 fax
bschulz@jmaarch.com; bdsarc@cox.net

Representing the ACSA
Clark E. Llewellyn, AIA
Dean, School of Architecture
University of Hawaii
2410 Campus Road, Room 201-B
Honolulu, HI 96822
(808) 956-3469
(808) 956-7778 fax
clarkle@hawaii.edu

Representing the AIAS
Je'Nen M. Chastain
9306 Kittansett Drive
Apt. G
Charlotte, NC 28262
(804) 317-7738
jenenchastain@gmail.com

Representing the NCARB
Albert C. Hamersky, AIA
3200 Fords Forest Court
Lincoln, NE 68506
(402) 488-7354
(402) 486-1924 fax
hamersky@alltel.net
Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

2009 NAAB Accreditation Visit Schedule

Saturday, February 7, 2009
NAAB Team arrives at Hotel Palomar in Dupont Circle
7:00 p.m. Team Dinner (Dupont Circle area, exact location TBD)

Sunday, February 8, 2009
8:00 – 9:15 a.m. Team Breakfast with School Administrators @ Hotel Palomar
(Team with Dean Ott, Associate Deans Cederna and Yatt)
9:15 – 9:45 a.m. Transit to Campus (Metro or car)
9:45 – 10:15 a.m. Team Room Orientation (Team Room – Caldwell Auditorium)
(Team with Dean Ott, Associate Deans Cederna and Yatt)
10:15 – 10:30 p.m. Review of schedule and supplemental/revised APR materials (Team Room)
(Team with Dean Ott, Associate Deans Cederna and Yatt)
10:30 – 11:00 a.m. Specific Review of Comprehensive Design Materials (Team Room)
(Team with Prof. Ally, Prof. Boza and CBDS Team Members)
11:00 – 12:00 noon Meeting/Working Session (Team Room)
12:00 – 1:30 p.m. Working Lunch (Team Room, box lunches provided or walk to Pryz Center)
1:30 – 2:30 p.m. General Tour of Edward M. Crough Center for Architectural Studies
(Team with Dean Ott, Assistant Deans M. Rinehart & D. Shove-Brown)
Overview of the Building & History (J. Yanik)
Leo A Daly CAD Lab (Jerry Mosby, Director)
Clarence Walton Media Center (Robert Willis, Curator)
Fabrication Labs (Ryan McKibbon, Director)
Architecture, Engineering and Math Library (Librarian)
2:30 – 5:00 p.m. Meeting/Working Session
5:00 – 6:30 p.m. Meeting with Faculty (Koubek Auditorium @ Crough Center)
6:30 – 7:30 p.m. Reception w/Faculty and Staff (Locraft Room @ Crough Center)
(Team, Full Faculty, Adjunct Faculty & Staff)
7:30 – 8:00 p.m. Transit to Hotel Palomar (Metro or car)
8:00 – 9:30 p.m. Dinner with various Faculty and Staff at Hotel Palomar
Monday, February 9, 2009

7:30 – 8:30 a.m. Team Breakfast @ Hotel Palomar w/Assistant Deans M. Rinehart & D. Shove-Brown and Dean Emeritus Stanley Hallet (Dean Ott available if requested)

8:30 – 9:00 a.m. Transit to Campus (Metro or car)

9:00 – 10:00 p.m. Working Session (Team Room)

10:00 – 11:00 a.m. Entry meeting with the Very Reverend David M. O'Connell, C.M., President, and Dr. James Brennan, Provost (Office of the President, Nugent Hall)

11:00 – 12:00 p.m. Working Session (Team Room)

12:00 – 1:00 p.m. Lunch with Undergraduate Coordinators and Graduate Concentration Directors (Locraft Room, Crouch Center)

1:00 – 2:00 p.m. Walk-Through of Studio Exhibits in Team Room (if necessary) with Team and Undergraduate Coordinators and Graduate Concentration Directors (Team Room)

2:00 – 4:00 p.m. Various Meetings between Groups of Team Members and Special Programs

Options include:
- Foreign Studies Programs (Assistant Dean D. Shove-Brown)
- Summer Institute (Director L. Boza)
- CUAdc (Director W. Jelen)
- New MSSD -- Sustainability Program (Director C. Grech & Prof. S. Cho)
- New MCRP -- Planning Program (Director H. Edwards & Prof. J. Lu)
- Library (Pangborn Hall)

4:00 – 5:00 p.m. School-wide meeting with students (Koubek Auditorium @ Crouch Center)

(Team and students only)

5:00 – 7:00 p.m. Working Session (Team Room)

Various Meetings between Groups of Team Members and Special Programs

Options include:
- Development Efforts (Roberts and Board Chair Dove)
- Review of Professional Practice Coursework (Prof. Barr and Prof. Yall)

7:00 – 8:30 p.m. Reception with Development Board, Design Council, Alumni & Friends, Tour Alumni Exhibit (Miller Exhibition Room @ Crouch Center)

8:30 – 10:00 p.m. Additional Working Session if necessary (Team Room)

10:00 – 10:30 p.m. Transit to Hotel Palomar (Metro or car)

Tuesday, February 10, 2009

7:30 – 8:30 a.m. Private Team Breakfast @ Hotel Palomar

(School Administration available if requested)

8:30 – 9:00 a.m. Transit to Campus (Metro or car)
9:00 – 12:00 p.m. Working Session (Team Room)
12:00 – 1:00 p.m. Lunch with AIAS officers, CSI officers, NOMA officers and other student leaders
(Faculty Conference Room @ Crough Center)
1:00 – 2:00 p.m. Coffee Meeting w/School Staff
(Faculty Conference Room @ Crough Center)
2:00 – 8:00 p.m. Working Session (Team Room)
8:00 – 8:30 p.m. Transit to Hotel Palomar (Metro or car)
8:30 p.m. Team Dinner (Dupont Circle area)

Wednesday, February 11, 2009

8:00 – 9:30 a.m. Breakfast and exit meeting @ Hotel Palomar with Ott, Cederna, Yatt, Rinehart, Shove-Brown
10:00 – 11:00 a.m. Team exit meeting with President O’Connell and Provost Brennan
(President’s Office, Nugent Hall)
11:00 – 12:00 p.m. Team exit meeting with faculty, staff and students (Koubek Auditorium)
12:30 p.m. Team departs CUA, with box lunches, to check out of hotel
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Bradley D. Schulz, AIA, LEED AP
Team Chair

[Signature]

Clark E. Llewellyn, AIA
Team member

[Signature]

Je'ner M. Chastain
Team member

[Signature]

Albert C. Hamersky, AIA
Team member

[Signature]

Richard C. Lessard, AIA, NCARB
Observer
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