

The Catholic University of America

Interim Progress Report for 2017

Instructions and Template

11/30/17

Contents

1. Instructions and Template Guidelines
2. Executive Summary of the Most Recent Visit
3. Template
 - a. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria
 - b. Plans/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern
 - c. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program
 - d. Summary of Responses to Changes in the NAAB Conditions (NOTE: Only required if Conditions have changed since the previous visit)
 - e. Appendix (include revised curricula, syllabi, and one-page CVs or bios of new administrators and faculty members; syllabi should reference which NAAB SPC a course addresses)

1. INSTRUCTIONS AND TEMPLATE GUIDELINES

Purpose

Continuing accreditation is subject to the submission of interim progress reports at defined intervals after an eight-year or four-year term of continuing accreditation is approved.

This narrative report, supported by documentation, covers three areas:

1. The program's progress in addressing not-met Conditions, Student Performance Criteria, or Causes of Concern from the most recent Visiting Team Report.
2. Significant changes to the program or the institution since the last visit.
3. Responses to changes in the NAAB Conditions since your last visit (Note: Only required if Conditions have changed since your last visit)

Supporting Documentation

1. The narrative should describe in detail all changes in the program made in response to not-met Conditions, Student Performance Criteria, and Causes of Concern.
2. Provide information regarding changes in leadership or faculty membership. Identify the anticipated contribution to the program for new hires and include either a narrative biography or one-page CV.
3. Provide detailed descriptions of changes to the curriculum that have been made in response to not-met Student Performance Criteria. Identify any specific outcomes expected to student performance. Attach new or revised syllabi of required courses that address unmet SPC.
4. Provide additional information that may be of interest to the NAAB team at the next accreditation visit.

Outcomes

IPRs are reviewed by a panel of three: one current NAAB director, one former NAAB director, and one experienced team chair.¹ The panel may make one of three recommendations to the Board regarding the interim report:

1. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent VTR.
2. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated progress toward addressing deficiencies but require the program to provide additional information (e.g., examples of actions taken to address deficiencies).
3. Reject the interim report as having not demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies and advance the next accreditation sequence by at least one calendar year but not more than three years, thereby shortening the term of accreditation. In such cases, the chief academic officer of the institution will be notified and a copy sent to the program administrator. A schedule will be determined so that the program has at least six months to prepare an Architecture Program Report. The annual statistical report (see Section 9 of the 2015 Conditions) is still required.

Deadline and Contacts

IPRs are due on November 30. They are submitted through the NAAB's Annual Report System (ARS). Contact Kesha Abdul Mateen (kabdul@naab.org) with questions.

Instructions

1. Type all responses in the designated text areas.
2. Reports must be submitted as a single PDF following the template format. Pages should be numbered.
3. Reports are limited to 25 pages/10 MBs.
4. Supporting documentation should be included in the body of the report.
5. Student work is not to be submitted as documentation for a two-year IPR.

¹ The team chair will not have participated in a team during the year in which the original decision on a term of accreditation was made.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF 2015 NAAB VISIT

CONDITIONS NOT MET

2015 VTR
I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development: Faculty and Staff
I.2.3 Physical Resources
I.2.4 Financial Resources
I.3.1 Statistical Reports
II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA NOT MET

2015 VTR
B.1 Pre-Design
B.2 Accessibility
B.5 Life-Safety
B.7 Financial Considerations

CAUSES OF CONCERN

2015 VTR
Human Resources
Physical Resources
Digital-Network Infrastructure
Long-Range Planning
Curriculum and Development

3. TEMPLATE

Interim Progress Report
The Catholic University of America
School of Architecture and Planning
M. Arch. [60 credits]
M. Arch. [111 credits]
Last APR submission: September 7, 2014
Year of the previous visit: 2015

Please update contact information as necessary since the last APR was submitted.

Chief administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located: Randall Ott

Provost: Andrew Abela

President of the institution: John Garvey

Individual submitting the Interim Progress Report: Randall Ott

Name of individual(s) to whom questions should be directed: Randall Ott

Current term of accreditation: 8-year term

Text from the most recent VTR or APR is in the gray text boxes. Type your response in the designated text boxes.

a. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development: Faculty Staff

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is still Not Met and continues to be a concern of this visiting team.

The support staff work hard (and they appear to enjoy what they are doing), but the staff are minimal in number for the size of the program. This team is concerned that, because the total number of support staff has been reduced, the school has limited to no support in running the program. The total number of support staff positions was 12 at the time of the last visit. Currently, there are only 4 positions: the assistant dean, shop supervisor, computer technician, and assistant to the dean.

The total number of students in the School of Architecture and Planning during the last visit in 2009 was 504, which was peak enrollment (376 undergraduates and 128 graduates). At this visit, the actual numbers are 233 undergraduates and 111 graduates. With a 75% reduction in staff in the 6-year period between visits, the team has a concern that the school and, subsequently, the program are not adequately staffed. The focus of our evaluation is on the professional component of the program—the graduate enrollment—and this number has only been reduced by 7 students since the 2008-2009 academic year.

The faculty have concerns regarding course scheduling. Some faculty report that they are not always sure how many students they will have for a course—sometimes during the first few days of class, enrollment doubles from the number initially projected. University faculty recently voted to shorten the student drop/add period so that there would be more certainty with regard to class enrollment numbers at the start of each semester.

CUA, 2017 Response: There have been several changes/augmentations in staff. Since the 2015 visit, Assistant Dean August Runge left CUA after five or six years to move to New York and a similar position at Fordham. He was replaced after a regional search by Catherine Sullivan, who had served previously at CUA in several roles in the Provost's Office. Most recently, she served as Assistant Provost. Once she expressed interest in the position, she was highly sought by the school given her wide familiarity with processes at CUA. We consider this a substantial upgrade at this position, and her addition to the school has been an immense help. Computer Technician Daryoush Ghalambor left CUA in late summer of 2016 to relocate to California. He was replaced after a regional search by Hussam Elkrantz, an expert in computer visualization who also has professional master's credential in architecture—a considerable upgrade at this position. In fact, several times prior to taking this post, he taught in our computers coursework here at CUA. He left professional practice in Alexandria Virginia to join CUA as a full-time staff person. In spring of 2015, near the time of the NAAB visit, the school was successful in hiring an administrative assistant, Katie McLoughlin. This has greatly helped office functionality. Katie overlapped for nearly two years with Pat Dudley, our long-serving Assistant to the Dean (an administrative assistant post helping the Dean). Pat then retired from CUA in January of 2017. The initial intention was to rehire at that position, and a search was launched. Out of an abundance of caution, with further budget cuts looming on campus (see financial section), that search was quietly closed after the interviewing of several candidates. It was decided to cover the functions Dudley was performing with some of McLoughlin's time and some of Sullivan's time. While an adjustment, so far this has functioned well. McLoughlin's several years of experience in the school while Dudley was here let her grow gradually into this role. Shop supervisor Davide Prete remains in his post as at the time of the 2015 visit. In October of 2016, after long discussions, the school finally

realized its dream of obtaining a full-time 'Director of Major Gifts', exclusive to the school. This is a level of coverage we have never enjoyed before. For some years the school has lacked any internal, dedicated development support and the best coverage we have ever previously had was for several years a half-time position (the other half of that person's effort was shared with Engineering). CUA has now followed the path of placing dedicated, exclusive development professionals into many schools. Our school was one of the first selected for this, given past success with development efforts a decade ago. After an extensive regional search, we hired Andrew Bowne, a person with a Master in Business and considerable prior experience in development efforts for educational non-profits in DC. This has been a pure staff upgrade—and a very welcome one. Our outreach to alumni, donors and school friends has increased dramatically, and has resulted in pledges, bequests and direct gifts of nearly \$750,000 over the past year (see financial section). This is a 'sea-change', truly, in our yield. It has the potential, over time, to substantially change the funding equation of the school. Browne has worked extensively with our existing Executive Development Board at the school and has led the inauguration of a new 'Board of Visitors' focused exclusively on development. His new position was funded one-half by the school and one-half by CUA's development office. Overall, we had four full-time staff at the time of the last NAAB visit. Today we stand at five. There was substantial turn-over of people in the past two years, but not in a single case coming out of frustration or lack of resources but instead due to people making the understandable life changes of moving or retiring. We do consider several of our new replacement staff to have given us notable new functionality in their roles and the one outright addition—a development person—is perhaps the most essential addition that could possibly have been made at this time, particularly given the financial strictures on campus and the importance of fundraising to private schools. The latest NAAB report itself identifies this need as key. It would be advantageous to have more staff certainly. Adding back the Assistant to the Dean would be a priority, particularly given the number of new alumni-oriented and development events we are now mounting. But we really do not feel that staff coverage is inadequate for the current head-count of students and faculty in the building. We have dedicated coverage at a very capable level now in all key positions—the development role was the last general area where it was simply unacceptable to have poor or absent coverage. We recall that at the time of the 2002 NAAB visit, when the school was marginally larger than today in student headcount (approximately 325 then versus 283 now) we had only four staff—a computer specialist, a slide librarian, an administrative assistant and an Assistant to the Dean. We consider our current rostering of staff to be more capable and more highly credentialed for our purposes than circa 2002. The school functioned effectively then, and it functions effectively today, with its five full-time staff. We have made demonstrable and goodly progress in this area since NAAB visited in 2015, though of course we would want more. Projecting into the future in terms of staffing is difficult in these tight financial times. We would hope that with a second year of solid progress and results in the development area, some select further staff augmentation could occur. But only time will tell. Priorities would likely be the Assistant to the Dean position and a half-time computers assistant. Neither of those would be dramatically costly, and thus represent a reasonable aspiration under the current circumstances. The faculty concern about course scheduling has, we feel, been largely addressed. Some campus-wide peculiarities in registration have been remedied. Internally, the number of courses with low or erratic enrollment has also been alleviated by course consolidations. (During the 2015 visit, the school was still transitioning from a position where its expansion programs were larger and able to offer a sizable number of advanced electives of high specificity; that transition was rough as a number of courses had to be closed due to low enrollment.) We have now had two more years to fully consolidate and address these challenges. In the Fall of 2017, for example, not a single course was closed after the commencement of classes. Of the total student headcount in the school as of Fall 2017 of 283, 74 of them currently are graduate students—a considerable change from the figure of 111 reported at the time of the last visit.

I.2.3 Physical Resources

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The Crough Center is a converted gymnasium with many inefficient spaces, but, as a whole, it is adequate in size for the current needs. The addition of an elevator has made most of the building accessible.

Nevertheless, the building infrastructure is antiquated and inefficient. Industrial bay lighting fixtures are the primary source of studio illumination. They emit a very loud, very distracting noise, and are expensive to operate. Students conducted an energy audit and recommended turning off the lights during daylight hours and using only the natural light. The first year's savings were reported to be about \$10,000. Studies indicate that better illumination and greater savings could be achieved by replacing the lighting, wiring, and controls.

Likewise, the uneven, uncontrollable HVAC system is not conducive to teaching or learning. The plumbing is also problematic; a ruptured water line recently caused catastrophic damage to the basement. The woodworking, print, and fabrication laboratories have been recently renovated and reconfigured. New equipment, ventilation, and lighting were installed following the flood mentioned above.

CUA, 2017 Response: We have worked with the central administration and facilities department extensively over the issue of heat fluctuations, with numerous meetings and exchanges. In the two years since NAAB visited, real progress has been made here. Temperatures have been much more tolerable and moderated throughout the building. One area of concern remains—for unclear reasons the Crough Center's Koubek Auditorium has been rather too cool much of this year. Still, overall, the problem is much reduced. The major factor in this is simply having a 100-year-old building of highly eclectic—if evocative—spatial disposition, with numerous high lofts and a huge clear span ceiling over everything. Control of heat and AC in such a vertical space is inherently challenging. Further, the building is supplied by an outmoded central heating system. On this last point, good news is on the way. The university has recently begun a systematic replacement and upgrade of the entire campus heating and cooling plant and distribution system, with trenches now appearing in areas around the campus. One of the first legs of this new system will reach Crough. We do not feel this entire issue can be effectively solved once-and-for-all until that connection is made—likely within the next year. The repair following the flood in the lower level has resolved the plumbing issue. We have had no further incidents of water in the building, or problems with the plumbing in general. The buzzing lights remain unchanged. Largely, the solution has been to simply turn this system off for most of the academic year. The offending fixtures are very high up within a space that is probably 40' on average in height. More task-oriented desk lighting has been the preferred solution. There are several months in winter when these lights are put on in late afternoon during class-time.

I.2.4 Financial Resources

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The financial challenges of the school are directly related to declining student enrollment and the disproportionate number of faculty.

The program reached a high point of enrollment in 2008-2009 at 504 total students (376 undergraduates and 128 graduates). This visiting team evaluated the professional portion of the program: the graduate programs. As mentioned in Section I 2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development, there is concern about the inability to fund an adequate number of staff positions to support the program. In 2008-2009, the number of graduate students was one-third of the total enrollment, with 12 total staff members to support the program. At this visit, the staff count is down to 4. The number of staff is inadequate to support the program.

Signs of an enrollment increase are good. The enrollment numbers have increased since last year to 344 total students (233 undergraduates and 111 graduates). The school felt confident that these numbers would continue to go up since the number of applicants

has been increasing. The school's goal is a total enrollment cap of 430 students (232 undergraduates and 133 graduates).

At the time of the team visit, a university budget had not yet been approved for next year, which also concerns the team.

CUA, 2017 Response: Financial resources remain an area of concern for the school. Developments since the 2015 visit have limited further the school's direct budgetary allocation. NAAB notes in its report that 'The financial challenges of the school are directly related to declining student enrollment and the disproportionate number of faculty.' In the intervening two years, some attrition has taken place and several faculty members have resigned from the school. Since we still function as a 'faculty of the whole' as opposed to being departmentalized, faculty numbers in all program areas can affect staffing resources in architecture. Associate Professor Hazel Edwards (our Director of Planning) left for Howard University as Director of Architecture. Associate Professor Chris Grech moved back to his family home in Malta and resigned from CUA. An additional faculty member in the planning program was not reappointed as the four-year point, and is no longer at CUA. Yet another faculty person in sustainability was not approved for tenure and was offered instead a part-time professor of practice position, resulting in some further partial cost savings. Overall, these changes resulted in a substantial rebalancing of the ratio of faculty to student headcount and promised the opportunity to reallocate funds and possibly undertake staff hires. Further, the central administration offered to add two externally funded architecture faculty positions to the school in the area of classical studies (see section on the 'new classical initiative'). Thus, while there were losses in various collateral programs due to regular faculty attrition, there were also faculty augmentations in architecture in a new potential growth area. Relating to NAAB's comment above, all of this was positive on the level of resources and potential rebalancing. However, in the Spring of 2016 CUA encountered the first signs of campus-wide enrollment stress. Broad, long range demographic trends have become more challenging for many private universities. CUA's financial aid regimen proved difficult in this new market. This necessitated campus-wide budget cuts for the 2016/2017 academic year. Campus-wide changes in the recruitment/financial aid process were implemented to adjust to this new reality. Results in fall 2017 were better, but still not at the higher enrollment yields of, for example, 2013. The result was further campus-wide budget cuts for this current fiscal year. The school's tenured faculty and administration met several times in summer of 2017 to cooperatively plan for the cut allocated to us. The majority of the cut had to be covered with the open faculty positions mentioned above (this did not affect the funding for the new classical positions, which was external to the school). A further substantial amount of the cut was allocated from our already modest funds for instructors (see below). Smaller amounts were cut from study abroad program costs and from plotting. The change in plotting expenditures resulted in our instituting, for the first time, plotting credit limits for each student (this had not only financial benefits but sustainability benefits, as our free-for-all 'plot-till-you-drop' mentality had encouraged considerable waste). A final change was the asking of tenured faculty to do one extra course per year (see below). Overall, enrollment signals in architecture are mixed, though trending guardedly upward. The freshmen count for Fall of 2015 was 65 in architecture—a fairly high number which gave us some confidence that numbers would rise consistently. The freshmen Fall 2016 count, however, was only 45—a result of the campus-wide stress mentioned above. The freshmen Fall 2016 count was back to 62. To put this in perspective, the long-term internal goal we have for freshmen yield is approximately 70. That would give us an undergraduate program in architecture of about 280+/- and graduate program in architecture of about 70, for a total headcount in architecture of 350+/- . Adding in our other programs, we would have a total headcount in the school of about 400. There are signals in these freshmen numbers that this is by no means unrealistic, but we are not there yet. Looking further into the future, the best opportunity to permanently address any financial concerns about the school will be through fundraising. As noted under Human Resources, the most essential step in that regard has already been taken—the addition of a full-time development professional to the school's staff. In a single year, the yield from this step has exceeded projections. It was hoped initially that the school could raise a target of about \$550,000 a year in cash and pledges. The total so far in the first year has been nearly \$750,000 in cash and pledges. One major component of that was a multi-year pledge of \$100,000 per year for four years to support the new initiative in Classical Architecture and Urbanism

(see section on changes to the program below). Another \$200,000 general pledged bequest was made. These funds cannot all be used immediately for pressing needs; much of the money raised is for dedicated purposes and will likely flow in over a number of years. But the overall result has greatly exceeded expectations. Some general funds have indeed been booked and have been expended on marketing, guest critics (here we have been able to begin to address the need for further adjuncts from downtown teaching in our program), and other general purposes. Again, we feel this new source of funds is the most substantive, long-term way to address generally the financial health of the school. Further success here in subsequent years would help wean the school off of its near complete dependence upon tuition revenue as its source of funds, and would move it more toward a model more typical amongst private programs of enjoying substantial development support.

I.3.1 Statistical Reports

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: Statistical Reports are provided. However, not all of the required information is available or easily accessible.

Extensive demographic information is provided. However, no comparative data is provided to gauge the changes in demographics during the period since the last team visit. While it is possible to obtain information regarding the changes by comparing the reports from 2009 and from this year, the changes are too complex to allow a useful, comparative reading. More data needs to be provided to allow better analysis of trends that gauge the effectiveness of the social equity policy.

The team did not find data on the percentage of matriculating students who complete their degree program within the normal time to completion or within 150% of the normal time to completion.

While extensive data was provided on the demographics of the faculty, comparative data between this visit and the 2009 visit was not provided.

No data was provided on the number of faculty receiving promotion or tenure. Data is provided on the number of faculty who have licenses in U.S. jurisdictions. However, little data is provided on where they are licensed.

CUA, 2017 Response: [Click here to enter text.](#)

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The school's 2015 APR describes the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process, and the involvement of adjunct faculty assures that students are exposed to current issues in practice. While the process is defined, it does not appear to be uniformly implemented.

The failure seems to be a lack of coordination of core content in non-studio classes. Anecdotal evidence of course content being repeated in successive classes concerned the team, as did reports of syllabi not being shared among faculty resulting in often redundant course content. The program strengths are in the range of unique concentration options in Tracks I and II. These concentrations include: Urban Practice, Real Estate Development, Emerging Technologies and Media, and Cultural Studies and Sacred Space. However, students reported a lack of coordination among the concentrations and the lack of a holistic vision.

CUA, 2017 Response: The changeover in both of the Associate Dean positions since the last visit have allowed us to put fresh eyes on this issue. One of the new Associate Deans, Hollee Becker, has extensive experience lecturing in both the areas of structures and environmental controls. She has brought her expertise in those non-studio subjects to bear on this issue specifically, and has given greater attention to coordination of core content in all non-studio classes. Also, several faculty members from our Sustainability Program have now taken over offering both of the Environmental Controls lecture courses and are working in tandem to insure proper coordination. All syllabi are now fully available to all faculty through the university's syllabus system. We feel this concern about curricular review and development has been effectively addressed.

B.1 Pre-Design

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: Student work and supporting material in ARPL 602 and ARPL 632 (an elective) reflect an understanding of this criterion, but not an ability to perform the requirements of the criterion.

This criterion calls for **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.

CUA, 2017 Response: We have augmented our handling of this issue to insure a level of Ability. Students begin pre-design with precedent studies and site analysis in ARPL202 with collection of climate, topographic, cultural, circulatory and civic data and analysis of such to influence the project design. The level of analysis is intensified in ARPL301 to include arguments and decisions regarding the choice of building location on a large site including the impact such situation will have on all criteria, creating a pro/con list for various locations and remedies for any negative aspects of a chosen location. At this level, students are asked in teams to create a program for an elementary school based on their own resources and then to compare the program size and spaces to that dictated by the District of Columbia Public School System. ARPL302 incorporates FAR and zoning regulations for height and setback into site planning. Further, the curriculum committee is currently discussing bringing back ARPL221 Pre-Design as a required course in the Fall of Year 3. This will allow the elements of pre-design to be taught in a lecture setting with assignments directed to give students the ability to apply pre-design to subsequent studios. The opportunity to reoffer this course as part of our required curriculum arises due to a reduction in courses necessary in CUA's "First Year Experience" freshmen oriented general education requirements. This is a process currently underway and we will report on this further in our next interim report.

B.2 Accessibility

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Met. Projects in ARPL 402/602: Comprehensive Building Design Studio (CBDS) and throughout the program do not provide evidence of student ability with regard to the accessibility requirements of this criterion.

This criterion demands **ability** to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical (including mobility), sensory, and cognitive disabilities.

CUA, 2017 Response: We have also augmented our handling of this issue to insure a level of Ability. ARPL333 Construction I introduces students to the codes and the intent surrounding accessibility. ARPL301 reinforces the understanding with the application of codes for accessibility in egress, restroom facilities, parking, ramps and elevators through lectures and studio critiques. Students are required to provide accessible access, egress, site planning, parking and restroom facilities. These concepts are again required to be applied in ARPL302 studio with multi-family housing accessibility. In ARPL402/602 students are able to demonstrate the ability to meet accessibility standards in the project design in terms of equal inclusion for mobility without direction from the instructor. This is our CBDS studio.

B.5 Life Safety

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Met. While selected projects in ARPL 402/602: Comprehensive Building Design Studio (CBDS) illustrate this ability, the team found little evidence that life safety is consistently taught to students at the level of ability required by the criterion.

This criterion demands **ability** to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

CUA, 2017 Response: We have also augmented our handling of this issue to insure a level of Ability. Life safety considerations begin with understanding in ARPL301. Students in this class learn the criteria for Means of Egress and must then implement the criteria in their design project of a public building. Fall 2017 students are currently designing an elementary school. In this project, students must show calculations for occupant load, travel distance to egress, and fire-rated enclosures for egress stairwells. Students are now required in ARPL302 to show codes are satisfied for means of egress in multifamily housing. Beginning in Spring 2018, ARPL402 students will be required to show ability to incorporate code correct means of egress illustrated by calculation of occupant loads and travel distance. This is our CBDS studio.

B.7 Financial Considerations

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Met. The program needs to address understanding financial considerations as they relate to 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, instead of focusing on the financial considerations of an architectural firm's practice. In the course binders for Track I and Track II, ARPL 722: Practice Management, there is not enough evidence to illustrate an understanding of this criterion.

This criterion demands **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.

CUA, 2017 Response: Financial Considerations are now addressed within lectures in the choice of materials and construction methods in Structures I and II, and Construction I and II. In studio, we have incorporated financial considerations into the syllabus for the Spring 2018 ARPL402 CBDS studio—a new development. This will be the first comprehensive building design studio in several years in which students will be required to estimate the cost per square foot and total cost of the project without cost of the parcel. The students will be taught how to calculate project cost in ARPL432 CBDS Supplement and will then apply that knowledge to the studio project in ARPL402 CBDS. This is a process currently underway and we will report on the outcome of this further in our next interim report.

b. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern

● Human Resources

2015 *Visiting Team Comments:*

The visiting team supports maintaining the program's unique multi-disciplinary faculty, even during transitional budget and enrollment stabilization:

- There is concern that the tenure-track faculty do not have adequate resources to support scholarship travel needs (faculty report a number of instances of out-of-pocket expenses to support trips).
- The adjunct faculty support the reconfigured comprehensive design experience by providing vital professional role models for students. Students consult with the outside firms of these faculty members to improve building design projects and to establish summer internship and future employment connections. Therefore, the reduction in funding for hiring adjunct faculty is of concern.

There is a need to restore core support staff for the program in order to stabilize it:

- There is an immediate need to fill the two staff positions recently vacated and a need to provide release time for faculty to assist with student advising. As the program awaits new staff hires, the associate deans are dealing with advising, scheduling, contract writing, registration, and graduation requirements.
- The team is concerned because the support staff have been reduced from 12 staff in 2008-2009 to 4 at the time of the current visit, and to 6 when the new positions are filled. The current support staff are Assistant Dean August Runge, Shop Supervisor Davide Prete, Computer Technician Daryoush Ghalambor, and Assistant to the Dean Pat Dudley.

CUA, 2017 Response: For comments on the school's staff complement, see Human Resources above. Regarding concerns about recent reductions in adjunct hiring: progress on this has not been possible under the current regimen of budget cutting. The most recent round of budget rescissions (July 2017) actually heightened this concern by necessitating our losing of a large portion of our remaining part-time instructors. Only a couple instructors from downtown were employed in the Fall of 2017—with a similar if slightly hiring number slated to be used in the Spring of 2018. The loss of direct, day-to-day professional expertise is lamentable. Still, the curriculum was covered effectively. The breadth of the multidisciplinary faculty members we have hired over the past decade served us well in this circumstance. In order to cover everything and also still maintain our historically low student/faculty ratio in studio, the faculty elected to assign its tenured members a loading of one extra course per year (doing two courses in one semester and three courses in the other semester). This also allowed flexibility to still offer a robust array of electives. Tenure-track faculty were left at the prior loading of two and two. While having to deal with such issues is far from optimal, we do feel we made this work effectively. The fact that we had, over the past two years, two entirely new additional hires in architecture (within the new classical track) helped—both of those people had extensive practice experience (one of them in fact still maintains his widely respected regional firm of eight employees). The prognosis for the 2018/2019 academic year would be much the same regarding use of instructors—we will likely only be employing a small number. It

is ironic: typically, urban schools are criticized for being overly reliant on part-time instructors from downtown and thus for lacking the kind of dedicated curricular or coordinating functions provided by full-time faculty. We built a sizable full-time faculty and now find ourselves largely without part-timers from the profession. We should note that the two new full-time faculty did not consume resources that could have been spent on hiring instructors; those faculty members were funded external to the school. The concern about supporting faculty travel remains. Funds for this have even been tighter in the 2016/2017 academic year. We have been unable this year to support travel by the tenured faculty; some limited funds still exist to support tenure-track faculty.

● Physical Resources

2015 Visiting Team Comments: Repair of the facility's deferred maintenance items is needed (these items were also cited in the 2009 VTR):

- The team has health and safety concerns regarding the HVAC's extreme temperature fluctuations, which create difficult working conditions within the space.
- The buzzing lights, given the high use of the design studio spaces, are a distraction and an annoyance to students, faculty, and visiting critics, and disrupt the quality of the educational experience.
- The upgrade of the dust collection/ventilation system for the lower-level support shop is needed as an immediate fix to mitigate the migration of fumes from material cutting on the lower level to the upper level of the building. Moving the dust collection system outside the building would allow more students to use the equipment.

CUA, 2017 Response: For comments on the temperature and the lighting, see Physical Resources above. The additional dust and air quality issue noted here has been fully addressed. About six months after the last visit, a plan was put together to engineer and fund a major upgrade of the entire woodshop and fabrication lab's lighting, electrical and HVAC/dust-collection systems. The project took about one further year to design, fund, and bid. Construction commenced in Summer of 2017. The work included all new lights, new electrical connections, and most importantly new air handlers, compressors, all ducting, and external units. This serves the woodshop itself, the laser cutter room, the metal working area and the fabrication mill area. The cost was approximately \$200,000. It was funded through the capital expenditures account. This was a major upgrade of our facilities. Testing of the system has now commenced. It should be fully operational soon. For the first time since our high-tech equipment was installed a dozen years ago, we have a fully professional system in place.

● Digital-Network Infrastructure

2015 Visiting Team Comments: The digital-capacity needs of this professional program exceed the university's standard levels. The digital-network system is woefully inadequate for accomplishing many of the requirements of the courses:

- The network speeds for the file sharing of digital files is too slow.
- The faculty e-mail capacity of 2GB is too low.

CUA, 2017 Response: These concerns have been systematically addressed. In the summer of 2017, our rather antiquated print server function was relocated to the 'tech services' building, under the direct supervision of the campus's general computers staff. An entirely new server platform was constructed. This has allowed not only greater capacity and speed, but also more frequent and thorough upgrades and updating. Functionality and speed has been much higher—despite the fact

that the tech center is rather distant on campus from Crough. Our internal computers person still has direct ability to monitor the system. He works closely with central tech support. Complaints about this function, very prevalent at the time of the visit, have vanished. In a similar fashion, the entire wireless system at Crough has been upgraded over the past year, with vastly greater capacity and responsiveness. Once a source of near constant complaint, wireless service is now regarded by everyone as excellent. No complaints have been heard in the past year, whatsoever. Likewise, about 18 months ago, the university converted all faculty e-mail accounts on campus to Google Mail. This has allowed virtually unlimited storage space to all faculty. Complaints about this function have ended. The central university has been very responsive on all of these issues and helped us structure full solutions.

● Long-Range Planning

2015 *Visiting Team Comments:*

- Moving forward with the inclusion of the Department of Art within the School of Architecture and Planning could improve multi-disciplinary linkages. This opportunity has the potential to strengthen the foundational and historical roots of architectural education in the visual arts, as long as the logistics of this move can be resolved.
- Reinstating the ½ time development staff position, formerly shared with the School of Engineering, will assist the School of Architecture and Planning in moving forward with fundraising efforts.
- More assistance is needed from the university to manage enrollment, marketing, and public relations for the school. Assistance in promoting the school's unique aspects will help with future enrollment. The faculty were quite frustrated by the lack of support for providing press releases for events and for handling the acknowledgements received.
- In terms of increasing future enrollment, and possibly integrating the Department of Art, expansion of the physical facility will need to be explored.

CUA, 2017 Response: There have been no actual steps to integrate CUA's Art Department into the School of Architecture and Planning (though it is still discussed occasionally). While the possibility of moving Art to Crough was considered a few years back, the cost of recreating that department's kilns proved to be substantial. Recent discussions on campus given campus-wide enrollment issues could rekindle the issue, however. A more likely area of cooperation now though is with Media Studies, given that this department has now moved into Crough (see Media Studies comment below). There has been a full-time hire for the school in development, exceeding our greatest expectations (see Faculty and Staff Resources). Over the past two years, the university has begun a Marketing Office, including a number of hires, and has expanded and revamped its Media Relations functions. The School's administration has met numerous times with those offices. Most immediately, a series of meetings have taken place over the Fall 2017 semester with the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies and representatives of the Busch School of Business at CUA, in order to talk with architecture about graduate level recruitment augmentation and targeted marketing. The School of Business has numerous experts in the area of graduate recruitment and social media. A plan has been devised for such recruitment in architecture over a Dec-April window costing over \$36,000. This involves Google, Facebook and other common advertising platforms. Targeted analytics will be employed throughout. The cost of this marketing will be borne by the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. This will be the first fully modernized and social-media-oriented campaign in the history of our school. Another initiative was the full renovation of our website with a greater eye toward recruitment—now this is fully

complete and being loaded as of this writing. Enrollment services at CUA has also been substantively augmented, with the hiring of a new Vice-President for Enrollment Management, who has brought in a new team. It is too early to know the exact impact these steps will make, but we are hopeful.

● Curriculum and Development

2015 Visiting Team Comments: Students expressed frustration over the fact that no one seemed to be overseeing all four concentrations of Tracks I and II of the Master's program, and, as a result, there seemed to be overlaps in course content. Academic requirements for concentration areas seemed, at times, to be too restrictive and prevented students from participating in other opportunities in which they might be interested (e.g., travel opportunities). This team supports the students' interest in having the school develop core courses and in allowing more flexibility that extends across all concentration areas. In addition, student frustration with syllabi that are changing and late and with the lack of access to grading rubrics continues.

CUA, 2017 Response: Shortly after the NAAB visit, changeover occurred in both of our Associate Dean positions and there was a restructuring of duties. Prof. Judith Meany (see resumes) assumed the role of Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Prof. Hollee Becker (see resumes) assumed the role of Associate Dean for Student Services. It was felt that this new structure (as opposed to the prior division of duties based on graduate/undergraduate) would allow for greater cohesion between the undergraduate and graduate programs and would assist in the recruiting of our own students into the graduate program. It also allowed a fresh start regarding how the concentrations should be coordinated and how to open up for cross fertilization amongst the graduate concentrations. The syllabus issue was addressed through the university's more comprehensive syllabi uploading system.

c. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program

Please report such changes as the following: faculty retirement/succession planning; administration changes (dean, department chair, provost); changes in enrollment (increases, decreases, new external pressures); new opportunities for collaboration; changes in financial resources (increases, decreases, external pressures); significant changes in educational approach or philosophy; changes in physical resources (e.g., deferred maintenance, new building planned, cancellation of plans for new building).

CUA, 2017 Response: There have been several major changes in the program since the time of the last visit—the initiation of an IPAL program, the launch of an initiative in classical architecture and urbanism, the consolidation of the Architecture Library in the main library, and the moving into the Crough Center of CUA's Media Studies Department. Each will be commented upon in detail here. IPAL: The school of Architecture and Planning was approved by NCARB 18 months ago to offer the IPALs program. This was a major effort consuming much curricular and administrative time over the past 30 months—beginning in April 2015, not long after the NAAB visit. We saw considerable recruitment potential in the initiative, and felt our location in Washington DC made this a good fit for us. We have a robust network of alumni and supportive practitioners in the Washington DC region, who regularly recruit our students during their academic training prior to graduation. We developed a curriculum offering an academic grounding in the fundamentals of architectural study coupled at strategic points with practical experience in architecture offices. In addition, the proposed academic program is sequenced so that students are prepared in specific areas of examination throughout their academic learning. The philosophical underpinnings of our proposal view academic understanding, practice and examination as a learning continuum leading to practice upon graduation. Our proposal is a reordering of our current academic program, placing practice as a mandatory component of our student's experience rather than as a personal option pursued by students individually. The integrated focus and time expectations manifested in IPAL provide a stronger and more certain path to licensure and practice. IPAL is viewed as a significantly faster paced academic and practice experience. It is

expected that students enrolled in IPAL will receive equivalent academic qualifications while obtaining more rigorous practical experience earlier in their career path along with licensure examination opportunities. This will result in Architectural Licensure several years ahead of students who follow the existing academic and experience path now followed by all professional architecture candidates. In April, 2015, we crafted an integration of our professional curriculum with intermingled professional practice internships and opportunities to sit for examination. Our primary intent in developing this new program/track within our B.S. and M.Arch program is to offer our strongest and most interested students a program that grants opportunity for professional licensure upon graduation from The Catholic University of America. Our proposal to NCARB recognized that we must fully utilize all our present faculty resources to their fullest extent possible. This means that our current curriculum will not change and will be offered to all our students in the School simultaneously. In the five-year horizon, we envision about 20-25% of our current students and incoming Freshman may be candidates for this program. Over time, we see this program growing and we may receive additional financial resources from enrollment to add to the administration of the School. One advantage is that with professional licensure at the end of the education process, a significant majority of our undergraduate students will remain at CUA for their graduate education thus resulting in enrollment for 6 1/2 years of the program. As part of our application, Provost Abela endorsed our application. The Catholic University of America is one of 21 Universities approved for this program in the United States. In the academic year 2016-2017, The School of Architecture and Planning regularly met with both Freshman and Sophomore students to present and outline the advantages of the IPAL program. Concurrently we worked with our University central administration to regularize the Summer sessions so that housing and scholarship programs would be offered to these students. In our roll out of the program, we stressed the importance of GPA and readiness to engage in an accelerated curriculum. We counseled students, especially Freshman that if they did not meet the academic requirements, they would have another opportunity to apply in the following academic year, if they qualified. The program formally began in the summer of 2017. It received a total of 15 applications—10 from freshman and 5 from Sophomores. Ten of these applications were accepted—7 of them freshman and 3 sophomores. Ultimately, three freshman enrolled and 1 sophomore. All successfully completed the summer curriculum and were subsequently enrolled with NCARB in the IPAL program. As noted earlier, all the curriculum previously approved by the School and University remains in place but the sequence of courses integrated with practice internships has been changed the schedule of courses so students will enroll in Summer sessions as regular academic semesters. In September, 2017 the IPAL Coordinator began meetings with all students enrolled in the freshman and sophomore level classes. The response is even stronger than last year. From anecdotal information, the students who are enrolled in IPAL are paving the way and many more students are considering the program. We are intending to follow the same time line as last year. IPAL applications will be due no later than March 15, 2018, with immediate review and the start of the Summer semester, May 21, 2018. In addition, the IPAL coordinator has established advising sessions for the 4 enrolled students to prepare them for their first internship opportunity in Summer, 2018. The coordinator has also begun outreach to architecture firms who would sponsor IPAL students. Full curricular charts have been developed and are available to NAAB upon request. We are very excited to have been selected for this program and feel it will add considerably to our school's links with the vibrant surrounding professional community.

New Track in Classical Architecture and Urbanism: As a way of potentially assisting in opening a new recruitment stream into the school, the Provost's Office proposed to the school in Summer of 2015 that it could add two additional funded faculty positions in the area of classical/traditional studies. Those positions would be initially funded for the first three years through the Provost's own budget—thus directly increasing the number of faculty in the school. This would represent a direct infusion into the school of approximately \$250,000 in teaching resources. The central administration felt that development efforts, which had been increasing dramatically at CUA and were proving successful, could be used to eventually help fund the initiative. Enrollment, too, could rise due to the effort, which would provide additional permanent funds. In the late summer and fall, a strategic planning discussion occurred that resulted in a three-page scope document (8/15/15) outlining the pedagogical rationale and offering several scenarios for how such coursework could be organized and integrated into our current undergraduate program and graduate concentration structure. The initiative was named 'Classical Architecture and Urbanism'. No school of architecture in the Middle Atlantic Region currently has a defined program or area of emphasis in Classical

Architecture and Urbanism. This is unusual in that the region has for centuries been one of America's most prominent venues for classical buildings and designs. In this way, the initiative was felt to relate directly to the history of our context: Washington, DC. A further inducement lay in the Catholic Church's specific traditions—these stretching back for a millennium and a half or more—in the development and dissemination of principles about classical/traditional design. It was also felt that the school's many-decades-strong avant-garde position in aesthetics would allow for a program in classicism seated in a rather unique way—as a complement to a powerful position in Modernism.

November 9th, 2015, a luncheon attended by the Provost was held at the school that attracted over 40 local and regional professionals who were interested in classical or traditional studies. The featured speaker was Allan Greenberg—an internationally renowned architect with offices in New York City and Alexandria, VA. He stressed the pedagogical potentials of a conscious tension of traditional and modern compositional systems. Following the response to the luncheon, approval by the faculty was given on December 1st, 2015 on an 8-page curricular proposal outlining the courses and pedagogical methods. On January 17th, 2016, the initiative was formally announced at CUA. Development efforts began soon after. Faculty searches were immediately launched to find two new tenure-track or tenured faculty members. One of those searches proved successful, bringing James McCrery, a respected and much awarded regional practitioner in classicism, to the school as an Assistant Professor (see attached resumes) in August, 2016. The second search also located a highly regarded candidate (a historian/theologian who had written several books on traditional architecture) for what was intended to be a more theoretical-inclined position, but that person ultimately decided after long negotiations not to relocate to join CUA. Another search was launched in 2017, and resulted in the hiring of CJ Howard as an Assistant Professor in August, 2017, another local practitioner who is expert in the area of classical practice (see attached resumes). Both are actively involved in studio at this time. The initial studio offerings in classicism have been popular—for instance in the Fall 2017 semester a section of classical studio offered in the Junior year-level attracted 29 out of 60 potential students as their first choice, resulting in only half of them being able to be placed in the studio. The ability of the initiative to actually attract an entirely new recruitment stream into the school will not be clear for several more years. The initiative in no way changes the actual performance criteria from an accreditation standpoint. It is a fully integrated part of our typical streams of coursework at both the undergraduate and graduate level. We report on it here simply to suggest that the school is taking proactive steps to bolster its recruitment position and to continue engaging in pedagogical exploration. It also directly shows the central administration's support for the school and willingness to augment the school's budget with real resources.

Consolidation of the Architecture Library into the Mullen Library. In 2016, the Architecture Library was relocated directly into the Crough Center from the Engineering School. NAAB noted that CUA met the information resources 'with distinction'. Unfortunately, this circumstance did not long hold. The central administration undertook a study of library resources and made the decision to close all of the satellite library on the campus. This affected not only architecture, but also satellites in other areas such as music and philosophy. The financial realities were stark and clear: maintaining the satellite collection in architecture was costing the campus several hundred thousand dollars extra per year. It was not viable for the school to take on such an expense. The late hours requested by architecture for this satellite function were particularly challenging—whereas the main library (Mullen Library) typically already maintained such late hours as a matter of course. Also, the almost immediate physical proximity of Mullen to Crough argued specifically against maintaining this separate location. Further, the move of the architecture materials directly into Crough did not have a substantial impact on a gradual slide downward in use of traditional library print materials. Library and central administration officials met with the school's faculty to hear its concerns and to seek its advice in forming a solution. Through the summer of 2016, the collection was transferred in its entirety to Mullen. The dedicated staffing lines associated with the design materials were retained, and we still have an Architecture Librarian who regularly attends our faculty meetings and participates as always. The architecture collection is not dispersed throughout the large main library but held in one specific zone as an integral collection. The loss of the on-site architecture library function is lamentable, but is hardly unique to this campus and is a sign of widespread stress in traditional library materials usage. The attractive and glass-walled vacated space was turned over to the school for its use (see below).

Relocation of Media Studies Department into Crough: A further change in the physical resources is the moving of CUA's Media Studies Department, a department of the School of Arts and Sciences,

into the Crough Center. This was precipitated by ongoing concerns regarding another quite old building on CUA's campus whose foundations were affected by the 23 August 2011 5.8 magnitude earthquake that hit DC. Subsequently, for some years, that building underwent slight movement on its hill, which worsened in late Spring of 2017 and finally led to the decision to evacuate the structure until its future could be determined. Numerous departments in Arts and Sciences had to be suddenly relocated through parceling out to other buildings. The Crough Center was one logical choice for this given enrollment declines in Architecture and Planning and given the opening up of the 3,000 sq. ft. library space. Architecture and Planning had mixed if largely positive reactions to this idea. While it obviously would impact our use of several spaces and could make the building seem tight again, there were real potentials for synergies between the two constituencies. Media Studies has a technologically advanced agenda, involving computers, animation, film editing, lighting, and so forth. The department had considerable amounts of camera and computer equipment. A number of courses in Architecture and Planning deal substantively similar subjects, particularly in our 'TMAIN' Concentration in the M.Arch Degree (Technology & Media in Architecture and Interiors). Some modest prior collaborations had occurred between the two schools. Many discussions ensued about the actual space allocations, as the architecture faculty had hopes of converting the library into both classroom and advanced technology uses (a 3D visualization and virtual reality space, for instance). The Provost and CUA Facilities Director attended a meeting with the architecture faculty to discuss options. The wide-open and fully glazed loft-like library space offered welcome flexibility to Architecture and Planning; cutting it into typical offices and smaller laboratory spaces for a different department seemed a real loss. In the end a cooperative compromise was reached where architecture would give to Media Studies a zone of about 2,500 sq. ft. in the front of the lower level of Crough, which already had a number of offices and one larger teaching space. Also provided to Media Studies was one bay of the multi-bay library space for use as a lighting lab. The thorough renovations of these spaces and move in occurred in the late summer of 2017. Architecture and Planning lost use of five offices and, most importantly, the lower level classroom (that became Media Studies' main computer lab). Architecture and Planning did retain the vast majority of the open loft former library space, with a partition placed at one end to separate off a lighting studio for Media Studies. The move necessitated relocating numerous faculty within Crough. All regular faculty still today retain dedicated office spaces for their use, though shared offices for instructors were virtually eliminated by this (still, given reductions in the Instructor ranks, that has been less a problem than anticipated). So far, the move has been largely non-problematic. The two populations of faculty and students have mixed well. There is no overt perception of sudden crowding—the space still seems ample to all. Some curricular links and overlaps are being planned. Discussions are underway to insure cross use of equipment and facilities. Particularly useful to Architecture and Planning would be advanced computer and lighting studio functions; interesting to Media Studies are 3D printing and plotting functions. Departmental officials from Media Studies have been invited to, and made presentations at, Architecture and Planning's Advisory Board meetings. A joint barbeque was hosted by both faculties in order to get to know each other better. So far so good. Architecture and Planning is continuing its discussion of how to best utilize its remainder of the former library space, with options as a classroom and advanced technology space being in the lead. Currently, it is being used as a flex classroom—a use for which it is functioning quite well.

d. Summary of Activities in Response to Changes in the NAAB Conditions
[2015 NAAB Conditions](#)

CUA, 2017 Response: No changes to NAAB Conditions

e. Appendix (include revised curricula, syllabi, and one-page CVs or bios of new administrators and faculty members; syllabi should reference which NAAB SPC a course addresses)

CUA, 2017 Response: [Click here to enter text.](#)