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1. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The team extends its appreciation to Vice Provost Quick, Associate Provost Romans, Dean Ma, Vice Dean Murphy, Chair Mutilow, Department Head Borden, Ms. Ilger, the students, the faculty, and staff for their graciousness during the visit.

With the arrival of Dean Ma, the accredited Master of Architecture program has emerged within the school of architecture. By virtue of his recent re-appointment, the university has affirmed its confidence in his leadership. The architecture faculty likewise enthusiastically support Dean Ma’s vision and are encouraged by recent tenure track appointments made by his office. Vice Dean Murphy and Head Borden are likewise highly respected by both faculty and students.

Located in an internationally-recognized milieu for architectural research and excellence, The University of Southern California’s (USC) school of architecture attracts motivated domestic and international students and more recently, students from Pacific-rim countries. The accredited program has grown 300% over the last five years which, considering the global recession of the past four years is remarkable.

A series of recent changes created opportunities for the program; in most cases the program leveraged these opportunities, however the unique nature of this degree presents management and pedagogical challenges. The program’s ability to effectively tailor its offerings to meet these challenges is the key to its success.

The charge is to verify compliance with conditions and student performance criteria thoughtfully developed by NAAB, applied uniformly across comparable programs nationally. In reviewing the USC NAAB-accredited program, the team found a repeated failure to meet specific Student Performance Criteria. Under the program’s current director and leadership the team is confident these issues will be resolved.

2. Conditions Not Met

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge:
B.2. Accessibility
B.5 Life Safety
B.6 Comprehensive Design
B.7 Financial Considerations

3. Causes of Concern:

A. Program Response to recent Visiting Team Reports and Focused Evaluations:

Previous teams’ reports (2002, 2005, and 2007) cited the same Student Performance Criteria as being Not Met. This pattern of failure to deliver the same Student Performance Criterion(ia) can erode credibility of the NAAB-accredited degree offered.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2008 M. Arch.)

1998 Criterion 12.20, Building Envelope Systems: Understanding of the basic principles that inform the design of building envelope systems

Previous Team Report (2005) The understanding of building envelope systems is subsumed in the “basic studies” required of all students in the accredited M. Arch. program. These “basic
"studies" are deemed equivalent to courses that are taken by the 5-year B. Arch. students. Students who do not demonstrate that they have completed comparable classes at their undergraduate institutions must take these "basic studies" classes with undergraduates. This analysis happens at the time of admission into the program through an evaluation of a student's undergraduate transcripts.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** This Criterion is covered in course ARCH 511L taught by Lecturers Marvin and Lampert. This Criterion is now met.

**1998 Criterion 12.22, Building Systems Integration:** Ability to assess, select, and integrate structural systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, building envelope systems, and building service systems into building design

**Previous Team Report (2005):** The team found inadequate evidence in student work to substantiate this criterion as met.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** [Current B.11 Building Service Systems] The team found evidence of understanding of basic principles and performance of building service systems in course ARCH 315: Design for the Luminous and Sonic Environment taught by Assoc. Professor Lagreco and Lecturers Simmonds, Cowen, and Valmont; however this knowledge isn't appearing in studio design work. Criterion B.11 is met. (See comment on criterion B.11 further in this report.)

**1998 Criterion 12.27, Detailed Design Development:** 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 (2005):** The team found only minimal competency in the high-pass work and a significant lack of content in the low-pass work.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** [Current Criterion B.6, Comprehensive Design] See comment on criterion B.6. further in this report.

**1998 Criterion 12.28, Technical Documentation:** Ability to make technically precise descriptions and documentation of a proposed design for purposes of review and construction

**Previous Team Report (2005):** The team did not find evidence of ability in the work presented.

**2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** [Current Criterion A.4, Technical Documentation] – The team found evidence of students' project documentation abilities in Course 526 Professional Practice: Legal and Economic Context taught by Coordinated by Janek Dombrowa, Lecturer Lampert and Assistant Professors Gerber and Kensek. This condition is met.

**1998 Criterion 12.29, Comprehensive Design:** Ability to produce an architecture project informed by a comprehensive program, from schematic design through the detailed development of programmatic spaces, structural and environmental systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections, and building assemblies, as may be appropriate; and to assess the completed project with respect to the program's design criteria.
Previous Team Report (2005): The team found inadequate evidence in student work to substantiate the criterion as met.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: [Current Criterion B.6] Evidence wasn’t found to substantiate that the criterion was met; it remains unmet. See comment on criterion B.6. further in this report.

1998 Criterion 12.37, Ethics and Professional Judgment: Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgments in architecture design and practice

Previous Team Report (2005): Course evidence indicates student awareness but not understanding.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: [Current Criterion C.8, Ethics and Professional Judgment] Course 525 Professional Practice: Pre-Design, Project and Office Administration taught by Associate Professor Hricak and Lecturer Chow adequately covers the students’ understanding of this criterion; it is now met.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

Part One (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Part One (I): Section 1. Identity and Self-Assessment

1.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission and culture and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context.

The accredited degree program must describe and then provide evidence of the relationship between the program, the administrative unit that supports it (e.g., school or college) and the institution. This includes an explanation of the program’s benefits to the institutional setting, how the institution benefits from the program, any unique synergies, events, or activities occurring as a result, etc.

Finally, the program must describe and then demonstrate how the course of study and learning experiences encourage the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects.

[✓] The program has fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2011 Team Assessment: The program’s history and mission are rich with accomplishments listed in the APR and reiterated in dialogue with faculty, students, and administration. The university-wide Strategic Plan is currently being revisited to supersede the current 2004 plan. The result will formally codify the university’s goals regarding educational excellence and outreach to Pacific- rim cultures. In creating its own Strategic Plan this coming year, the program expects a series of ongoing changes from alignment of its own internal goals with those of the university.

1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

- Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff in all learning environments both traditional and non-traditional.

Further, the program must demonstrate that it encourages students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers, and it addresses health-related issues, such as time management.

Finally, the program must document, through narrative and artifacts, its efforts to ensure that all members of the learning community: faculty, staff, and students are aware of these objectives and are advised as to the expectations for ensuring they are met in all elements of the learning culture.

- Social Equity: The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.
The program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.

The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2011 Team Assessment: The program allows students, staff, and faculty to participate in developing policies affecting their learning environment and stimulate an engaged community. Policy development occurs within organizational structure set by the dean, vice-dean, and director of the program. The school has its own Executive, Admissions, Human Resources, Lecture, Facilities, and Curriculum Committees. The faculty actively work to create an engaged and transparent governance structure. A section in the "Organization and Planning" document addresses a collective agreement for governance. At the university level, the Academic Senate is the representative faculty body at USC. Each year, the school elects a full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty representative to this campus-wide governance body.

Students elect representatives to their own student organizations: ASC for undergrads and GASA for graduate students. The studio culture document formalizes a commitment to a positive and respectful learning environment.

The program addresses diversity by establishing an "Educational Opportunity Program Center" that identifies trains, and places low-income and/or first generation college-bound candidates into higher educational programs. Under-represented first generation college-bound minority students are given consideration in admission and tutoring programs.

Current M. Arch. student demographics are: 34% Caucasian, 5% African American, 6% Hispanic, 18% Asian/Pacific Islander, 2% Native American/Alaskan Native, 35% international/non-resident alien, and 0% unknown. The 2010 population was 55% female and 45% male.

Student campus groups such as: NOMA (National Organization of Minority Architects) and AWA (Association of Women in Architecture) address topics of social equity, diversity, and gender.

Female faculty hold top positions within the school, like studio coordinators, Graduate Program Directors, and the Vice-Deanship. Dean Qingyun Ma, the highest administrative position in the School, is the first Chinese-American to hold this position.

In addition to community diversity, amendments to the last two University Faculty Handbooks (2008, 2010) now support the work / family-life balance.

I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives: Programs must demonstrate through narrative and artifacts, how they respond to the following perspectives on architecture education. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently within the context of its history, mission, and culture and to further identify as part of its long-range planning activities how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community. That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching.¹ In addition, the program must

describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects
and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the
development of new knowledge.

[✓] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2011 Team Assessment: The USC School of Architecture takes a global view of its academic
community. The Dean created the USC – AAC (American academy in China) as an
academically-based, culturally-focused program involving faculty, staff, students, and donors at
multiple sites. Two major program-sponsored exhibitions have taken place through the AAC.
Growing numbers of both Chinese and American Universities participate in the AAC.

The program sponsors four, semester-abroad opportunities: The Como Italy Program, the
Barcelona Program, the AAU program, and the Southeast Asia Program.

On a national level, the school is nationally ranked by the Gourman Report and
DesignIntelligence. Nineteen faculty members are fellows in the American Institute of Architects;
three are distinguished professors of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture; two
are members and one is an honorary fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects; and four
have won Phi Kappa Phi book awards.

Faculty sit on a number of campus committees: faculty senate, library, international affairs, vision-
and-voices, sustainable cities, tenure and promotion, and business affairs. Several have joint
appointments with the Schools of Gerontology, Engineering, and Geography.

Students regularly participate in academic and local communities through involvement in the
American Institute of Architects for Students and Architecture for Humanity.

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

[✓] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2011 Team Assessment: The School of Architecture encourages a broad exchange of ideas
within the studio and the local professional community. Opportunities are available to explore
new knowledge realms especially across disciplines and locales. Opportunities for leadership are
wide-ranging and mirror the innovative, socially responsible culture of the program.

C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment. That students enrolled in the
accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship
and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an
understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located, and;
prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development
Program (IDP).

[✓] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2011 Team Assessment: Students in the program understand requirements for professional
registration. Adjunct associate professor Michael Hricak is the IDP coordinator; students are
aware of this important step in the licensure process and on to practice. This information is
gained in ARCH 525, Professional Practice.
D. **Architectural Education and the Profession.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to practice in a global economy; to recognize the impact of design on the environment; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to the multiple needs of a diversity of clients and diverse populations, as well as the needs of communities and; to contribute to the growth and development of the profession.

[✓] **The program is responsive to this perspective.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Students are exposed to client relations at two levels: course work and studio projects. The professional practice courses cover client expectations from the perspective of contracts, scope of work, and legal issues. Assigned studio projects are client-driven, such as recent work focused on senior housing and city planning.

Students and faculty are equipped to contribute to the growth of the profession. Research and innovation in the form of funded faculty research and competitive student research assistantships are encouraged. The school has taken a leadership role in advanced digital representation in both software knowledge and 3-d modeling fabrication. A program mission is to embrace trends in technology and to continue to explore new innovations toward the goal of creating technology and design leaders in the profession.

E. **Architectural Education and the Public Good.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to be active, engaged citizens; to be responsive to the needs of a changing world; to acquire the knowledge needed to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges through design, conservation and responsible professional practice; to understand the ethical implications of their decisions; to reconcile differences between the architect's obligation to his/her client and the public; and to nurture a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service and leadership.

[✓] **The program is responsive to this perspective.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Courses 525 (Professional Practice: Pre-Design, Project and Office Administration) and 533 (Urban Landscape: Case Studies and Studios) provide M. Arch.+2 students an understanding of the need to aid in exploring solutions to environmental, social, and economic challenges both locally and globally through design, conservation, and responsible professional practice. Students participate in a wide variety of student-based outreach organizations including: the Student Council, AIA/S, GASA, Architecture Brigades, and Architecture for Humanity with great benefit to both the student body and the greater Los Angeles community.

I.1.4 **Long-Range Planning:** An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and, where appropriate, the five perspectives. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform its future planning and strategic decision-making.

[✓] **The program’s processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.**

**2011 Team Assessment:** The School’s long range plan identifies multi-year improvement objectives consistent with its mission. Routine input is routinely collected from multiple sources to inform strategic decision-making.
The process begins with the graduate Chair, program director, and associate director. Directors meet bi-monthly with the graduate chair to address ongoing issues, and track plan adjustments in each program. The graduate chair reviews issues being considered at each faculty meeting. Curricular or program changes are reviewed by the school’s curriculum committee, voted on by the faculty, and affirmed by the university curriculum committee. Basic curriculum standards are developed through a faculty-run curriculum committee review. The M. Arch. program director proposes initiatives to the faculty, head, and dean (basic budget, course improvements, visiting faculty, and supplemental opportunities) annually.

The dean assigns staff to the chair, directors, and graduate admissions coordinator to compile statistics for any needed issue. Program administrators (vice deans, chair, director) meet with GASA (graduate architecture student council) members and review studio culture policies, discuss pedagogical standards, and concerns. The chair and director review mid-term and final course evaluations with faculty. Periodic faculty retreats address larger planning issues affecting the entire school such as balancing resources between the academic programs. (BArch, BS, the four masters’ programs, and the PhD program)

Priorities identified for the NAAB-accredited M. Arch. program are:

1. Increase admissions standards, diversity, and balance within design studios;
2. Re-evaluate required non-studio course work to ensure students are prepared for practice; ready for immediate production (digitally, technically and theoretically);
3. Continue integration of fabrication and technique;
4. Distinguish between the M. Arch. and the BArch programs;
5. Nurture emerging interests between academic units across the university for cross-platform scholarship;
6. Develop studio-based research in India, Brazil and beyond;
7. Increase Hispanic demographic representation;
8. Increase female faculty appointments in advanced studios,
9. Seek research and external opportunities to encourage impactful outreach design initiatives locally and globally;
10. Further advancement in faculty excellence and mentorship; and
11. Target faculty recruitment - specifically for the graduate program.

As the school establishes its long-term priorities, it is important for it to leverage its uniqueness, interdisciplinary linkages between building science, landscape architecture, and historic preservation, and the integrity of both the B. Arch. and accredited M. Arch. programs.

1.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:
- How the program is progressing towards its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.
- Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:
  - Solicitation of faculty, students’, and graduates’ views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
  - Individual course evaluations.
  - Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.
○ Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution. The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.

[✓] The program’s processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2011 Team Assessment: The school conducts on-going self-assessment at multiple levels and intervals. Administration has an assessment procedure at the university, school, program, student, faculty and dean’s levels.

Each year, the provost requests schools to submit a fall planning document and annual strategic plan, focusing on each school’s unique metrics of excellence and budget. This process includes a yearly analysis of previous and new initiatives and their impacts.

School-level self-assessment is conducted by an EXCOM, composed of six committees conducting ongoing self-evaluation of the faculty, facilities, external activities, and the curriculum simultaneously for each degree program. A second entity works with the EXCOM: the two vice deans (internal academic affairs and external development-related affairs) and three academic program chairs monthly and again, at a yearly retreat. Student representatives are invited to monthly faculty meetings.

Regular program-level self-assessments are conducted by faculty to evaluate student work, and program chairs, directors, and faculty for effectiveness. Mid-term and final reviews occur through the dean’s office. As graduates have grown, the school has hired a full-time program director and associate director; who collaborate and continually evaluate student progress.

Students evaluate faculty performance semester through standardized, on-line university questionnaires. Salary enhancements for tenured/tenure-track and adjunct faculty consider student evaluations of teaching performance. The School solicits mid-semester course evaluations.

Performance reviews are conducted annually for all tenured/tenure track and full-time non-tenured faculty. EXCOM-elected faulty review them and are also require examples of research/creative work, teaching responsibilities, and service achievements for the year. Student course and instructor evaluation ratings are reviewed for evidence of effectiveness. Additionally, the dean meets with each faculty member to review outcomes of the review and professional goals for the coming year. The vice dean and chairs conduct a similar review of adjunct faculty and part-time lecturers.

The dean is reviewed by two advisory boards composed of practitioners and representatives of the building, design, and development communities who assist the school. The Architecture Guild board meets for a monthly report from the dean. The dean’s advisory council meets annually to report on the direction of the school. The dean presents the updated strategic plan to the faculty each fall which is submitted to the university.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

1.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

- Faculty & Staff:
  - An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions.\(^2\)
  - Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
  - Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.

✓ Human Resources (Faculty & Staff) are adequate for the program

2011 Team Assessment: Staff and faculty have adequate resources to support the program. In isolated cases where deficiencies exist, such as the expressed need to hire two additional environmental systems faculty, searches are under-way. Policies addressing equal opportunity, increasing diversity, balancing faculty family and work responsibilities, requirements for tenure and faculty professional development were found in binders. Students were pleased with the freedom of access to faculty and staff.

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

✓ Human Resources (Students) are adequate for the program

2011 Team Assessment: Associate professor Selywn Ting monitors the M. Arch. student admission process and advises each student; he is continuously available throughout each student's career. He confirms students are enrolled in appropriate classes consistent with NAAB guidelines and minimum requirement for non-major electives.

\(^2\) A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
1.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

- **Administrative Structure**: An accredited degree program must demonstrate it has a measure of administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm the program's ability to conform to the conditions for accreditation. Accredited programs are required to maintain an organizational chart describing the administrative structure of the program and position descriptions describing the responsibilities of the administrative staff.

[✓] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

**2011 Team Assessment**: The dean reports to the provost of the university and is a member of the Provost's Council. He controls budget and hiring for the school, submits the annual budget, and reviews the school's strategic plan with the provost. Management is revenue-centered which provides the program greater autonomy and financial responsibility.

The dean is supported by two vice deans. The Vice Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs focuses on internal programs and faculty development. The Vice Dean of Administration and External Affairs handles external development and administrative management.

Degree-level chairs are appointed by the dean according to degree types: Chair of Undergraduate Studies (BArch, BS in Arch Studies), Chair of Grad Studies (M. Arch., MLA, MBS, MHP, and certificate programs), and Chair of PhD Studies. They work through the five committees to modify curriculum, use of facilities, and admissions policies. Full-time faculty serving on the five standing committees are also eligible for election to the EXCOM.

- **Governance**: The program must demonstrate that all faculty, staff, and students have equitable opportunities to participate in program and institutional governance.

[✓] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

**2011 Team Assessment**: The program's five standing committees (Curriculum, Human Resources, Lectures/Exhibitions/Publications, Facilities and Admissions) are vehicles by which faculty, students, and staff advance the academic mission of the school. Each EXCOM member serves on one of the five standing committees and reports to the dean.

The Student Councils (ASC – undergrads; GASA - grads) provide elected representation for the students. The Vice Dean is the "Dean of Faculty" and promotes faculty development, contracts, and cases for promotion.

1.2.3 Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

[✓] Physical Resources are adequate for the program

**2011 Team Assessment**: The following physical improvements have occurred within the past five years:

- Timme Architectural Research Center Addition
- Student Studio Workstation upgrades: Level Three Timme
- Clipper IP/LAB upgrade
- Watt 1 A/V upgrade
Watt Level Two – ADA upgrade
Watt HVAC conversion to University chilled water

All architectural facilities were observed to be fully handicapped-accessible. With recent growth in the number of students in the M. Arch. program, meeting space in the Timme Center is at saturation. If the growth continues, creative management of the space will be needed or additional space may be necessary.

Woodworking, welding and a computer numerical control machine (CNC) are currently housed in single-level sheds in a service court behind Watt. Space is constrained with limited vehicular access for material movement. Vice Dean Murphy has approval to construct temporary storage behind the sheds; however it too will be limited and difficult to navigate. A permanent, long-term solution is needed for shops, proximate to campus, and security.

1.2.4 Financial Resources: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[✓] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2011 Team Assessment: The accredited M. Arch. program has adequate use of institutional and financial resources. USC uses revenue center accounting management in which tuition income goes directly to respective schools. The school’s income is based on the purchase of each tuition unit. Program expenses include direct and indirect overhead costs. Indirect costs include: facilities, utilities, development, central administration, student aid, and security.

Total unrestricted income for the School of Architecture is $22.6 million, representing a 78.7% increase from 2003-04 ($12.65 million). Major expenses are undergraduate student aid and indirect expenses. Forty-seven percent of total unrestricted income is returned to the university for these expenses. The remaining 53% of gross income (approximately $11.9 million) covers salaries and benefits.

The M. Arch. program also follows the revenue center model. Tuition income is based on tuition for all M. Arch. courses; the M. Arch. program budget reflects these amounts.

USC’s pooled endowment is approximately $3.5 billion. The school’s portion is approximately $26 million. Allocation of endowment funds is determined by the program director and student services to determine level of student need to tap either restricted funds or endowment interest. In the past, the dean has designated a small portion of these funds for special initiatives such as funded studios or workshops.

The USC Architectural Guild raises annual funds for scholarships, traveling fellowships, interview workshops, job fairs, and lectures. Approximately $25,000 was raised in 2009-10. The Guild’s Board is comprised of local participants in the construction process: architects, engineers, contractors, and vendors.

Tuition at USC is the same for all undergraduate programs and most graduate programs; therefore expenditure of unrestricted funds is similar between schools. Amounts expended per student by professional schools range from $17,000 to $29,000. The School of Architecture expenditure per student is at approximately $19,000. In most schools, graduate and upper division students benefit more than undergraduates due to smaller graduate seminars and better access to research equipment and software.

Tenured faculty receive a $2,000/yr research stipend for off-campus conferences, books, equipment, and software. Tenured faculty also compete for school research grants allocated from a pool of $40,000 per year.
Tenure-track faculty are encouraged to conduct scholarly research. Each receives a stipend of $6,000 per year for basic research. Both tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to receive Graduate Research Scholar (GRS) awards to hire graduate students who may share similar research interests to collaborate with faculty. This program is being revised for 2011-12, to be more targeted. Its annual budget is $53,000.

The school and the dean conduct ongoing multi-year assessments of faculty salaries and compensation. The faculty requested a more transparent process; the dean/vice deans are working with administration to respond.

I.2.5 Information Resources: The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

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

[✓] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2011 Team Assessment: Information resources are housed in the Helen Topping Architecture Fine Arts Library in the basement of Watt Hall. It incorporates appropriate study, computer, and video facilities in addition to traditional stacks containing seventy thousand volumes. The Central Library appropriates adequate funding for maintenance and care of the collection. All twenty-three USC libraries are interconnected via the electronic card catalog. Space is becoming critical and sets of bound periodicals are being relocated to a conditioned, overflow storage facility off-campus. Requested volumes are delivered within one day of the request. Expansion space for is not a current need but will likely be in the future.
PART I: SECTION 3—REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports

Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

- Program student characteristics.
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.
  - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
    - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
  - Time to graduation.
    - Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.
    - Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.

- Program faculty characteristics
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.
  - Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.

[✓] Statistical reports were provided and provide the appropriate information

2011 Team Assessment: Up-to-date statistical reports were provided in three separate volumes in the team room.

I.3.2. Annual Reports: The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2009 NAAB Procedures. Beginning in 2008, these reports are submitted electronically to the NAAB. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the NAAB will provide to the visiting team all annual reports submitted since 2008. The NAAB will also provide the NAAB Responses to the annual reports.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports.

---

3 In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

[✓] Annual Reports and NAAB Responses were provided and provide the appropriate information

2011 Team Assessment: Annual reports were requested including the 2002 VTR; all were provided and contained appropriate information.

1.3.3 Faculty Credentials: The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty are adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history and context of the institution.

In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit⁴ that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

[✓] Faculty credentials were provided and demonstrate the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement.

2011 Team Assessment: Faculty credentials were provided in the APR and again on a chart posted in the team room. The faculty exhibit was on display on the second floor of Watt Hall. The faculty possess exemplary educational and professional credentials; many of whom have achieved the status of Fellow in the American Institute of Architects.

⁴ The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team’s ability to view and evaluate student work.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW
The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

[✓] The policy documents in the team room met the requirements of Appendix 3

2011 Team Assessment: Policy documents found in Volumes 1-3 the team room binder meet the requirements of Appendix 3 in the VTR.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE – EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria: The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:
Architects must have the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This ability includes facility with the wider range of media used to think about architecture including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making. Students’ learning aspirations include:

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

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

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Communication skills are exhibited in critical writing ability, analysis, and research papers found in courses ARCH 314 History of Architecture, Contemporary issues, ARCH 532 Elements of Urban Landscape, and ARCH 533 Urban Landscape Case Studies. ARCH 505aL Graduate Architectural Design includes written design statements prepared by students and reviewed as part of the project critiques.

A. 2. Design Thinking Skills: Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Projects in course ARCH 561 Architecture in the Urban Landscape: Projects Places show development of site planning concepts from varying perspectives and present reasoned points of view.

A. 3. Visual Communication Skills: Ability to use appropriate representational media, such as traditional graphic and digital technology skills, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Visual abilities presented, especially computer rendering and other digital skills, are exemplary. Evidence is found in studio work in ARCH 505abL and 605abL - Graduate Architecture Design.
A.4. Technical Documentation: Ability to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Coursework binder ARCH526 – Professional Practice: Legal and Economic Context, Project Documentation contains evidence of students’ ability to produce a competent set of preliminary architectural construction documents including site plans, floor plans, building elevations, sections, wall sections and limited detailing. This level of design thought and technical ability is also evident in the student studio work displayed, particularly that of ARCH 605a Graduate Architecture Design. Outline specifications were not found.

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

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Work produced in ARCH 505aL and 605aL indicates the students’ ability to research and analyze building materials and systems and synthesize these in the building’s exterior closure. Relevant project examples include Aggregated Matter (605b Spring 2011) and the MOMAT project (605a Fall 2008).

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

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The team found investigative typologies, program and context in preliminary research exercises, conceptual design investigations, exterior space schema, and building component investigations, with exemplary work found in ARCH 505abL/605abL studio projects.

A.7. Use of Precedents: Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Design projects include precedent investigation as a basic part of the design process. Appropriate use and documentation of precedent is part of the projects’ grade. Courses in the Urban History curriculum such as ARCH 561, Architecture in the Urban Landscape; Project Places also include critical reviews and studies of urban design precedents. ARCH 314 History of Architecture, Contemporary Issues includes examination of history and fundamental principles of iconic contemporary designs. Evidence was found in studio coursework binders.

A.8. Ordering Systems Skills: Understanding of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Studio projects viewed included diagram mapping of ordering systems, which depict two- and three-dimensional designations of elements such as public/private circulation
paths and major structural elements. Supporting courses include ARCH 532, Elements of the Urban Landscape and ARCH 533, Urban Landscape Case Studies which investigate historical urban patterns and layering of landscape elements in site analysis.

A. 9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Consistent with becoming a prominent educational presence on the Pacific Rim, courses cover aspects of the parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape, and urban design through study of traditions and global culture in indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, and national settings. Evidence is seen in course ARCH 533, Urban Landscapes; Case Studies, relating linkages between nature and the urban environment, utilizing case studies from cities around the world. This course specifically explores relationships between natural and urban environments and cultural forces in South America, China, and Europe.

Students have summer study-abroad opportunities and the ability to propose personal travel study itineraries. They also compete for travelling scholarships sponsored by the Architectural Guild.

A. 10. Cultural Diversity: Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Students are exposed to eastern and western cultures through courses ARCH 214a and b which are history courses focusing on architectural traditions of both eastern and western cultures. Students have opportunities for study abroad and travelling fellowships made available through the Architectural Guild.

The student body, faculty, and city are culturally diverse. Current M. Arch. student demographic percentages are: 34% Caucasian, 5% African American, 6% Hispanic, 18% Asian/Pacific Islander, 2% Native American/Alaskan Native, 35% international/non-resident alien, and 0% unknown. The program’s 2010 gender breakdown was 55% female and 45% male.


[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Graduate students are eligible for paid positions as Graduate Research Scholars, supporting faculty research. ARCH 561, Architecture in the Urban Landscape; Project Places - explores theories of planning by overlaying multiple methodologies on campus planning documents and evaluating the success of various techniques. An excellent example of applied research is seen in Spring 2010 Studio ARCH 505b project, the USC Emeriti Center. Students study needs and the impact of a combined center for life-long learning with senior housing specifically for the retired USC community.
Realm A. General Team Commentary: The team found ample evidence of critical thinking and representation skills in student work reviewed. Students are motivated and intelligent. The ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of research is clearly indicated in course materials and supporting studio projects. Research in particular is a core emphasis of the program. Student visual communication skills are outstanding and are seen in both studio years.

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Incorporating life safety systems.
- Integrating accessibility.
- Applying principles of sustainable design.

B. 1. Pre-Design: Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Students are given outlines of programs at the beginning of studio projects, which are analyzed, evaluated and developed into a working document over the evolution of the design. Studios include lectures on the life safety code and compliance. ARCH 511, Building Systems, examines building codes in research and writing exercises. ARCH 525, Professional Practice; Pre-Design, Project and Office, covers programming and evaluation of clients’ needs.

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

[✗] Not Met

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence of this ability was not seen in the student work. Of all projects reviewed, one indicated an ability to design facilities for use by individuals with disabilities. Accessibility course material is found in ARCH 315, Design of Luminous and Sonic Environment, in the reading material and lectures, which indicates an understanding of the topic; however little evidence of an ability to integrate wide ranging aspects of universal design was found in ARCH 505b, Graduate Architecture Design studio projects (the targeted studio course).
B. 3. **Sustainability**: *Ability* to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction and operations on future generations through means such as carbon-neutral design, bioclimatic design, and energy efficiency.

[✓] Met

2011 **Team Assessment**: The team found evidence of the students' ability in ARCH 505ab, Graduate Architecture Design studio projects and lecture course Arch 315, Design of the Luminous and Sonic Environment.

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

[✓] Met

2011 **Team Assessment**: ARCH 511, Building Systems includes lectures and assignments in grading, soil types, and soils' report analyses. ARCH 561, Architecture in the Urban Landscape; Project Places and ARCH 533, Urban Landscape Case Studies show ability in the use of critical, big-picture thinking in the design of sites. Examples of soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed development is evident in studio projects.

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

[✓] Not Met

2011 **Team Assessment**: Students are exposed to codes and their application in ARCH 315, Design for the Luminous and Sonic Environment; however, no evidence was found of the students' ability to apply basic life-safety concepts in their design work - particularly egress concepts.

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

- A.2. Design Thinking Skills
- A.4. Technical Documentation
- A.5. Investigative Skills
- A.8. Ordering Systems
- A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture
- B.2. Accessibility
- B.3. Sustainability
- B.4. Site Design
- B.5. Life Safety
- B.7. Environmental Systems
- B.9. Structural Systems

[✓] Not Met

2011 **Team Assessment**: The team did not find evidence of student work indicating the ability to develop a comprehensive project integrating the designated SPC. Many SPC falling under Comprehensive Design are understood through coursework; however, studio projects feature building
envelope systems and façade articulation while equally relevant building systems are not as intensely pursued. (Life Safety, Accessibility, and Environmental Systems' Integration). The program's focus on a performative design methodology and emphasis on enclosure systems, though laudable, does not obviate the need for minimum ability in the other designated SPC, creating a comprehensive scheme.

The program has a history of not meeting this specific criterion, which disturbed the team. Previous teams' reports echo similar symptoms to those found by this team - in the 2002 VTR, Comprehensive Design was not met; in the 2005 VTR it was not met; in the 2007 FER it was not met.

The team feels the past pattern of not meeting this criterion is now a serious shortcoming which affects both the students' educational preparedness and the accreditation credential.

B. 7 Financial Considerations: Understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting.

[✓] Not Met

2011 Team Assessment: In ARCH 525 Professional Practice - Pre-Design, Project and Office, Part 3, Chapter 7 the syllabus indicates a lecture covering the fundamentals of building costs; however no evidence was found to indicate understanding in the form of handouts, quizzes, or student work. No evidence was seen in the studio. (ARCH 505a)

B. 8. Environmental Systems: Understanding the principles of environmental systems' design such as embodied energy, active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar orientation, day-lighting and artificial illumination, and acoustics; including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: ARCH 315, Design for the Luminous/Sonic Environment covers topics of natural and artificial lighting and acoustics well. Studio projects indicate an intimate understanding of details related to passive air movements and dynamic façade designs.

B. 9. Structural Systems: Understanding of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Basic principles of structural design are found in Professor Schierle's and Associate Professor Guh's courses: ARCH 213ab and Arch 313-14. Being situated in an active seismic zone allows students to gain first-hand knowledge and instruction in designs to resist horizontal forces.
B. 10. Building Envelope Systems: Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Student work showed a deep understanding of development and integration of building enclosure systems. Investigative topics in Course ARCH 605a, Graduate Architecture Design included specific performance of building skins. The topic is addressed in ARCH 511, Building Systems where students detail glass curtain wall assemblies, waterproofing, and anchorage to the building structures.

B. 11. Building Service Systems Integration: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: An understanding of basic principles and application of these principles is evident in student work found in ARCH315, Design of the Luminous/Sonic Environment.

B. 12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration: Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: An understanding of building materials and assemblies was seen in the course outline and student work produced in courses ARCH411, Architectural Technology and ARCH511, Building Systems.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: An understanding of building service systems, materials, and assemblies is evident throughout coursework: ARCH 315, Design of the Luminous and Sonic Environment, ARCH 411, Architectural Technology, and ARCH 511, Building Systems. The team finds SPC B.6 Comprehensive Design Not Met due largely to lack of specific application of building systems integration, life safety, and accessibility principles in the studio.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

- Knowing societal and professional responsibilities
- Comprehending the business of building.
- Collaborating and negotiating with clients and consultants in the design process.
- Discerning the diverse roles of architects and those in related disciplines.
- Integrating community service into the practice of architecture.

C. 1. Collaboration: Ability to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.
2011 Team Assessment: The criterion is met. Evidence was found in collaborative studio projects produced in ARCH 605b, Graduate Architecture Design and team assignments in ARCH 561, Elements of the Urban Landscape; Projects and Places and ARCH 526, Professional Practice.

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

2011 Team Assessment: Students' understanding of human behavior, the natural environment, and design of the built environment is found in coursework in ARCH 533, Urban Landscapes; Case Studies and ARCH 561, Elements of the Urban Landscape; Projects and Places and in the lectures, reading summaries, and precedent case-studies.

C. 3 Client Role in Architecture: Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and reconcile the needs of the client, owner, user groups, and the public and community domains.

2011 Team Assessment: Students are exposed to the client's role in projects; for example, in the Emeriti Center project, (spring 2010, ARCH 505b, Graduate Architecture Design studio) students work directly with client groups. Supporting courses like ARCH 525, Professional Practice; Pre-Design, Project and Office, cover client negotiations, contracts, and managing client expectations.

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

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence of students' understanding of project procurement, delivery, and management was found in coursework in ARCH 525 and 526, Professional Practice; Pre-Design, Project and Office Administration taught by Assistant Professor Hricak and Lecturer Chow.

C. 5. Practice Management: Understanding of the basic principles of architectural practice management such as financial management and business planning, time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.

2011 Team Assessment: Students gain an understanding of this Criterion through courses ARCH 525 and 526, Professional Practice; Pre-Design, Project and Office Administration and Legal, Economic Context, Project Documentation taught by Associate Professor Hricak and Lecturer Chow. Courses identify key issues within architectural practice management. Quizzes and student writing demonstrate the students' understanding of the topic.
C. 6. Leadership: Understanding of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Course and studio projects often rely on collaborative team interaction. ARCH 525, Professional Practice; Pre-Design, Project and Office, covers the architect's contractual responsibility as the leader of the design and construction process. In this course, guest lecturers address "Developing Leadership Skills & Mastering Communication Skills" also covering behavioral traits of leaders, stewardship, teamwork, and mastering communications skills.

C. 7. Legal Responsibilities: Understanding of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in courses ARCH 525 and 526, Professional Practice; Pre-Design, Project and Office Administration of the students' understanding of the architect's legal responsibilities. ARCH 525 covers ethics as a complement to architects' legal responsibilities.

C. 8. Ethics and Professional Judgment: Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues, and responsibility in architectural design and practice.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Course 525, Professional Practice; Pre-Design, Project and Office provides a comprehensive approach to approaching ethical situations and professional judgment which was seen in tests and presentation materials.

C. 9. Community and Social Responsibility: Understanding of the architect's responsibility to work in the public interest, to respect historic resources, and to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Projects in ARCH 505b, Graduate Architecture Design studio and ARCH 525, Professional Practice; Pre-Design, Project and Office Administration provide evidence of this criterion being met. This principle is further advanced by the program's ownership of the Gamble House and the ongoing Case Study Houses program.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: ARCH 525 and 526, Professional Practice; Pre-Design, Project and Office are critical complements to an excellent offering of courses covering Leadership and Practice. Materials found indicate a wide-ranging coverage of topics supported by excellent examples of student work.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Regional Accreditation: The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The university recently received reaccreditation from the Western Association of Schools & Colleges; evidenced by the March. 7, 2011 letter to President Nikias found on pages 134-7 of the APR.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (BArch.), 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 BArch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Two Master of Architecture degrees are offered: the accredited degree, and a post-professional program for students with a professional Bachelor of Architecture or degree or equivalent.

Students admitted to the accredited program must have a four-year degree in architectural studies from either a U.S. school with a NAAB-accredited professional architecture program; a U.S. school accredited by a regional accrediting body without a NAAB-accredited professional architecture program; or an international program deemed equivalent. Students matriculate in the fall semester and are in residence a minimum of two years (four semesters). They must meet established standards for graduate study at USC, and complete 64 credit units including prerequisite Basic Studies and 48 units of graduate level courses including Advanced Studies and approved electives.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development
The program must describe the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications (e.g., changes or additions) are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Further, the NAAB expects that programs are evaluating curricula with a view toward the advancement of the discipline and toward ensuring that students are exposed to current issues in practice. Therefore, the program must demonstrate that licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The accredited M. Arch. curriculum receives three tiers of administrative oversight. The first is every two weeks in a meeting with the directors, the chair, and vice dean. The second is in the directors’ meeting (M. Arch., M. Landscape Architecture, M. Building Science, and M. Historical Preservation), where critical curricular and administrative issues common to all programs are addressed. The third occurs when sequence, structure, and new courses are proposed to advance the curriculum. With the increase in student enrollment from 2007 to 2010, a significant adjustment is
underway to maximize available resources and enrich the accredited M. Arch. program. Curriculum development is spearheaded by the M. Arch. director, the graduate chair, and the vice dean.

Creation of a new course requires four tiers of review: the first is to propose a new or revised course by completing university form 301. It includes reason and cause for the proposed revision and is submitted to the Curriculum Committee consisting of licensed, senior faculty and administrators who assess its value and context within the curriculum structure. This group recommends refinements for approval. The third step is submitting the approved course in the faculty meeting and a vote on its adoption. If approved, the course is resubmitted to the university where, upon approval, catalog text is created, effective by the next academic calendar.
PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PREPROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

In the event a program relies on the preparatory/preprofessional educational experience to ensure that students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist. Likewise, the program must demonstrate it has determined how any gaps will be addressed during each student’s progress through the accredited degree program. This assessment should be documented in a student’s admission and advising files.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Initial applications are evaluated using criteria created by the school in the form of test scores, transcripts, and portfolios. Rare consideration is given to applicants that, after portfolio review, exhibit unique abilities, provided other metrics are acceptable (competitive). Many students are recruited from programs having accredited professional degrees who have established successful performance precedents at USC in the core curriculum or “Basics.”

Upon acceptance, a detailed review of transcripts occurs by Associate Director/Advisor Selwyn Ting who charts a candidate’s history in a matrix with “Basics” requirements cross-referenced with the student’s applicable transcript course grade. About half of the students are required to take digital skills’ classes. Some international students are required to take English language classes to improve comprehension. Most incoming students are required to take 314 History of Architecture, Contemporary Issues, 525 Professional Practice; Pre-Design, Project and Office, and 213ab Building Structures and Seismic Design to comply with the core curriculum.

As a dedicated advisor, Professor Ting works with the students upon entry and at intervals to map individual paths through the two-year program. As one student related in an interview: “Selwyn makes sure everyone graduates on time.” He reviews requests for waivers of supplementary course work which are considered on a probationary basis. He tracks students’ progress to determine if a course should be required or waived.

There is evidence in the studio midterm progress comments that students receive notice if they are not meeting program expectations. Comments include recommendations to assist in refocusing efforts to improve progress.

The program seeks to remain as a program requiring a preprofessional degree for admission, although most students take additional courses, as stated earlier, to meet entry-level requirements. The school offers students an opportunity to improve weak areas by offering a digital “boot camp” the summer preceding the first semester and additional summer classes between the years to keep on track toward the 2-year graduation goal.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees
In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence of exact NAAB language is found on the USC architecture website and on page 10 of the 2010-11 digital bulletin.

http://arch.usc.edu/Programs/Undergraduate/BachelorofArchitecture

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: 2009 NAAB Conditions and 2010 Procedures are available through the following link on the USC School of Architecture’s website and is incorporated into the Studio Culture document. http://arch.usc.edu/Programs

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:

www.ARCHCareers.org
The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
The Emerging Professional’s Companion
www.NCARB.org
www.aia.org
www.aies.org
www.acsa-arch.org

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Career development information is found on the USC Architecture program website. http://arch.usc.edu/Resources/StudentServices/CareerDevelopmentInformation

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs
In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:
All Annual Reports, including the narrative
All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
The final decision letter from the NAAB
The most recent APR
The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

These documents must be housed together and accessible to all. Programs are encouraged to make these documents available electronically from their websites.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Copies of the APRs are in the Architecture and Fine Arts Library. Copies of the APRs and VTRs are available by request in the main office of the School of Architecture. Program was encouraged to post both APRs and VTRs on the Department of Architecture website.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.

[✓] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The NCARB pass rate link is found on the following school web page: http://arch.usc.edu/Resources/StudentServices/careerdevelopmentinformation.
Appendices:

Program Information

[Taken from the Architecture Program Report, responses to Part One: Section 1 Identity and Self-Assessment]

A. History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)

Located in Los Angeles, a global center for arts, technology and international trade, the University of Southern California is one of the world's leading private research universities.

When USC first opened its doors to 53 students and 10 teachers in 1880, the "city" still lacked paved streets, electric lights, telephones and a reliable fire alarm system. Today, USC is located in the heart of one of the biggest metropolises in the world. The University is a non-profit, privately owned, coeducational, non-sectarian, diverse, urban university. In 1885 the university declared that "no student would be denied admission because of race, color, religion or sex." This policy is reflected in the current make up of the student body – students from all 50 states and 149 countries with 44% being Caucasian, 23% Pacific Islander, 6% African American, 13% Hispanic, 1% Native American, 11% Non-Resident Alien, and 2% Unknown/Other at the undergraduate level and 30% being Caucasian, 19% Pacific Islander, 4% African American, 9% Hispanic, 0% Native American, 27% Non-Resident Alien, and 11% Unknown/Other at the graduate level. USC enrolls more international students than any other U.S. university and offers extensive opportunities for internships and study abroad. With a strong tradition of integrating liberal and professional education, USC fosters a vibrant culture of public service and encourages students to cross academic as well as geographic boundaries in their pursuit of knowledge.

USC is the oldest private research university in the West. For its first 50 years, USC was the only major university in Southern California. It joined the Association of American Universities in 1969. The AAU is comprised of the top 62 universities in the United States and Canada. USC is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

The University is comprised of the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences and 17 other professional schools, including engineering, theater, architecture, fine art, cinema, business, education, social work and law. There are 3200 full time faculty currently, with approximately 3,180 volunteer faculty affiliated with the Medical School and other 430 volunteers with the School of Pharmacy. A staff of 10,800 supports faculty research, teaching and service. The total student enrollment in 2009-10 was 35,000 students (with 17,000 in undergraduate and 18,000 in graduate and professional programs—6,600 of which are international students)

USC has approximately 230,000 alumni – leaders in public policy, the arts, architecture, urban planning, law, engineering, economic and business affairs, scientific research, and health care. USC is committed to the principle that the educational mission of the University is most effectively carried out in a context that encourages the creation of new knowledge, with approximately 130,000 degrees at the graduate level and 98,500 at the undergraduate level thus far.

The University has traditionally performed a wide variety of roles in the service to the community – contributing to the welfare of its own members, as well as to southern California and the nation. This outreach was recognized when Time Magazine named
USC its College of the Year for 2000. More than 60% of USC Students volunteer in University sponsored programs within our neighborhood. These programs provide important support for educational, social, and health services in the community.

The University completed its last financial campaign in 2003 with the initial target, one billion dollars. At the close of the campaign almost three billion dollars had been raised over a nine-year period. It was the most successful campaign in the history of higher education at the time. As the largest private employer in Los Angeles, USC generates $4.9 billion in fiscal activity annually in the Los Angeles region and beyond.

C. L. Max Nikias became USC's 11th president in August 2010, following a 19-year term of former President Steven B. Sample. A patent-holding electrical engineer, Nikias arrived at USC in 1991 to build a multimedia research center and rapidly earned distinction as an innovator, leader, fundraiser and scholar. Following a vigorous four-year tenure as dean of the USC Viterbi School of Engineering, he served as executive vice president and provost for five years. During that time, he recruited new academic leadership; strengthened the academic medical enterprise; attracted a series of major donations; created innovative cross-disciplinary programs; enhanced USC's globalization efforts; and increased support for students at the undergraduate, graduate and doctoral levels.

Mission of the Institution
Adopted by the USC Board of Trustees, the central mission of the University of Southern California is the development of human beings and society as a whole through the cultivation and enrichment of the human mind and spirit. The principal means by which our mission is accomplished are teaching, research, artistic creation, professional practice and selected forms of public service. Our first priority as faculty and staff is the education of our students, from freshmen to postdoctorals, through a broad array of academic, professional, extracurricular and athletic programs of the first rank. The integration of liberal and professional learning is one of USC's special strengths. We strive constantly for excellence in teaching knowledge and skills to our students, while at the same time helping them to acquire wisdom and insight, love of truth and beauty, moral discernment, understanding of self, and respect and appreciation for others.

Research of the highest quality by our faculty and students is fundamental to our mission. USC is one of a very small number of premier academic institutions in which research and teaching are inextricably intertwined, and on which the nation depends for a steady stream of new knowledge, art, and technology. Our faculty are not simply teachers of the works of others, but active contributors to what is taught, thought and practiced throughout the world.

USC is pluralistic, welcoming outstanding men and women of every race, creed and background. We are a global institution in a global center, attracting more international students over the years than any other American university. And we are private, unfettered by political control, strongly committed to academic freedom, and proud of our entrepreneurial heritage.

An extraordinary closeness and willingness to help one another are evident among USC students, alumni, faculty, and staff; indeed, for those within its compass the Trojan Family is a genuinely supportive community. Alumni, trustees, and friends of USC are essential to this family tradition, providing generous financial support, participating in university governance, and assisting students at every turn.

In our surrounding neighborhoods and around the globe, USC provides public leadership and public service in such diverse fields as health care, economic development, social
welfare, scientific research, public policy and the arts. We also serve the public interest by being the largest private employer in the city of Los Angeles, as well as the city's largest export industry in the private sector.

USC has played a major role in the development of Southern California for more than a century, and plays an increasingly important role in the development of the nation and the world. We expect to continue to play these roles for many centuries to come. Thus our planning, commitments and fiscal policies are directed toward building quality and excellence in the long term.

In 2004, USC created a strategic plan for increasing academic excellence entitled "Building Strategic Capabilities for the University of the 21st Century." (see appendix). To summarize, this plan built on the 1994 and 1998 strategic plans, which focused on such topics as interdisciplinary inquiry and an institutional commitment to dealing with urban issues. The 2004 Strategic plan anticipated the future competition among higher education providers worldwide. Though adopted in 2004, the plan is reviewed and adjusted by a permanent Planning Committee on a regular basis. Its vision for the future clarifies USC's intention to become one of the most influential and productive research universities in the world, with three core approaches underlying our collective efforts:

a. To conduct a range of research and scholarship that advances knowledge and at the same time addresses issues critical to our community, the nation, and the world (meeting societal needs, spanning the divisions between basic and applied research)

b. To create a significant global presence that will increase international visibility, reach, and impact of our research, scholarship, art, education, and service (expanding our global presence)

c. To focus our educational programs on meeting the needs of qualified students worldwide, from undergraduates through continuing professional development. This commitment will guide our choices regarding pedagogy, instructional technology, curriculum, admissions, and support services (promoting learner centered education)

The strategic plan also acknowledged that although developing these strategic capabilities will require far-reaching changes in university structure and culture, it is important to ensure that USC remains committed to respecting its four core values: a. free inquiry, b. the values of the Trojan Family (caring and respect for one another as individuals; appreciation of diversity; team spirit; strong alumni networks; and a commitment to service), c. commitment to informed risk-taking, and d. a commitment to ethical conduct.

The newly elected President Nikias has announced a new strategic plan will be issued in the near future with a new set of priorities for his tenure as president of USC.

B. History and Mission of the Program (1.1.1)

A Department of Architecture was established at USC within the School of Fine Arts in 1919, the first in Southern California. This small department grew rapidly with the help of the Allied Architects of Los Angeles. A separate School of Architecture was organized in September 1925. A new building was built for the School in 1926 with open courtyards that reflect the historic heritage of the region. The building, Harris Hall, has served as a social nucleus and is still the heart of the School today. Arthur Clason Weatherhead, the first dean, was joined by five practicing architects as faculty, who also served as an
advisory committee to the University. This established a pattern of professional service and pragmatism complementing academic inquiry that still exists today.

Working with the Educational Committee of the American Institute of Architects, the School increased its scope to a five year program, leading to a Bachelor of Architecture degree, with an emphasis on regional influences that remained consistent for the next two decades under Weatherhead's guidance. Additional art courses were added to the curriculum in 1928, when a major sequence in fine arts was established, leading to the degree of A.B. in the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences. The School was organized as a College in 1931, at which time professional curricula in design, painting, and sculpture, leading to the professional degree of Bachelor of Fine Arts, were established. In 1932, the graduate curriculum in architecture for the degree of Master of Architecture was approved. The name of the College was changed to the College of Architecture and Fine Arts in 1933. The emphasis of the School changed dramatically after World War II. Arthur B. Gallion, who took over leadership in 1945, transferred the fine arts curricula to the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences, changed the name of the School to the College of Architecture and added a department of Industrial Design, led by Raymond F. Loewy, whose innovation in streamlining and the use of new materials have come to symbolize the optimism of the period. The era of post-war prosperity in America in the 1950s that accelerated with the end of the Korean conflict was a period of tremendous growth in Los Angeles, and the USC School of Architecture was in the vanguard of exploring ways in which the built environment could respond to radical changes. The casual lifestyle demanded by war weary GIs called for an open architecture that allowed more access to the outdoors, to take advantage of the benign climate of Southern California.

The faculty at the School in the late 1940s and throughout the 1950s reflected these critical changes, with Gregory Ain, Robert Alexander, Harwell Hamilton Harris, Garret Eckbo, Sal Merendino, Emmet Wemple, Conrad Buff, Calvin Straub, and Donald Hensman, all prominent in a shift towards modernism. The demographic shift and social transformation, in a move toward more personal freedom and mobility that began in Los Angeles and reverberated in the rest of the nation after the war, continued through the 1960s.

The Case Study House program, which had critical implications for the American building industry was a bold initiative started by John Entenza in Los Angeles and many of the protagonists in this important project had graduated from USC. Pierre Koenig, who designed and built Case Study Houses #21 and #22, was a leader in this effort and continues to represent this valuable legacy at the School today. As a student at USC, under the aegis of Dean Gallion, Koenig, a returning G.I., extended the modernist language into a new material, steel, and advocated prefabrication techniques that would make American construction and housing production more efficient. As natural resources become more scarce, his investigations take on new importance. He won two California Council AIA awards in 1996: The Maybeck Award for lifetime achievement in design, and The 25 Year Award for his Case Study House #22.

Conrad Buff, FAIA (BArch 1952), Calvin Straub, FAIA (BArch 1943), and Donald Hensman, FAIA (BArch 1952), taught at USC under Dean Gallion's leadership and have influenced generations of architects through the quality of their work. In the Case Study Houses #20 and #28, all three explored how the principles of modernism responded to a regional context, heavily shaped by the tradition of the preceding architectural philosophy of the Arts and Crafts Movement.

The USC Architectural Guild was founded in 1958. The Guild is still the primary support group of USC School of Architecture and continues to form a unique link between USC
Architecture students and faculty and the professional community. Its members come from all the related businesses of architecture, design, construction and real estate development.

A notable graduate from this rich period is alumnus and Pritzker Prize winner Frank Gehry (B,Arch 1954), who epitomizes the mixture of originality tempered with pragmatism that has historically characterized a USC education. Since graduating in 1954, Gehry has followed a highly individual path of self-discovery that has made him one of the most influential and creative architects in the world. As the inspiration behind "the Los Angeles School," the contemporary equivalent of the Chicago and Philadelphia initiatives which have so profoundly redefined practice in the past, Gehry continues to surprise and delight an international audience that looks to him for innovation. Following interim administrations by Henry Burge, Samuel Hurst took over the leadership of the school in 1963 and during his 10-year term James Ambrose, Pierre Koenig, and Ralph Knowles joined the faculty with advocates for change such as Charles Eames and Craig Ellwood continuing as visiting lecturers. Konrad Wachsmann, an internationally recognized authority on prefabrication, was the Director of the Institute for Building Research from 1963 to his retirement in the mid 70s, and had a lasting influence on the technology curriculum, establishing the only center for research in industrialized construction at USC.

Recent Pritzker Prize winner Thom Mayne (BArch 1969), principal of Morphosis, is an example of the diverse viewpoints grounded in technical and environmental principles that typified this era. He is widely recognized as a leader in the next generation of architects in "the Los Angeles School." He credits the depth and extent of his awareness manifested in his sensitive readings of context to Professor Ralph Knowles. Knowles pioneered techniques of solar design long before the concept of sustainability was introduced. His educational approach is now used as a model by a rapidly growing faction that advocates concern for environmental issues.

Dean Hurst recruited many of the current faculty including Graeme Morland, Dimitry Vergun, and Roger Sherwood. Frank Dimster came from the Pereira organization. Hurst also invited Christopher Alexander, Reynar Banham, Alvin Boyarsky, Ray Bradbury, and Esther McCoy as visiting lecturers, among others. In 1973, Ralph Knowles became interim dean, a position he held until 1975, when A. Quincy Jones assumed the deanship. From 1979-80, Panos Koulermos served as interim dean. Robert Harris, formerly dean at the University of Oregon, became dean in 1980 and led the School for the next 11 years.

Robert Harris, who guided the School through the tumultuous 1980s, reinforced its strengths and expanded its focus to an emphasis on diverse cultures, as well as urban concerns, through his own leadership of the effort to restructure the planning strategies that will guide the growth of Los Angeles in the future. As the chairman of the committee that formulated the Downtown Strategic Plan, Harris imbued the curriculum with the high level of excitement that now pervades the city, coming from a collective realization that it represents an unprecedented urban model for the future because of its multi-cultural mix. From 1992-95 Victor Regnier served as interim dean of the School.

The profile of the School of Architecture faculty during the 90's represented contributions to academic and professional life—spanning unprecedented changes in the University, the city and the professional community. During this period, significant urban projects include John Mutlow's Pico Union Housing, Charles Lagreco's Broadway Historic Theater District study, and Frank Dimster's Two Houston Center. Other projects and studies conducted include Stefanos Polyzoides' proposals for Playa Vista, Graeme Morland's East Los Angeles and Metro Rail Studies, Achva Stein's work with LA city parks, Amy Murphy's studio research on the boulevards of Los Angeles, Kim Coleman's investigation
into new hybrid program types throughout the Los Angeles Region and Roger Sherwood's research on Courtyard Housing and Apartment Footprints. With Robert Harris, Arthur Golding and other faculty conducted significant and forward thinking studies on the Los Angeles river as well as the "Cornfields" region of downtown LA. All of these projects serve to demonstrate the continuing active involvement of the School in the shaping of our urban environment.

The School of Architecture entered a new phase as this century closed and a new one began under the leadership of Dean Robert H. Timme, who came to the School in January 1996. Timme, former dean at the University of Houston and partner in the firm Taft Architects, expanded the enrichment opportunities of the School, establishing five endowed chairs and one directorship. The School's program in Como Italy was endowed and two other semester abroad programs were established, one in France and the second in Asia. The School established an architectural complex north of the campus for community design activities. As an effective effort to increase dialogue and collegiality, the faculty now meet annually for a faculty retreat, as well as several times throughout the year at several faculty events. Under Timme, four new degree programs were established, the Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies, the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture, the Master of Historic Preservation, and the +2 Master of Architecture degree. The USC Architectural Guild Press was established and endowed by alumnus Bill Blurock.

One of Dean Timme's many successes was the funding campaign for a major addition of the School. In the Spring of 2006, the School completed construction of a new third floor addition to Watt Hall, providing 22,000 square feet of space. The $9.2 million center includes open plan design studios, 23 faculty offices and research suites, presentation spaces and department/conference suites. This new square footage has allowed the School to begin better prioritizing the existing facilities as it plans for the future.

In 2007, the School of Architecture showcased its global ambitions with the appointment of Dean Qingyun Ma. With the approval of the new Ph.D. program in 2008, Ma established three new Chairs—Ph.D. Graduate Studies and Undergraduate Studies—as a fitting recognition of the growing and emerging graduate studies programs. If Harris sowed the seeds for the graduate program and Timme built the third floor graduate facilities, Ma ensured a complete commitment to the development and growth of the program. While the undergraduate program enjoyed a robust and well respected curriculum earning a top 10 status in this year's Designintelligence rankings, the graduate programs needed continuing support to maintain its curricular momentum. Under Ma's stewardship, the graduate programs, especially the Architecture and Landscape Architecture program grew exponentially. The Master of Architecture program undertook various strategies to ensure the pedagogical aims of research, urban studies and new architectural technologies found new form in digital technologies, study abroad programs, and urban studies. This evolving pedagogy was taught by a combination of new visiting and full time faculty. The School's abroad programs benefitted from the newly formed American Academy in China (AAC). Founded by Dean Ma, the AAC is an academic and organizational portal into China for USC and its collaborative partners. Additionally, the program in France is being replaced with a new program in Barcelona, Spain. By being located in the urban heart of Barcelona, the new program promises to be evolve and strengthen the goals of the semester abroad programs.

The faculty adopted the following formal statement of the School's academic philosophy.

Although the fundamental academic goals of the School have been relatively constant over a long period of time, it has been necessary to recast them in relation to an ever
more pluralistic society and student body and in relation to changes occurring in the profession and in our cities.

The pluralistic dimensions of our academic and professional context are challenging indeed. Students arrive from greatly varied places across the country and throughout the world, bringing varied experiences and values with them. Los Angeles, itself, provides an extraordinary model of a city whose policy-making, planning and design must address the varied interests of a multitude of culturally differentiated residents. Against this complexity, the School of Architecture searches for fundamental principles and for the inventiveness that must be at the heart of a responsive professional practice.

Los Angeles provides an excellent laboratory for the study of changes that are challenging our cities. Increasing urbanization of the suburbs, revitalization of city centers, transportation and communication changes, the erosion of natural amenities, and dramatic demographic changes all require new inspection of traditional ideas. The profession is experiencing rapid change. These changes include greater degrees of specialization, electronic communication, innovations in construction and building management, international practice, computer related design methods, more public participation in planning and design decision-making, increased complexity in contracts, and an ever more burdensome legal and bureaucratic environment. In addition, there is a growing public interest in design and development of diverse approaches and ideologies.

The mission of the School must address these new circumstances, as well as the more timeless purposes and values. The following four statements express this mission.

1) **To train professionals within the context of a humanist academic tradition.**
   As the only private school of architecture based at a major research university in the west, the School has a responsibility to achieve pre-eminence in programs that integrate professional and general studies. Thus, the School intends that its students and faculty take full advantage of the resources of the University. The School understands architecture among the arts, humanities, and sciences as a fundamental intellectual discipline, as well as a historic and important profession.

2) **To advance knowledge about the theory and practice of architecture.**
   Three fundamental premises guide the School's teaching and research in support of an effective and highly valued profession:
   1. Recognition of the interdependence of theory and practice;
   2. Respect for the disciplines of visual form and of technology as the means for the realization of architectural form; and
   3. Understanding the basis of architecture as a profound response to the human condition.

The difference between training and education is a critical difference to a professional school. The vast extent of information and skill that graduates must possess mandates the content of much of the curriculum. Yet the ability to use judgment wisely and to be inventive in the face of unfamiliar conditions and new problems is the essence of professionalism. Thus, it is fundamental that all studies in a professional school be both theoretical and practical. In this regard, fluency in the application of understandings about visual order and technology is central to our mission.

3) **To address social and cultural issues.**
   The USC School of Architecture has centered its teaching and research efforts on urban architecture that is supportive of the most fundamental aspirations of society. Now, in the midst of significant cultural and environmental challenges
and opportunities, the School and the University are cognizant of responsibilities to educate design professionals for the region, the nation, the Pacific Rim, and for urban areas worldwide. The School's programs must reach out to the community of which it is a part. The faculty must nourish an image characterized by a concern for the quality of the physical environment and a willingness to participate in university and community affairs. Community work, participation in local, national and international programs, research and publications, and activities in professional organizations and institutions are all means for making expertise available at a broader cultural level.

4) To be a stimulating environment for learning. Within the University environment, the School of Architecture has the responsibility to maintain an intellectually challenging environment in which to learn about architecture. Much of the learning occurs in design courses and in seminars where the interaction between students and faculty is direct, frequent and consequential. For such learning to be supported and sustained requires a superior faculty, diversified in their training and experience, a highly qualified support staff, outstanding facilities and equipment, and an adequate annual operating budget.

The School must offer both graduate and undergraduate study opportunities as well as the opportunity to learn from the experience of travel and study in other places. Programs must be included with a variety of specializations: design, visual studies, history and theory, technology, and professional practice. And the School must offer a wide range of activities that ensure a stimulating place for learning: lecture programs, symposia, publications, exhibits, individual counseling, and social functions.

History of the Master of Architecture Programs
A post-professional Master of Architecture degree has been offered at USC since 1988. Students holding first professional degrees were admitted to this program as well as a few outstanding applicants who held four-year preprofessional degrees. These students were required to complete the BArch program as well as the M. Arch. program. Upon completion of the M. Arch. degree, both degrees were awarded. The high quality of the students admitted under this structure became a basis for considering changes that would clarify the existence of a program for such students. Additionally, the School was aware that many domestic students were not applying for admission since the program was not listed among other "+2" programs.

During 1997-98, the faculty of the School of Architecture approved initiation of a new professional degree program for students holding 4-year preprofessional degrees. The program was structured to require completion of all of the coursework of the School's BArch program either by transfer credit or enrollment in courses at USC. Additionally, the program requires advanced studies suitable for a master's degree. Thus the faculty consider graduates to have satisfied not only all of the fundamental learning objectives of the BArch program, but also the additional expectations of a graduate education.

The Provost upon recommendation of the University Curriculum Committee approved the program. The first students were admitted in fall, 1998 and graduated at the end of the spring semester, 2000.

On October 30, 2007 the new Robert H. Timme Architecture Research Center opened, a stellar demonstration of Dean Timme's dedication and perseverance to house the emerging graduate programs properly. With the addition of an entire new third floor to the existing school, the physical and symbolic growth clearly mirrored the aspirations of Harris, Timme and Ma.
The Master of Architecture program has seen a remarkable increase in admissions over the past three years. Since Dean Ma's stewardship of the school in 2007, the number of applicants and acceptance has risen by an average of 270%:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entering:</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 10:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08:</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 05:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in admissions offers stems from the improved quality of applicants. Simultaneously, the program saw a higher than expected conversion rate (50%); the average is 30%. This is due to a global awareness of the new Dean and his professional reputation, profile and a steady growth in the reputation of the program. The increase in the student body has allowed the program to offer an unparalleled variety of electives and studio topics, especially enabling the studies abroad program to mature. Additionally, the larger number has allowed more diverse faculty hires from within and out of Los Angeles. The students admitted are a richer mix of international students than before, including students from the Middle East, Asia and India. Many are exceptionally strong and experienced post-professional eligible students aspiring to take the license examination through the +2 two year accredited program. One emerging problem is their lack of English fluency. As a result, many students take several American Language Institute (ALI) courses that supplement their architecture course load. The program has strived to rectify this situation in subsequent admissions decisions.

Beginning in 2007—coinciding with Ma's first year as the Dean—the M. Arch. Program curriculum began introducing several new initiatives for the academic year:

Design Studios: Recognizing the diverse academic and cultural background of the entering +2 program students, John Mutchow—the current Chair of Graduate Studies—defined the curriculum of the first year design studios as the BASICS. The diversity within the student body required a curricular system that would standardize basic knowledge and establish a solid datum for academic performance. Such academic performance is critical as preparatory material for the complexities of the second year advanced studios. The first year, two semester sequence offers a sound foundation in developing skill sets, critical processing and comprehensive design. All studio coordinators and most instructors in the first year have taught in the five-year undergraduate professional program and are fully aware of the responsibilities of a comprehensive design studio.

The first semester, Arch 505a, focuses on multiple communicative tools and fundamental design skills that allow students to develop and document architectural concepts. Paramount in this semester is the focus on tectonic and construction systems. Last year, the studio designed a real-sized bird feeder to address issues of tectonics, scale, meaning, structural systems and construction. The bird feeder immediately segued into a community center that permitted them to address basic construction systems and urban conditions.

The second semester, Arch 505b, teaches comprehensive design while examining more complex topics such as urbanism and social issues. In 2008, John Mutchow, along with other senior faculty members, taught studios in urban architecture that addressed issues of context, meaning and system integration. Other studios addressed social issues and
service to the public good such as Professor Victor Regnier's Emeriti Center for Creative Retirement. The studio asked the students to consider the emerging social issue of gerontology and the ability for architecture to address the topic with sophistication, intelligence and comprehensive design. Advisors were invited and the students experienced a holistic studio that began as a call for social responsibility and finished with a technically well documented and designed structure.

The 605a and 605b advanced studios are platforms for research and design topics that expand contemporary discussions in architecture. Several of these studios are funded, providing a unique opportunity for students to react to real parameters and for the professional sponsors to explore creative solutions. These advanced studios are driven by high profile visiting faculty from Los Angeles and abroad. The program advocates three different systems to induce faculty variety: an IN, OUT, and ON system. 'IN' is inviting guest faculty. 'OUT' is sending out our students to other institutions/instructors (usually in a summer abroad program). And 'ON' is integrating and sourcing our own local talent in Los Angeles. In addition to these faculty profiles, the studios are defined by a combination of the three mission threads: Innovative Sustainability, Global Urbanism and Digital Technology.

In 2007, the Eco-Tower project was sponsored by a developer who wanted an ecological, off-the-grid residential tower on Hainan Island, off the coast of Southern China. The LA River studio was administered with the Army Corps of Engineers and co-taught by David Fletcher, landscape architect and vice-dean of Otis College. The project focused on the river's redevelopment through urban design and the strategic use of ecological systems for the 15 cities along the river to interact as one integral organism. The Interactive Studio—co-taught by Flavia Sparacino, noted designer and developer of interactive systems—investigated the potential of digital systems to change, expand and redefine architectural space within urban space. Sir Peter Cook led an advanced urban studio for several sites in Hammersmith, London.

In 2008, several key 605 studios began to explore the role of the "architecture object" against a variety of specific issues. Through sophisticated digital technical drawings, John Enright explored issues of material performance in advanced building systems. At an urban scale, Graeme Morland examined the complex programmatic relationship in the "mixed use urban development with public transit plaza" studio. The goal is to expose the students to the layers of public and private economic and social issues and ask for a credible architectural solution whose technical detailing is related to the programmatic resolution.

In 2009, award winning Los Angeles architect Michael Maltzan working with the City of Los Angeles, USC and other government agencies, lead a team of students to envision the future of Exposition Park in Los Angeles. As the most advanced studio, this topic addressed difficult urban issues including political policy, community identity, economy and infrastructural systems and offered intelligent architectural and urban solutions.

Graduate Studies Abroad Programs:
The GSAP is a cornerstone to the mission of the program and of the advanced second year studios. Paralleling the academic benefits of the undergraduate studies abroad programs, Graduate Studies Abroad Programs aim to be ambitious and comprehensive in its goal to be an on-site investigatory and research entity. GSAP believes that heightened awareness of the nuanced issues in local culture can only be possible from being embedded in the culture and country. For the past three years, the GSAP has attempted to establish a flexible agenda that would permit different locations. From last year, the program focused on two principle global regions: Asia and the United States.
In 2007, an ecological development on the island of Hainan led to an on-site studio researching the potential of such development. This was conducted with Columbia University and Tongji University.

With the establishment of the American Academy in China (AAC) in 2008, the method with which different academic institutions can collaborate and unite has become streamlined and efficient. The AAC allows the USC graduate programs to enter and field workshops and elective courses with other universities, thus expanding the academic and cultural experience for the students. The Master of Historic Preservation Program and Master of Architecture Program led a combined workshop with Columbia University examining the controversial erasure of the traditional residential neighborhoods. It raised important issues on the meaning of historic preservation in the context of a city and its citizens desiring modernization.

Alternative to semester-long travel and study programs, other abroad opportunities included short weeklong site visits. The weeklong field trips to London and Madrid in Spring 2009 focused on documentation and comprehension of the project sites. For the Interactive studio in Madrid, the studio collaborated with the Universidad Europea de Madrid.

**Mission of the Master of Architecture Programs**

There are two Master of Architecture programs at USC. One is a three-semester post-professional degree program and the other is a four semester (2 years) professional degree program.

The overall goals of the Masters of Architecture Program are to provide students with a competitive edge of advanced knowledge and skill, to provide study choices that support career interests and address societal issues, and to make fully available the Los Angeles region as an instructive laboratory for advanced architectural studies within and out of the United States.

The program focuses on Innovative Sustainability, Global Urbanism and Digital Technology and stands on the foundation of professional training and preparation. As the program aspires toward research and speculation, the program believes the transformative power of research in advanced concepts, innovations and strategies should be validated by testing and locating the design research within the unpredictable, problematic and resistant environment of reality—the reality of culture, site and construction.

Architecture in urban and rural environments throughout the world face conditions of extremely polarized density and require design initiatives that support amenity, sustainability, and cultural meaning. This is a serious search given the complexities of modern human ecologies, their continuing haphazard growth and development, and their wastefulness with regard to natural resources and societal potential.

The M. Arch. degree program has the following two sets of missions:

**Pedagogical missions:**

Within an overall consideration of urban studies, digital technology and sustainable systems, five sets of investigations are fully supported by the program. These design and research directions include the following:

The strategic opportunities to create more supportive urban places—amenity, sustainability, and meaning: habitat, places of commerce and exchange, the public realm, historic districts, open space and the streets, circulation interchanges, and infrastructure.
The transformation and redefinition of building typologies—housing, cultural and educational institutions, civic and social service facilities, centers for health and well-being, market places, and environments for production and employment

Understanding the integral importance of advanced technology and engineering, applied towards the advancement of and ecology-building construction, materials and methods of assembly, structures, environmental systems, manufacturing procedures, industrialization, energy and natural forces, and natural systems

Attention to design methodologies and processes, theories of architectural design, process structures, visual communication, computer studies, methods and techniques of architectural simulation

Investigation of issues of theory, history, criticism, historical inquiry and methodology, theories of interpretation, architectural criticism, history of ideas, cultural and social implications

Administrative missions:
To diversify the mix of students in the graduate program in order to enhance the educational experience for both international and domestic students.

To generate greater national and international recognition of the quality and opportunity for graduate education in architecture at USC, through a more active strategy in publications, websites and participation in recruitment efforts. The School's website is being re-designed and a popular blog, PARAsite, has successfully become a source of information for the Program's events.

To maintain a graduate program in architecture on a parallel track with the program in landscape architecture and urban planning, and thus to create greater opportunity for joint studies across all four graduate programs

To generate additional revenues to support graduate study and the School.

C. Long-Range Planning (1.1.4)
The range of situations we have to address urgently (massive urbanization, depletion of natural resources, social change and unprecedented innovations) are very actual phenomena for which there is no parallel. Architecture education has to mediate the present, the processes and dynamics that are generating our physical, social and cultural environments every moment. It ought to develop critical tools for interpreting and translating multiple factors, for bringing different discussions, competences and types of information on a level of communication. It needs to recast itself as the link between diverse disciplines and practices, as an interface that enables exchange and cross-reference, the merging of intents towards common goals and the emergence of possible futures.

Correlation
Architecture defines territory by changing its image and meaning. Setting up multiple viewpoints highlights our role in determining it and the means available for engaging it. To engage productively urbanized areas and landscape alike, architecture education can best be understood as operating across cultural geographies. Cultural, in the sense that all endeavors, activities and results are a manifestation of society, its state and ambitions. And geographies, in the sense that these manifestations are spatial, that they describe our relationship with a given context, with the environment as much as with one another.
Architecture education should foster our understanding of these interactions at different scales, highlighting what is specific to them and what is operational. Its reach encompasses topographies as the interface of geology and climate, program as the organization of productive, social and cultural activities, and techniques as the interpolation, the means engaged to effect a translation, a transition, a connection (between ideas, fields, parts).

The scope of architecture ought to be to explore the resonances between diverse disciplines, to negotiate balances and understand dynamics, to seek correlations, to find responses and distill essences. It is a broadband field that generates the specificity of its outcomes.

Tools
The means employed in the formulation of informed, creative propositions should encompass techniques and media appropriate and specific to the context in which a proposition is placed. Design research seeks out the nature of an intervention, the issues brought to bear in a discussion, defining critical tools to be engaged in developing a thesis.

This approach presupposes a diverse input through lectures, seminars and workshops, an engagement with different parts of the School, with other faculties and institutions as well as with actual situations. It presupposes working with different media (in terms of production) and through different media (exhibitions, publications, events) as communication within the school, but also as engagement with the public.

The process by which the program identifies its objectives is a collaborative one, involving the Dean, the Vice Dean, the Graduate Program Chair, the Director of the M. Arch. Program, the M. Arch. Faculty Advisor, the Faculty and the Students of the Program. While the basic standards of any program curriculum is created and modified through the school's faculty run curriculum committee review, the Director of the M. Arch. Program will propose a set of initiatives (course improvements, visiting faculty, supplemental opportunities) for each academic year which will improve the academic excellence of the program and meet the challenges of today's society and the architectural discipline. In terms of general issues common to all the graduate programs (English efficiency standards, cross-discipline elective offerings, new recruitment strategies), there is a bi-monthly meeting of our four directors with the Graduate Chair to discuss and resolve matters on an ongoing basis and to propose improvements in current standards and processes. Both the Dean's staff person assigned to assist the Chair and Directors as well as the Graduate Admission's Coordinator assist with the compilation of statistical information needed to deeply examine any particular issue. The administration (Vice Dean, Chair and Director) meet with GASA (elected graduate student council) members to review studio culture policies, discuss pedagogical standards and a variety of concerns from the student's perspective. The Chair and Director review student midterm and final evaluations of courses and faculty each term as one means to determine the effectiveness of any particular area of the curriculum. There are also periodic faculty retreats to address larger planning issues that affect the entire school as the administration balances resources between our many different academic programs (BArch, BS, our four master programs, and the PhD program).

Propositions
The M. Arch. program should be strengthened as a critical interface not only between technology and design, but also between cultures, environments and design, supporting the development of research topics and interests promoted by the school, namely digital intelligence, urban culture, material performance.
To this end, the well-established constructive tradition and the experimental drive of new technologies, as much as the growing urban agenda, should find a more solid theoretical and critical and base to inform them. While essentially developed within the logic of their own fields, they are ready to explore the potentials of opening up to a cross-platform dialogue to sharpen their finality, to explore the full weight of their modalities, to become truly propositional in a climate that demands creativity through interaction.

The current faculty search for a History and Theory position should support this need, particularly if it can act as catalyst between the different parts of the graduate school and as further link to resources outside the school.

The challenge posed by the program as developed under the leadership of the previous director, Eui-Sung Yi, is to address the scope, mandate and responsibility of our profession in the light of radical shifts in awareness, understanding and capabilities that are marking the pace of our times.

Both the Dean as well as the Chair of the Graduate Program have prioritized the need to increase advanced research within the graduate programs, both to support our increased capacity for funded studios with recent faculty hires (several of whom are not practicing architects but research related scholars), as well as to connect to the University’s larger agenda for each school to increase the competitiveness of their graduate programs. We are currently examining what new models for research, publication and funding can be pursued more aggressively within the master programs as well as looking at the connection of our thesis based programs to our newly created Ph.D line.

Simultaneously, there have emerged interesting connections between academic units across the university for cross-platform scholarship and course work—for instance via GIS technology, with the joint appointment of John Wilson from Geography to the School of Architecture and the development of a degree and/or certificate program in Spatial Sciences (currently approved by the Provost and is being examined by the Schools of Planning, Architecture and Engineering as well as the College of Letter Arts and Sciences); or the collaborative work on the issue of energy across the campus through the Sustainable Cities initiative, and our potential collaboration with the School of Policy, Planning and Development on studio-based research in India, as well as Brazil in the coming year.

**Sequence**

The first year of the M. Arch. +2 program provides a solid grounding of skills, knowledge and understanding of architecture as a sum of multiple factors involving a complex range of techniques, both conceptual and material. The emphasis of the second year is on the application of this knowledge through a narrower, more specific and exploratory focus to reflect and shape the profile of the school as a research institution.

The focus of the main M. Arch. programs can be summarized as:

- organizations: networks, emergence, interactivity, processes, logistics.
- environments: cultural geographies, convergence, urbanty, visual culture.
- surface: tectonics, geometries, performance, mediation, production

These are by no means exclusive of each other. On the contrary, they should set the premise for productive corporations, common interests and the development of new potentials. Their individuation is an essential step in engaging integrative processes.

The development of an active Studio culture is only one component of the educational
context. This should provide a stimulating and inquisitive critical framework that defines the Graduate School as a whole.

There is a double mission therefore of highlighting:

- Inside: internal workings course structure, support and integration (studios, seminars, lectures, workshops).
- Outside: interface and external relations reviews, shows, lectures, publications, web, events.

The first is essentially academic, the latter curatorial.

As there are many people working towards the further improvement of the M. Arch. +2 program, clarity in distinguishing academic from administrative competences would sharpen the discussion, evaluation, fine-tuning and development of the contents of the program.

Communication of these contents needs a curator to streamline intents and projections. This is not solely a task of facilitating, it is a critical activity that engages the core mission of the School, its ambitions as much as its outcomes, and its dialogue with the world.

The Long Term Plan should address the following issues:
- to expand the curriculum in contemporary critical theory and cultural studies. This can be achieved by strengthening collaborations with the Annenberg School for Communication, the Roski School of Fine Arts, and the School of Cinematic Arts.
- to develop more fluid modalities for academic exchanges both for faculty and for students, in order to facilitate a more immediate presence in other contexts and to attract external resources on a more flexible basis.
- to develop the Graduate Study Abroad program to support our understanding of contemporary urban dynamics in addition to the undergraduate European and Asian focus.
- to develop a Study America initiative. The precarious state of many cities in the US, not least Los Angeles, warrants attention, discussion, propositions. To encourage exchanges, collaborations and interaction would provide us not only with first hand experience of a much neglected field, wide open between politics and speculation, but could also act as catalyst to attract a broader audience.
- to continue to improve issues of diversity at the faculty and student level within the program and school as a whole. Though improvements have been made since the last visit, there are areas which we expect to make larger strides towards improvement over the next few years (increased Hispanic demographic representation, further improvement in increasing female faculty appointments in advanced studios, creating more research and external opportunities to encourage impactful community design initiatives globally and locally).
- to plan for further improvement in faculty excellence. As the M. Arch. program has grown and its standards of excellence increased over the past 10 years, there is more need to increase distinct faculty recruitment specifically for the graduate program (recognizing differences between faculty who are appropriate for our undergraduate program). In order to create a graduate program that is at the leading edge of the profession and discipline, the School will need to examine in what areas we must recruit faculty with a defined
advanced research agenda that can complement our design faculty (i.e. in the area of sustainability, urban planning and digital technologies). This triggers issues of salary compensation of our faculty in general and our ability to be competitive with other peer institutions.

-to continue to capitalize on our own current strengths. As new energy and direction has been brought to the program in recent years and we have made great strides towards improving the M. Arch. program, it is of equal importance that we continue to recognize what is unique and exceptionally positive about the graduate programs currently—such as the real and potential interdisciplinary connection between Building Science, Landscape and Historic Preservation, the ability to work at a scale with both our BArch and M. Arch. +2 (with approximately 800 students combined) to have the resources (both economic and human) to create one of the strongest professional programs in the country for both programs (particularly with our connection to the Architectural Guild and professional community), and the location in the Los Angeles area on the Pacific Rim and the northern edge of Central and South America. Many of these strengths and others have been discussed in our Five Perspectives responses in the previous section.

We are fortunate to have three distinct opportunities this year at self-reflection—the NAAB accreditation visit for the M. Arch. +2 program, the LAAB visit for our Master of Landscape program (October 2010), and the University’s 10-year review of all of our graduate and Ph.D program which requires a separate APR and process. We will yield the benefit of a tremendous amount of feedback generated from these three visits to further define our long term planning strategies as well.

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)
University Level Self Assessment:
The School of Architecture conducts ongoing self-assessment at a variety of levels and intervals. The School submits documents as a part of the University’s WASC accreditation process. This occurs every ten years. In addition, the University also reviews all graduate academic programs every ten years as well. The School of Architecture’s Graduate Program (including our PhD program, the two M. Arch. programs, the Master of Landscape, the Master of Historic Preservation and the Master of Building Science, each with their own certificate programs) will be reviewed in the fall of 2010 and the spring of 2011, and is currently preparing its own separate APR for that particular review running concurrently with our NAAB accreditations review.

Each year, the Provost asks schools to submit both a Fall Planning document and annual strategic plan, reviewing each school’s own metrics of excellence and budget. This self-assessment process mandates a yearly analysis of previous and new initiatives and their ability to increase the quality of the program. Often the Dean is asked by the Provost to provide a list of peer institutions against which we might compare and an assessment of how our program is being most strategic in increasing our competitiveness and effectiveness as a leading learning-based professional degree program.

School Level Self Assessment:
Under the Dean there are two primary entities that work together to both manage the academic programs as well as conduct on going self-evaluation. The first is the faculty/student committee structure, consisting of six core committees: the Executive Committee (EXCOM), Human Resource Committee, Lectures/Exhibits Committee, Curriculum Committee, Facilities Committee and Admissions Committee. EXCOM consists of five elected faculty members and a student representative from undergraduate program and the graduate program as well as an elective staff representative. Each faculty EXCOM member sits on one of the five other standing committees as a reporting line to the Dean. All full time faculty serve on one of the five standing committees. All six
committees in unison play a central role in a constant and on-going representative self-evaluation of our school, our faculty, our facilities, our external activities and our curriculum for each degree program.

The second entity that works in conjunction with EXCOM and our five standing committee structure is the program administration consisting of a Vice Dean and three academic program chairs (Undergraduate Program Chair, Graduate Program Chair and PhD Program Chair). This is a new structure added in 2007 to provide more direct and immediately impactful self-assessment of the effectiveness of teaching faculty and specific courses to fulfill the promise of each academic program. Under the Graduate Chair, there are four Master Program Directors (one for each program in Architecture, Landscape, Historic Preservation and Building Science). The Graduate Chair and the program directors meet every two weeks to conduct on-going self-evaluation and planning for each academic year. Each chair can create and charge a specific task force (which reports to one of the five standing committees) to study and propose new strategies to increase excellence in their own program or in a particular aspect of architectural education. Past task forces have included ones which examine more effective means of digital technology integration throughout the curriculum, the role of theory/criticism/history within the design culture, increasing the relationship between our technology courses and the design studio.

In addition to the dual entities of the committee and administrative structure, the School holds monthly faculty meetings (which student representatives are invited to) and yearly retreats. No changes in curriculum can occur without a full discussion and vote in our regular faculty meetings. In the past, our retreats took place on Catalina Island lasting for three days or at the historic Gamble House in Pasadena. This year the retreat will be held in November at the A+D Museum on Wilshire Boulevard In response to the self-assessment process, EXCOM and the Curriculum Committee propose the topics for discussion. During the last several years, the major changes in the program have resulted from retreat work sessions. We also occasionally will hold a special retreat for a particular program, such as this fall when we will be having a graduate school focused retreat to gain faculty feedback and critical assessment as we complete our University APR as well as prepare for our upcoming NAAB visit for the M. Arch.+2 program.

Program Level Self-Assessment:
The School has a regularized process for faculty evaluation of student work, not only as a means to aid any particular student in terms of their own development but also the Chairs, Directors and faculty in terms of the effectiveness of their courses. Evaluations of studio performance are conducted every semester, and the results are carefully reviewed and placed in the student's file. The outcome of the studio evaluation of student’s work is used to guide each student’s professional development. We have created a digital drop box for submission of student work as well as a regularized portfolio submission process, after final reviews each term. Faculty typically use a standard form to evaluate student work. (See Figure 1) It reflects how well they have responded to issues of human experience, technology, and methodologies and skills.

As the number of graduate students has increased, the School as responded in two direct ways to increase review and advisement procedures since our last accreditation visit. The first is rather than have a part time Program Director and a full time assistant director, we have restructured the team to consist of a full time Program Director and a full time student faculty advisor. These two faculty work in tandem to continually evaluate and support our students through their degree program. The second change is that we have added a second student service advisor staff position to also better serve the graduate and undergraduate students in evaluating the effectiveness of their learning.
As a part of the evaluation process for studio, a counseling record of what the student should do to improve their weaknesses is prepared typically at mid term and after the final review. The Graduate Chair and Director discuss each term the effectiveness of the program and its faculty and course selection in fulfilling the mission of the program.

The School of Architecture's policy on studio work evaluation as a whole (whether graduate or undergraduate) relates to the integrative nature of architectural design and the learning opportunities inherent in design studio instruction. This policy reaffirms the faculty's desire to give continuing attention to architectural issues and principles with regard to three basic subjects:

1) The quality and meaning of human experience
2) The appropriate and effective use of technology
3) The development of methods and skills necessary to study architecture and to make design proposals of high quality.

The suggested definitions provided below bring greater specificity and meaning to these three basic subjects of our curriculum. They are meant to stimulate further thinking about how issues and principles are to be addressed in design education. Each faculty member is responsible for determining what subjects will be given primary attention in his or her studio course and indicating these choices on the course descriptions and evaluation forms.

The following further defines the three criteria that are used to assess student performance in studio coursework.

Human Experience refers to those aspects of architecture that affect not only direct experience and behavior, but also meaning and values. Thus, this fundamental and broad subject includes such motives as:

• attention to place and context
• attention to direct experience, to life
• attention to symbolic meaning
• attention to form and to spatial order

Technology refers to those aspects of architecture involving the actual making of places, of construction and response to natural forces. This subject embraces the decisions about the physical existence of architecture, such as:

• appropriate structural systems and elements
• appropriate materials and means of construction
• appropriate response to climate
• appropriate provision of interior environmental systems

Methodologies and Skills refers to the means and abilities of designing and includes such matters as:

• ability to define project purposes and objectives, through analysis of activities and inspection of historic precedent and type
• ability to integrate a comprehensive range of considerations
• fluency in use of study and presentation media
• ability to use judgment, as well as information in making decisions

The University also requires our student service advisors to conduct ongoing analysis and audits of student progress towards their degrees each year. Though very time consuming for our advisors when they are conducting these audits, it is has greatly
increased our ability and means to track and assist students who do not matriculate in a normal two year period through our various degree programs.

Student Evaluation of Faculty Performance
Classroom evaluations of faculty performance are conducted for each class every semester through a standardized questionnaire that is processed by the University. Student evaluations of faculty performance are a subject of discussion between the Dean’s Office, the Chairs and individual faculty members. They are also used to improve faculty teaching effectiveness and play a major role in part-time re-hiring decisions. The calculation of salary enhancements for tenured/tenure track and adjunct faculty takes into account student evaluations of teaching performance.

In addition the School also administers a mid-semester course evaluations. This allows the chair of each program and if necessary the Vice Dean an effective opportunity to ‘fine tune’ faculty performance mid-semester. This process also enables the students to give input to the faculty early enough to correct any problems.

Faculty Yearly Performance Reviews:
Each year the performance of all tenured/tenure track and full time non-tenure track is systematically reviewed by the School’s Executive Committee’s five elected faculty. Tenured, tenure-track, and adjunct faculty members submit material that documents research/creativity, teaching and service achievements for the year. Student course and instructor evaluation ratings are also included as evidence of teaching effectiveness. Rankings in the areas of research/creativity, teaching and service are combined to create a composite score, which is the basis for overall salary enhancement and at-risk compensation, both of which are based on assessed merit. Every year, the Dean meets with each faculty member to review the outcomes of the review and to discuss personal and professional goals for the coming year. The Vice Dean and Chairs also conduct a similar review of adjunct and part time lecturers, based mainly on assessment from studio level coordinators and teaching evaluations.

For our tenure track faculty there is a special set of events and processes for self-evaluation, including a bi-yearly meeting of all tt faculty and their mentors to present ongoing research, a third year review at both the School and University level, as well as a public lecture of the TT faculty as part of our regular lecture series with a meeting with tenured faculty after which to discuss progress and suggested areas of improvement.

Dean’s Level Self Assessment:
The Dean also has two primary means to review new initiatives to assess past program successes; his two advisory boards composed of practitioners and representatives of the building, design, and development communities assist the School.

The Architectural Guild Board meets monthly and hears a report from the Dean at each meeting. This board regularly receives information about the School’s programs and is invited to provide comments to the Dean. In addition to providing annual financial assistance for computer studies, student scholarships, and traveling fellowships the Guild holds public events on topics that are important to the region. In so doing, the Guild enhances the mission and image of the School.

The Dean’s Advisory Council meets yearly and discusses the direction of the School and its programs. Each fall, the Dean presents to the Council, the updated strategic plan that is submitted to the University. This update and the responses from the council are helpful in arriving at implementation and funding strategies. The Dean’s Advisory Council has been instrumental in the School’s major fund raising campaigns and annual development
efforts. The Council has been expanded to include female and minority representation as well as individuals who are in careers other than architecture.
2. Conditions Met with Distinction

Part One (I): Section 1 - Identity & Self-Assessment

1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity

Social equity within program is a model for providing faculty, students and staff a culturally-rich learning environment. Each interaction is handled respectfully; all have equal opportunity to learn, teach, and work.

1.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives:

A. Architecture Education and the Academic Community-
   The program's commitment to the academic community in areas of scholarship, community-engagement, and service is exemplified in the creation of the American Academy in China, its relationship with the Architectural Guild, national rankings in the top 10 by both the Gourman Report and DesignIntelligence magazine, and faculty caliber.

D. Architecture Education and the Profession-
   The Architectural Guild's presence within the program provides a unique and critical conduit between academia and the profession. The relationship is the envy of similar programs. The School of Architecture contributes to the growth of the profession in areas of research and technology. The architecture school funds faculty research and competitive student research assistantships. The school is developing the profession's future technology leaders.

Part One (I): Section 2 - Resources

• I.2.5: Information Resources
   The Helen Topping Architectural and Fine Arts Library (AFA) is an excellent resource. The collection of 70,000 volumes offers a tremendous breadth and depth of resource to students and users. Library Director Wallach is clearly a leader in her field and is invaluable to both the program and campus.

Part One (I): Section 3 - Institutional Characteristics

• I.3.3: Faculty Credentials-
   Full-time and adjunct faculty are respected professionals in the field of architecture, the region, and around the globe. Many have authored widely-used textbooks. The program is fortunate to have individuals of such depth and expertise serving as faculty.

PART TWO (II) EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

Part Two (II): Section 1 - Student Performance:

II.1.1. Student Performance Criteria:

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation

A.3: Visual Communication Skills:
Visual abilities presented, especially computer rendering and other digital skills, are exemplary. This is indicative of a focused, curricular effort on the part of the school and faculty, which should be recognized for this outstanding benefit to future USC graduates.
A.11: Applied Research:
Emphasis is placed on applied research which is demonstrated in the +2 curriculum project, A USC Emeriti Center from the spring 2010, 505b Design Studio.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:

C.8: Ethics and Professional Judgment:
The team found evidence of exposure to ethics and professional judgment in Course 525, Professional Practice: Pre-Design, Project and Office Administration taught by Professors Hricak and Chow. Evidence was also found in student examinations, presentations, and the course materials.
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