Drexel University
Department of Architecture

Visiting Team Report

Bachelor of Architecture (6-7 years)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
8 March 2006

Table of Contents

I.   **Summary of Team Findings**

1.   **Team Comments**

The Team was asked to review a Bachelor of Architecture program that consists of two separate tracks, a 7-year course of night study and a 2+4 program comprising two years of traditional studio-based study and general coursework, followed by four years of night study merged with the students on the other track. The Team observed that the outcome was essentially the same for students in each track and considers this report a single evaluation of the program.

Students:
The students at the Department of Architecture are a strong and diverse body, articulate in describing their experiences and active in participation in the life of the school and the university at large. Their diversity is expressed from many perspectives, including: a wide range of age and experience among students; differences in education preparation prior to enrollment; differences in the traditionally accepted categories of diversity as well as life experience. Although the students are vocal in expressing what could be improved in the program, many voiced a strong affirmation of their choice of Drexel for their education in architecture.

Faculty:
The Department of Architecture at Drexel University possesses an asset in its faculty. The relatively small group of full time faculty anchors the excellent history/theory sequence including classes in humanities and ethics, excellent drawing courses, and the first two years of design studio for the 2+4 program. Because of its small size, the full time faculty bears an unusually heavy burden serving on multiple committees representing the architecture program at the school (COMAD) and university levels in addition to the department level.

Virtually the entire faculty of the night program is part time. Like the students, they are able to work full time during the day and teach in the program at night. Many leaders in the profession in the community have been teaching in the program for twenty years or more. Others are more recent Drexel and Penn graduates. The team noted that the dedication and loyalty of the part time faculty was on par with the full time faculty, which is notable. The team was impressed with the collegiality among the entire faculty.

Administration:
The administration has successfully contended, and even made an advantage of the fact that it falls under the purview of two separate colleges, the College of Media Arts & Design (COMAD) for the first two years of the 2+4 program, and the Goodwin College for the night programs, adjunct faculty, and the support of the strong AIAS component.

The efforts of the program head are notable in two additional areas: 1) in coordinating and leading two tracks of the same program that must merge and produce graduates with corresponding knowledge, skills, and academic achievement; and 2) in energetic and creative efforts to develop and maintain relationships with the Philadelphia architectural community with the goal of finding suitable employment for Drexel students to complement the academic experience.

Affordability of the program is maintained by the administration with the assistance of the university and the colleges.

The Program:
Drexel University offers unique opportunities for two types of students: those who want to balance work during the day with study at night at a pace that accommodates this balance, and younger students with the perspective to choose the varied experience offered by the 2+4 program. These twin opportunities afford a quality of education to recent high school graduates as well as more mature students, including those with families and previous careers.

Students gain substantial work experience as they progress through their architecture studies. This experience provides an understanding of and ability in practice which is celebrated but which cannot be considered in this review as meeting conditions for accreditation. It would be helpful to the students and to the program if a method of assessing this learning experience could be developed through collaboration between the school and the firms involved.

The department has designed a curriculum with a number of unusual and interesting courses. Products of this work include the bus shelters distributed around the Drexel campus produced through the Design-Build Arch 171 class. Students also participate in the summer study abroad programs in Rome and Paris, designed for a three-week window to accommodate the vacation limitations of working students.

Students clearly choose Drexel because of the nature of the program and how it fits their particular goals for life and career. Their success in the program, their work settings, and after graduation, coupled with the fact that the overwhelming majority pursues licensure, is an affirmation of this special approach to architectural education.

2.   **Progress Since the Previous Site Visit**

   Condition 3, Public Information

   Previous Team Report: *The Team reviewed both the "Undergraduate Catalog: Evening and Professional Studies Catalog 1999-2000 and the Department of Architecture's Web site and found the required text was not included in either.*

   Under Condition 3 of this report, the team has concluded that this condition has been met both in print and web site media. There is still room for improvement in that the required text is not as easy to find on the web site as it could be.

3.   **Conditions Well Met**

   13.9   Non-Western Traditions

   13.15   Sustainable Design

   13.24   Building Materials and Assemblies

   13.34   Ethics and Professional Judgment

4.   Conditions Not Met

   8.   Physical Resources

   12.   Professional Degrees and Curriculum

   13.25   Construction Cost Control

   13.29   Architect's Administrative Roles

   13.30   Architectural Practice

   13.33   Legal Responsibilties

5.   Causes of Concern

1. The department does a fine job of exposing students to the historical canon of Western architecture and also to non-Western traditions, with a rich program of architectural history and theory classes, as well as study of precedents in the studio context. One outcome of this positive attribute of the program is that is possible for a student to miss the study of modernism in class work. The fact that modernism is studied in the studio is important, but an approach might be considered to achieve balance in history and theory curricula so that this important aspect of architectural history is not given short shrift.

2. Structure of the elective courses: some of the criteria which the Visiting Team noted were not met would be satisfied by electives. Course selection is set up so that a student might be able to avoid any professional electives.

3. The lack of full faculty participation in strategic planning for the department – especially regarding the ongoing development of the curriculum, coupled with the fact that many faculty have been with the program for a considerable time, suggests that the program has immediate issues to contend with and that there is also a need to plan for the not-distant future when search for new faculty will be undertaken. Students commented on both the strength and the sameness or similarity of the faculty. This will present both a significant challenge as well as an opportunity to the department in the near term.

4. While there is evidence that the Speaking and Writing, Critical Thinking and Research criteria were met, there is much room for improvement. The team agreed that more emphasis should be placed on these criteria across the curriculum. One promising sign in this direction is the proposal of a policy to require all architecture students to take the information literacy course in the library.

II.   Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1.   Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

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

1.1   Architecture Education and the Academic Context

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

| Met   Not Met |
| [x]   [ ] |

The architecture program benefits from the institution's academic, administrative and physical resources. These include university required General Studies courses such as English and physics, the administration of the evening program through the Goodwin College and shared resources of the College of Media Arts and Design. The Hagerty library, which contains a collection of architecture, interior design and other related subjects, has a librarian dedicated to COMAD resources. In addition to the architecture school studios and full-time faculty offices, the school makes use of classrooms, an auditorium and gallery space of the institution.

While the architecture program is part of the College of Media Arts and Design, a number of barriers exist which make it difficult for architecture students to take courses in a range of subjects, such as, graphic design, photography, digital media, film and video, screenwriting, playwriting, interior design, fashion design, packaging design and merchandising or the visual and performing arts. These courses are offered during the day at a higher cost than courses offered in the evening, making them inconvenient or simply unavailable to most students in the evening program. Students in the architecture program are able to use the college's shop. However, the shop needs to be expanded and shop hours extended to accommodate the evening program.

The architecture school is considered to be a "jewel" of the university by the President of the University and Deans of the COMAD and Goodwin Colleges. The innovative 2 + 4 program is recognized for its high-achieving students while the open enrollment policy of the evening program provides a unique opportunity for a diverse and non traditional student population to pursue architecture careers. During their first two years, students in the 2+4 program participate fully in student life on the campus. Evening students tend to be less interested in campus activities. However, they still feel they are a part of both an academic and a professional community.

The university president and deans would like to expand the 2+4 program but recognize the limit to its current enrollment of 28 new students per year is due to the limited ability to secure employment for all of these students in local architecture firms in their third year. While there is potential for future growth, addressing the needs of the existing program should be a higher priority.

Academic and professional standards for both full time and adjunct faculty are set by university policy. Full time faculty members are expected to balance research and service with teaching, whereas the adjunct faculty is only assessed by their teaching quality. Students must maintain a minimum grade point average to progress through the architecture degree program.

1.2   Architecture Education and Students

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

Met	Not Met
[x]	[ ]

Students are supported and encouraged to assume leadership roles within the school and profession. Drexel AIAS formed the Task Force for Progressive Education (TFPE) to address the educational needs of students. The task force conducted a student survey and reported their findings to the administration and faculty. The task force has given the students a medium to voice their opinions, concerns, and suggestions for the school. Students participate in the decision making of the school through a representative on faculty committee and curriculum committee. Currently the AIAS president is the student representative on both committees.

The tracks of the traditional students from the 2+4 program and the non-traditional students from the night program come together in the third year of the 2+4 program and the fourth year of the night program. This fusing of the two programs encourages students to respect those who may be different from themselves. A sense of professionalism and mutual respect is established in the school by the faculty and the co-op work experience. Students felt that the faculty and administration were very accessible and supportive.

1.3   Architecture Education and Registration

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

An impressive proportion of the students indicated to the Visiting Team that they intended to obtain licensure. Many of them are participating in the Intern Development Program and find themselves in a position of being qualified to take the Architect Registration Exam immediately or shortly following graduation, and their work experience appears to give them a solid footing for this final step towards licensure.

The program does not appear to have taken full advantage of possibilities for connections with the State Licensing Board, and consideration should be given of how these opportunities can strengthen an already strong aspect of the program.

1.4   Architecture Education and the Profession

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

Drexel's program is one of the few NAAB-accredited degree programs in which students are expected to work in an architectural firm or related discipline while they pursue their degree. All students participate in the part-time evening program. Students in the 2+4 program begin professional work in their third year; students in the evening program work throughout their education at Drexel. Most students have worked least three years, some as many as six years, and many have completed IDP before they graduate. Of the students surveyed during the team visit over 100 students, representing about 1/3 of the student population, said they plan to take the architects registration exam.

Both students and faculty appreciate the synergy between work and school. Students learn from each other about varied work experiences in different firms and students who work in construction and related disciples bring an added dimension to the classroom and studio. Most

adjunct faculty members who teach in the evening are practicing architects during the day, so class discussions and studio reviews often concern practice issues. Over 70 faculty members are adjunct faculty; only five are full time.

The role of the architect in practice is introduced in studio and in an introductory architecture construction course. The relationship of the architecture to the engineering disciplines is addressed in courses on Materials & Structural Behavior and Environmental Systems as well as in studio and thesis. The 6th year studio on urban design requires students to think beyond the building site and consider planning and social issues on a broader scale. Not all students take the Management Seminar I and II in which aspects of professional practice are further examined. However, students are required to take the General Lecture Series I, II, and III, in which ethical issues are introduced in the context of history and society.

Students are productive and experienced professionals by the time they graduate. They have also considered their ethical responsibilities and leadership role in society.

1.5 **Architecture Education and Society**

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

The team found that the three General Lecture Series courses do an excellent job of addressing the issue of architecture as a social art and the multiple stakeholders who influence the built environment, especially in regard to the impact of the architect's ethical decisions. Studio projects at many levels, beginning in the second year of both programs, demonstrate the student ability to address social challenges and concerns. The fourth-year studios are focused on environmental responsibility. Each year all fourth year studios participate in the annual LEED competition between local architecture schools. The design-build projects, especially the bus shelter, are a demonstration of how civic engagement is nurtured in the program.

2. **Program Self-Assessment Procedures**

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

The program has demonstrated how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives, both in the APR and in the Annual Reports. One of the most impressive portions of the APR is the AIAS student Task Force for Progressive Education (TFPE) report. This report, which originated in part from discussion and student unease at the increase in course hours (and expense) three years ago, was expanded to give consideration to a wide range of issues, including grading procedures and standards. It is extremely thorough and comprehensive, addressing the very premises behind the program. The conclusions of the report both reaffirm and strongly question aspects of the program, and while not all issues have been addressed, the students feel that they are now more involved in the planning processes of the department. The team noted a strong student concern about grading equity and fairness, which should be addressed by the program.

In spring of 2005, an exit survey with outgoing graduates was conducted soliciting input on strengths, weaknesses and improvements to program coursework, facilities and faculty. The questionnaire also surveyed where students were in their IDP process, their intentions to sit for the ARE, attend graduate school, start their own firm, or leave architectural practice. It was not clear whether this survey was done only once in preparation for the NAAB visit or if it was an annual process associated with graduation, which would provide more reliable and useful for the program.

The faculty does not appear to be engaged in a comprehensive assessment process of the program, although there is a process for re-evaluating studios at the end of the year. At a small scale, successes in program assessment are achieved through connections from studio to studio when the design faculty reviews the work of the previous quarter as a starting point for the next. Full-time faculty participates in the curriculum committee, but this group does not apparently have a regular agenda, meeting when particular issues arise. This is an area that deserves scrutiny and improvement, to allow the department to be self-critical at the strategic scale. The team found no formal mechanism by which faculty could assess the performance of administrators.

3.   **Public Information**

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

Met	Not Met
[x]	[ ]

The APR provided evidence that faculty members and incoming students have been informed of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation on the NAAB web site. The Drexel catalog clearly includes the exact language found in Appendix A. However, that language is not included on the web site with the program description where it should be, and can only be found by downloading the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and searching for Appendix A.

4.   **Social Equity**

The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with an educational

environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. The school must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources. Faculty, staff, and students must also have equitable opportunities to participate in program governance.

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

The program has a clear policy on social equity and equal opportunities for staff, faculty, and students. The University is committed to taking affirmative action. The program actively recruits racial and ethnic minorities and women in its hiring of faculty and recruitment of students.

5. Studio Culture

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

The department has adopted a well-written policy on studio culture that addresses both student and faculty roles. Students in the first two years of the 2+4 program enjoy a rich studio culture based on collaboration, engagement, innovation, sharing and respect. First and second year students have a close relationship and interact daily. The unique condition of evening students, who work and study at the same time, puts an extra demand on the professors to establish studio culture during class time. Students in the night program have limited opportunity for collaboration, innovation and engagement with other students outside of class times. Many students work in architecture offices and are able to extend the studio culture into their professional experiences. Since Drexel is so well integrated into the community many firms have Drexel students, faculty and alumni. Some students are able to get critiques of their studio projects from peers or professors in their offices.

Students and faculty have a strong mutual respect and empathy for the difficult challenges associated with balancing responsibilities at work, home, and in school.

6. Human Resources

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

The program has demonstrated adequate human resources for both accredited degree tracks offered. A low faculty-student ratio in the evening classes helps to mitigate the reduced contact hours. The faculty

appreciates low class size particularly in the upper year studios to allow sufficient time to adequately review each student's work.

7.   **Human Resource Development**

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

For full-time faculty in the College of Media Arts and Design, policies on development opportunities such as sabbaticals, travel, and awards are published in the Faculty Handbook.

Policies for adjunct faculty in the evening program are established by the Goodwin College of Professional Studies. The department head makes all recommendations for promotion of adjunct faculty. There is little formal opportunity for faculty development for the adjunct faculty although some are granted travel funds by the department on an informal basis. The adjunct faculty maintains currency through professional work.

The department offers a variety of opportunities for student enrichment including lecture series, exhibitions, and summer-abroad experience. Funding scholarships for travel is a specific fund-raising goal. The department currently offers academic advising to all students and internship placement to the 2+4 students at the end of their second year. Personal and career advising are available from the University.

8.   **Physical Resources**

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

	Met	Not Met
	[ ]	[x]

Although the department, with the help of the university and the colleges, has made significant strides in addressing ongoing concerns regarding the physical resources of the program, there are significant issues of concern that lead the team to conclude that this condition is Not Met.

On the positive side, a recent conversion of the freight elevator to a passenger elevator has markedly improved accessibility to the fourth floor of the Main Building, and modifications such as ramps between level changes have made this area a workable environment. Lighting is functional, and the unique architectural qualities of the space allow it to function well for its somewhat limited use as a classroom and pin-up space. The space in Arch 3021 is a fine example of good studio and office space developed in a renovated building, with ample display and a shared central area for computers and plotters for students to use.

The greater need of housing the entire program in a single facility has not been resolved, but this issue is clearly a topic for planning discussion, both at the college and the university-wide level outside of the

department. A number of solutions appear to be available, and the department is working appropriately to further this important goal within the constraints of overall university planning efforts.

There are three areas that raise the level of concern with respect to this condition:

1. The shop is a challenge from several aspects. It is not an accessible space. Although it was explained to the visiting team at the shop that students needed to take a safety orientation before being cleared to use the equipment, students made it clear that they had to enroll in a shop-related class and complete the class prior to this clearance. The classes are not designed for architectural students. The department is making strides in planning for extended shop hours, but this has not yet taken effect. The location of the shop off a dark alley is likely to prove a discouragement against evening and night use. The limitation on shop use is apparent in student work, little of which exhibits model-making at the scale or complexity that could be afforded. COMAD has applied for a grant for rapid prototype modeling equipment, but it is not clear to what degree this equipment would be offered to architectural students or where it would be housed.

2. Plotting and printing facilities for all students are a critical issue. This is addressed in a satisfactory way for students in the first two years of the 2+4 program, in that a common plotter is provided for these students in the center of the studio area at 3021 Arch Street. As soon as these students move on to the third year and join other students in the night study program, this opportunity is lost. There is an assumption that students will be able to use plotters and printers at their places of work, but in practice this is not always the case. Some firms allow use while others prohibit it, and there are discrepancies in technology available at these offices. This places some students at a disadvantage. The department is encouraged to find a solution at the campus that affords all students the same access to printing and plotting technology.

3. The requirement that students be afforded space: "*… including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class,*" has not been successfully met for the students in the night program. The particularities of this program suggest a different response than what is customarily found in the studio environment where each student is assigned a full studio station, but the students notice the disadvantages posed by having to bring their work for each class or crit and then take the work back with them, without a "home base" of any type. Not only is working studio space missed by students in the 2+4 program who have left such a space after the second year, but night program students also feel the lack. The department should strive to find creative ways, such as flexible work space for students outside of class, and dedicated storage, such as student lockers, to satisfy this important aspect of this condition within the unique parameters of this program.

9.   **Information Resources**

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

Met   Not Met
[x]   [ ]

The library facilities at Drexel University are housed in a single facility two blocks from each of the two classroom spaces used by the department. The portion of the library reserved for the architectural collection meets and exceeds the threshold of this condition, and the program should be commended for maintaining an adequate budget to both update and grow the collection over the past several years. The library as a whole is supportive of the mission of the architectural program, and the assignment of a librarian who has an architectural background both sends a positive message and helps maintain a strong base of information resources.

The collection is perhaps not accessed as much as might be desirable, in part because of the time limitations imposed on the night program students by their need to work by day and study by night, further complicated by long commutes faced by some students.

The department is making positive efforts to improve the knowledge that students possess with respect to navigation of information resources, this includes consideration of implementing a course in information literacy that would be required for all architecture students.

10.   **Financial Resources**

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

Met   Not Met
[x]   [ ]

The department budget has grown annually at a rate between 3% and 8% due primarily to increased allocation for full time faculty salaries during the past five years. There have been cost of living increases in adjunct salaries four out of the five last years. Since the last visit, there has been a 12.5% increase in annual expenditures per student to $5711 per FTE student as compared to $3900 per FTE student in the Department of Design. The team found evidence that there is parity in fiscal allocation between the Department of Architecture and other professional programs at the university.

11.   **Administrative Structure**

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

Met   Not Met
[x]   [ ]

Drexel University is an institution accredited by the Middle States Association of colleges and Schools (MSACS). The Department of Architecture is part of the College of Media Arts & Design (COMAD), on of nine colleges and three schools at the university. The autonomy of the program, and its function within the greater sphere of the university, is comparable to that of other programs within the university in general and the college in particular. The evening program is delivered through the Goodwin College of Professional Studies, which provides administrative services for all university evening programs, including the hiring of adjunct faculty. Goodwin College also supports AIAS Drexel.

12.   Professional Degrees and Curriculum

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

	Met	Not Met
	[ ]	[x]

The curricula of both tracks of the B. Arch program comprise Professional Studies, General Studies and Electives. In the fall of 2003 the total units for the degree program were raised from 192 to 209 with the intent to meet the NAAB requirement of 225 units prior to 2015. Of the 209 required units, 48 units are University requirements (General Studies), 87 units are in the studio/thesis sequence, and 74 units are in architectural studies. The program curriculum is 19.5 units short of the 67.5 quarter-unit requirement for General Studies.

13.   Student Performance Criteria

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

13.1   Speaking and Writing Skills

Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

In the previous Visiting Team Report the quality of writing was noted as varying widely. This report confirms a satisfactory quality of writing, in particular in student work from the General Lecture Series and in electives requiring writing assignments. Writing-intensive tutors are a requirement in the Drexel program, and this appears to be one of the reasons that writing skills have improved markedly.

The students as a group are articulate and well spoken, able to express clearly why they chose this program and how it has affected their personal experience.

13.2   Critical Thinking Skills

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

A logical and reasoned process of critical thinking is evident in much student work, both in the studio and the classroom context. The students themselves offer diverse points of view and backgrounds, and they are able to consider these and reach their own conclusions.

13.3   Graphic Skills

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

In spite of inconsistencies in the availability of print media resources to students, who are expected to make use of equipment at the offices in which they work, graphic skills in computer formats are developed to a level that shows a solid and occasionally exceptional ability. The drawing class gives students a strong foundation in freehand drawing and hand drafting approaches. The watercolor wash drawing work produced in the Advanced Drawing class is exceptional.

13.4   Research Skills

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

The ability to apply research skills to work in different settings is established early in the program and develops throughout.

13.5   Formal Ordering Skills

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

Students show a clear understanding of these fundamentals and principals, in particular in first- and second-year studio work. The curriculum at these levels is designed to give students exposure to develop in this area, and the results of these efforts are evident in studio work throughout students' academic careers.

13.6   Fundamental Skills

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

This ability is developed in the studio sequence at several levels. This includes early work on interior spaces in the first year and leads through principles of building design in the second year and a focus on site design in the fourth year studios.

13.7   Collaborative Skills

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

Collaborative skills are developed in several settings: the Design-Build class, Urban Design Classes, and the Materials and Structural Behavior III coursework. In addition, it appears that students clearly benefit from their work experience in offices in the Philadelphia area.

13.8   Western Traditions

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

Western architectural traditions are thoroughly covered in the context of both studio and class work. Student work, written and in the studio product, indicates a solid development of this understanding.

13.9   Non-Western Traditions

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

The criterion is Well Met.

The understanding of non-Western traditions is difficult to achieve, but this architecture program does an exceptional job, both in required and elective coursework. A general understanding of non-Western traditions is enriched by the personal research areas of the history and theory faculty. The study of vernacular traditions is strong in this program and deserves to be commended.

13.10   National and Regional Traditions

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

This program has taken advantage of the fact that it is situated in a rich regional tradition. Coursework and studio preparation takes students into this tradition. The curriculum is not limited to local traditions but appears to prepare students to extrapolate their direct experience to other regional settings.

13.11   Use of Precedents

Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

While this criterion is met, particularly in the early steps of the studio sequence, the program should give consideration to reinforcing the influence of precedents at all studio levels.

13.12   Human Behavior

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

This understanding is developed in several contexts, including the student housing studio, the second year studio to design a Catholic church, and the General Lecture Series.

13.13   Human Diversity

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

The understanding of human diversity is developed first in the Architecture and Society and General Lecture Series sequences. A number of the studio topics also focus on this area.

13.14   **Accessibility**

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

Ability in the design of facilities to accommodate accessibility is developed in studio work in the second year. This is also an area of the curriculum that appears to be reinforced by students' experience in the work program, where students may be confronted with these issues in a real-world context. Student work, in particular in later studios and thesis projects, displays the ability to apply that knowledge in design.

13.15   **Sustainable Design**

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

This criterion is Well Met.

Sustainable design is introduced strongly in the fourth year studios with a LEED competition. It is recognized as an important element that is also displayed in subsequent studio work. A significant number of the adjuncts are LEED accredited professionals, and this professional commitment appears to be translated into the curriculum in positive ways. There is also a strong connection between learning acquired in the classroom that is then applied in the studio context. The department has elevated sustainable design to a level of importance that deserves commendation.

13.16   **Program Preparation**

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

Program preparation is required in and developed through the thesis project. There is a specific course (Architectural Programming 431) that is an elective but appears to be taken by many

students. Some students also gain additional exposure to and familiarity with program preparation in the context of their work experience.

13.17   Site Conditions

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

Met	Not Met
[x]	[ ]

Studios at the 4th year level must work directly with site contexts (in conjunction with Sustainable Design challenges), and their work indicates that this ability is developed from this point through the completion of the studio sequence. The emphasis on site characteristics appears stronger with built site context than with natural sites.

13.18   Structural Systems

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

Met	Not Met
[x]	[ ]

The structural systems courses appear strong, with an encouraging pass rate, inspiring teachers, and some evidence that this learning is being applied in studio work. The final project in the structural systems class is a collaborative project involving comprehensive structural design issues.

13.19   Environmental Systems

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

Met	Not Met
[x]	[ ]

The materials that fall under the category of environmental systems are for the most part well covered, and some studio assignments require display of the understanding acquired through this course. One exception may be the area of acoustics, which needs to be covered better in future years.

13.20   Life-Safety

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

Met	Not Met
[x]	[ ]

Study of fire sprinkler systems is in the required Environmental Systems II (Arch 262) course. Understanding of both life-safety systems and of the basic principles of egress is displayed in studio work at levels from the second year through thesis work.

13.21   Building Envelope Systems

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

Work in this area includes a large-scale wall section in course 161, Architectural Construction. Studios 241 and 242 also cover the study of and development of the understanding of building envelopes.

13.22   Building Service Systems

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

The courses in Environmental Systems I and II cover the majority of these areas, although the topics of communications and security are not as well-considered. Primary elements of plumbing, electrical, and vertical transportation show in student studio work, indicating that a level of understanding has been developed.

13.23   Building Systems Integration

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

The integration of building systems in a completed project appears to be developed to the level of ability. This shows up more in some studio work at the upper levels than in early years and is likely one area where students' work experience is positively reinforcing what is learned both in the class and the studio.

13.24   Building Materials and Assemblies

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

This criterion is Well Met.

Course 161, Architectural Construction, starts students on a solid path in the development of this understanding, and this foundation is then reinforced in several studios along the complete sequence. Materiality seems to be an important basis for understanding design and how buildings go together, and students assimilate this knowledge well, many developing ability in this category.

13.25   Construction Cost Control

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

Met	Not Met
[ ]	[x]

This criterion has not been met. The subjects under cost control are generally included in electives rather than in required coursework. Although some students no doubt develop this understanding in their work experience, it is clear that student experiences vary widely. There is not an effective means for either the department or the Visiting Team to confirm that this understanding is developed by all students in the program. There is little in the way of cost control material in the Architectural Construction course, and although these topics may be covered in some thesis projects, it is by no means clear that this is true of all thesis work. The program should have a number of means available to address this concern.

13.26   Technical Documentation

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

Met	Not Met
[x]	[ ]

The ability to make technically precise drawings has been developed by students as they progress through the program, and this is no doubt reinforced by the valuable experience they gain in the work environment. There is not a clear picture of how students learn how to write outline specifications, and although some of this, again, is likely learned in work in offices, this is an aspect of this criterion that should be strengthened, demonstrated and/or measured in other ways.

13.27   Client Role in Architecture

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

Met	Not Met
[x]	[ ]

The program includes a clear focus on the responsibility of the architect in the context of the architect-client relationship. Many students, including those who work both in traditional and non-traditional practice settings, encounter clients and work with these issues daily, and it does appear that they bring this experience and understanding back to strengthen this discussion in the classroom and studio.

13.28   Comprehensive Design

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

The ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project in a final design product shows in studio work and is reinforced by a strong faculty.

13.29   Architect's Administrative Roles

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

	Met	Not Met
	[ ]	[x]

Exposure to the issues involved with the architect's administrative roles is typically found in the Management Seminar. While the course content is comprehensive, it exists only as a professional elective. Because of the way that electives are structured, it is possible for a student not only to miss this important course content but to avoid or bypass the professional electives entirely (by focusing of history and other electives). While this topic may be augmented through work experience, there is no evidence that all students develop this understanding through the class, the studio, or the work setting.

13.30   Architectural Practice

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

	Met	Not Met
	[ ]	[x]

As with the Architect's Administrative Roles, topics of Architectural Practice are covered in a comprehensive manner only in the electives in the two-class Management Seminar. Again, this understanding may be developed by many in the work setting, but the department has not yet developed an effective means to track or verify this experience and the understanding derived from it.

13.31   Professional Development

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

Students' experiences in the work setting give them a solid understanding in this area. The department has made efforts to develop build on this knowledge through programs such as having a representative from AIA talk to students about the Intern Development Program. The department is considering having an IDP mentor, and this important move would go even further towards reinforcing this. A high proportion of students are enrolled in IDP, and many are in a position to take the ARE immediately or shortly after graduation.

13.32   Leadership

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

Leadership issues are covered in the General Lecture Series sequence and the upper levels of the Design Studio sequence, and this is an area that appears to be strongly reinforced through lessons learned by each student in the work program.

13.33   Legal Responsibilties

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

	Met	Not Met
	[ ]	[x]

While this may be met in some students through their experience there is no apparent way to gauge or determine this. This material is partially covered in the Management Seminar, but this is an elective that may or may not be taken by all students. The department should develop either a means to measure and gauge what students are exposed to and learn in the work setting or ensure that this understanding is acquired in the classroom.

13.34   Ethics and Professional Judgment

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

	Met	Not Met
	[x]	[ ]

This criterion is Well Met.

Topics of ethics are strongly considered in the curriculum of the General Lecture Series III course. This is also an area where the unique structure of the work program gives students the means to observe and make judgments on ethical issues as they relate to practice, thus enriching their understanding.

III.   Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

1.   History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2005 Drexel University Architecture Program Report:

Drexel University, a privately endowed and supported institution of higher learning in Philadelphia, was founded as the Drexel Institute of Art, Science, and Industry in 1891 by Anthony Joseph Drexel, the Philadelphia financier and Chairman of the Drexel Morgan Guaranty and Trust Company. The founder's intention was to establish an institution of "higher education to accommodate the sons and daughters of artisans." Recognizing the modest income and varying working schedules of the people it sought to attract, programs were offered both in the day and in the evening from the beginning.

Offering courses in art, domestic science, commerce, technology and shop work, Drexel was dedicated to the application of knowledge to the vocations. As Drexel has developed, it has always maintained a close alliance with the various professions it supports. Full-time day programs are highlighted by their commitment to cooperative education in which students alternate professional work experience with their academic program. Evening programs are typified by students who are working full-time in their chosen profession during the day and simultaneously advancing their education part-time in the evening.

Until the end of World War II, the majority of Drexel's enrollment was in the Evening College. Afterwards full-time enrollment grew rapidly. In 1965 Drexel enlarged its educational commitment to research and graduate education when it offered its first PhD degree programs. In 1970 the name of the Drexel Institute of Technology was changed to Drexel University to reflect this shift in mission. Today Drexel offers 70 bachelors, 71 masters, and 30 doctoral programs. While the balance of enrollment has tilted toward the full-time day programs, the evening programs at Drexel have remained a significant component in its mix of offerings.

Over the past ten years a dynamic university administration, under President Constantine Papadakis, Drexel University has made great strides in many areas. University enrollment, which had drifted downward in the early 1990's, is now at an all-time high. According to the fall 2004 census Drexel University currently serves 17,656 students of whom 11,960 are undergraduates. The 1721 part-time students in degree programs comprise 14.4% (19.7% in 1999) of the total undergraduate enrollment. Over the last decade the university has also dramatically expanded and improved its physical plant, improved its digital infrastructure, and, most importantly, has expanded its scope and mission. The most startling example of this occurred in 1998 when the collapse of the Pittsburgh-based Allegheny Health System placed the future of Philadelphia's Allegheny University of the Health Sciences at risk. Drexel University agreed to manage the renamed 3000 student MCP/Hahnemann School of Medicine, and, if conditions warranted, to merge it with Drexel. In the spring of 2001 MCP/Hahnemann became the Drexel University College of Medicine, the College of Nursing & Health Professions, and the School of Public Health. Partly as a result of this merger the university's externally-funded research expenditures increased about six-fold, from $14 million in 1997 to more than $80 million in 2003. The most recent Drexel initiative is the creation of a School of Law which will emphasize Health Care, Intellectual Property, and Entrepreneurial Business to take advantage of synergies with university strengths. If Commonwealth approval is granted this fall, an inaugural class will be launched in August 2006, with a night school opening a year later.

Over the past six years Drexel University has become a much larger research intensive institution with a strong focus in technology and the biological sciences, while it still retains its strength in preparing undergraduates for technological careers through cooperative education and work-study programs. The fiscal challenges of a still modestly endowed private university in an urban setting with higher than average tuitions will also remain regardless of the positive effects of the merger and the continuing expansion of mission and focus. Although the potential of the medical merger and the Law School launch are exciting prospects for Drexel to contemplate, they will have little direct effect on the future of the Department of Architecture, which will continue to chart its own path.

2.   Institutional Mission

The following text is taken from the 2005 Drexel University Architecture Program Report:

"To serve its students and society through comprehensive, integrated academic offerings enhanced by technology, cooperative education and clinical practice in an urban setting"

This Mission Statement was adopted by the Drexel University Board of Trustees in 2004.

3.   Program History

The following text is taken from the 2005 Drexel University Architecture Program Report:

The Department of Architecture has been in continuous existence at Drexel since 1895, and its programs have always been offered in the evening. In its early years, two year diploma programs offered by the department were vocational in nature. By the mid 1930s the diploma program had expanded to four years with options in Design and Construction offered. By the 1950s the program had expanded again to eight years of study leading now to a Bachelor of Science degree in Architecture. By the 1960's, NAAB accreditation was increasingly becoming a requirement for licensure in many states, and the students and faculty could foresee that the program would be devalued without such recognition. In 1969, led by considerable student lobbying and the subsequent enthusiastic support of the Board of Trustees, approval was granted for the Department to formally apply for NAAB accreditation which was first granted in 1972.

In 1977, at the program's second NAAB review, it was recommended that the department seek approval from the Commonwealth to grant the Bachelor of Architecture degree. Although the department's BS degree was accredited, this action was clearly necessary to make the Drexel degree consistent with other accredited programs. Approval to award the, degree was granted in 1977 and was made retroactive to the initial accreditation in 1972. This confirmed that Drexel's architectural program had achieved both professional and formal recognition and that its alternative system of professional education was fully equivalent to various programs throughout the country delivered in more traditional formats. The department had been able to create this stable and productive program in large part due to its strengths - a strong faculty of practicing architect educators and a highly motivated, mature student body. Reaccredidation followed in 1979 and 1984.

The 1984 Review limited accreditation to three years. The Visiting Team's report considered this necessary, not because of a weakness in the academic program, but because of a lack of

administrative support in three key areas: lack of a full time Department Head, lack of a discretionary budget, and the lack of improved facilities. All of these major deficiencies were corrected by the 1987 Visit and a full five year term of accreditation was granted. Paul M. Hirshorn, AIA, was appointed as the Department's first full-time Head in July 1986, the department's discretionary budget was sufficiently increased to support student and faculty enrichment programs, and in January 1987 a major renovation to the department's primary teaching space was completed resulting in a superior facility arranged to suit the department's requirements.

The 1987 Visit was preceded by a major administrative realignment of the department. In 1985 all Evening College programs were asked to ally themselves with their day-time counterparts. After careful consideration, the department elected to join the College of Design Arts (now the College of Media Arts & Design) in July 1986. This shift required the department to develop a working relationship with the two colleges and two Deans since the Evening College (now Goodwin College) pays for evening instruction, as well as providing a range of services for evening students and evening instruction.

From 1986 to 1992, the department experienced a steady growth in enrollment to 297 students, an increase of close to 50%. For the first time the department enjoyed the attention of a full-time Department Head to address the space and staffing issues of growth, as well as providing a continuous overview of the department's program and course offerings. In large part due to the Department Head's attention, a variety of changes were instituted and other initiatives were put in motion. The program was shortened from 8 to 7 years by restructuring the final year, a foreign travel option with scholarship support was put in place, and the standards of the program were sharpened by the installation of studio advancement requirements. A large service component was started to offer studio and history courses to the Architectural Engineering Program which had just started in the College of Engineering. A second full-time faculty appointment, an architectural historian, was made, in part, to support this added coursework.

In 1992 the department embarked on an exciting experiment in architectural education by creating *the 2 + 4 Option* in which students follow two years of full-time study with four additional years in the existing evening program in the work/study format. This concept built upon Drexel's premise that students can be productive in offices after two years of education in Architecture, and that a small, motivated group of recent high school graduates can productively use this route into the upper level of the part-time program and, simultaneously, into the profession. To teach in and to coordinate *the 2 + 4 Option,* Judith Bing was hired in 1992 as the Department's third full-time faculty member. *The 2 + 4 Option* brought an infusion of new students to the Drexel program in a period when the number of new students entering the traditional evening program was declining slightly, so overall program enrollment remained stable. More importantly, it brought a younger component to the student body, making the mix richer than before.

In 1994 The Farajollah & Maryam Badie Arfaa Lecture Series in Architecture was created, enabling the department to launch a varied program of well-known architects and scholars to lecture to large appreciative audiences of Drexel students, faculty, and alumni plus students from other Philadelphia area schools, and architects from the entire Delaware Valley region.

The 1997 Accreditation Visit was an extraordinary moment for the Department of Architecture. An innovative program initiative wedded to our stated mission, the expansion of enrichment support, and the highest quality of work that we had ever displayed were sources of pride to students, faculty, and alumni. The mood of the visit, the positive comments of the Visiting Team,

and its generally positive report were all seen as a powerful validation of our unique approach. Needless to say we were surprised by the Board's decision to limit our accreditation to a three year term. We carefully reviewed the Visiting Team's concerns in priority order and requested reconsideration of the term of accreditation by suggesting that all major Visiting Team concerns, primarily a shortfall in the library's architectural collection, were in the process of being addressed, and that our educational mission was not significantly affected by these deficiencies. Our request was not approved by the NAAB Board which reaffirmed the three year term.

By the 2000 Accreditation Visit the department was able to meet all of the previous Visiting Team's concerns. The library's architectural collection was aggressively enlarged. The lack of sufficient support staff and dependence on the Department Head was solved by the appointment of Walter Moleski as Assistant Department Head, making him the department's fourth full-time faculty member. Inadequate adjunct salaries were addressed to some degree as annual raises again became the norm. Air conditioning improvements to the Main Building Studios were scheduled. During this period the department also pursued other outreach initiatives. In 1997 the department launched the *Discovering Architecture* program for high school students, and in 1998 created an Architecture Minor. In 1999 curricular changes broadened choice in upper level professional electives.

In September 2000 Jonathan Estrin was appointed Dean of the College of Design Arts. Improving the quantity and quality of academic space was the first priority that he articulated for the college which was quickly re-centered and renamed the College of Media Arts & Design.. With characteristic enthusiasm, he set a goal to build a new structure in five years to house all of the college's programs rather than continue in a variety of scattered facilities. This goal was not only ambitious it was also consistent with the Department of Architecture's priority to house all of its programs in one location for maximum interaction and vitality. In his first year Dean Estrin was provided with funds to make more modest immediate strategic physical improvements. He chose to invest in a redesign and expansion of the college gallery in Nesbitt Hall, and the relocation of the Department of Architecture offices and full-time studios to a vacant and available ground floor space at 3201 Arch Street, a loft building two blocks north of Nesbitt Hall, expanding facilities for Digital Media into the space vacated by the department. Because of the Department of Architecture's unique structure within the college, it was clearly the easiest unit to move, and the qualities of the available space were most compatible with reuse as an architectural studio. Another reason for this move was growth. The configuration of the new studio allowed the enrollment in *the 2 + 4 Option* - the University's most heavily subscribed major - to increase from 24 to 28 students per year. Both projects, gallery and new studio, were designed by the adjunct faculty firm of Sandvold-Blanda, selected for the project from a short list of faculty and alumni architectural firms, a process insisted upon by Dean Estrin. This renovation has provided the department with an excellent facility - one large studio for the first and -second year classes of *the 2 + 4 Option,* along with departmental and faculty offices, a slide room, two adjacent seminar rooms, and storage. The department has benefited from this move on a variety of levels. The consolidated studio has provided better interaction between the two 2 + 4 years, and upgraded electronic capabilities have helped as well. Providing individual faculty offices was also a welcome improvement, and having a facility with distinct architectural character has reinforced the department's distinct identity and a provided a clear presence on campus.

Over the past six years the Drexel student architectural society, renamed AIAS Drexel, has become a dynamic component in the life of the program. The society strengthened its link with AIAS and embarked on an extensive program of social, travel, and service activities. In 2003 AIAS honored the Drexel chapter with the 2003 AIAS Chapter Honor Award and 2003 AIAS Chapter President Honor Award. Over the past four years the department has developed a design-build

course in which students could design and construct a variety of simple structures placed around campus. What started as an experiment is now an expectation for full-time students, supported by student government, the administration, and very generous facilities staff. The department is now exploring ways to offer a parallel design-build experience for its part-time students as well. In 2003 Professor Judith Bing was elected Northeast Director of ACSA, serving on the Board of Directors with distinction for a two year term, and through her participation, increased national awareness of Drexel's contribution to architectural education.

In fall 2002 the Provost directed the Department of Architecture to review the structure of the Bachelor of Architecture degree program with respect to the total credits required. As part of its normal review of programs the administration was concerned that our degree credit requirement was not equivalent to other accredited architecture programs. Accordingly the department proposed additional credits in upper level studios, and in the two required CADD courses. These changes increased the total credits in the program from 192 to 209 credits. These changes were reviewed and approved by college and university curriculum committees in spring 2003 and took effect in September 2003.

Predictably, many students were upset by the credit increase since tuition for part-time students is charged by the credit. Most could agree with the need to equate the Drexel program with other B.Arch. programs, and the need to validate the demands of upper level studios with increased credits. However, many also interpreted the increased credits as an unjustified abrupt rise in the cost of their education with no corresponding improvement in its quality to which they felt entitled. A special meeting on the issue was held in October 2003. It was well attended. Department Head Paul Hirshorn presented the rationale behind the credit changes, followed by a question and answer session, and a frank and open discussion on a variety of issues. From a student's point of view the main objection was the substantial rise in their tuition, and this was certainly a related result. Since the working Drexel student body receives almost no scholarship support, and pays for tuition out of current income, this tuition increase was significant to them.

Once the necessity for the credit increase was accepted, the students responded in an extraordinarily positive way. If their opinion could not affect the university's decision to raise credits, the students seemed to reason, then, their focus ought to shift to the quality of their program, and what might be improved. Following the October meeting the AIAS chapter formed a *Task Force for Progressive Education,* electing representatives from each studio year, and conducting surveys of student opinion. The final report of this Task Force, two years in the making, was presented to the faculty at their spring 2005 meeting. The report that was generated was worth the wait. It confirmed problems about which the faculty have been aware (no model shop), but also uncovered issues about which the faculty were not aware (course scheduling, consistent studio feedback, studio class procedures), or might have underestimated (plotting facilities). It also made a series of thoughtful suggestions for improvements. Over the summer the department has begun to respond to various points in the student survey, and intends to continue the process until all points raised have been carefully considered, and responded to publicly. More importantly, the department sees this as an opportunity to formalize a different sort of discussion with the student body to elicit better feedback on an ongoing basis.

The increased credit issue deserves a few final observations that summarize our current condition. First, the credit increase was validated by the 2004 NAAB Conditions which now require all B.Arch. programs to reach a minimum 225 quarter credits by 2015. We can now see the 2003 credit increase as a head start in meeting this requirement, accounting for half of the additional required credits. Secondly, even though the rise in the cost of a Drexel architectural

education has certainly affected all part-time students, no drop in enrollment has been discernable over the past two years as a result. Drexel's part-time program, one must conclude, still remains an affordable option for those students who cannot study full-time. Finally, the credit increase issue mobilized the student body to express its opinions, setting the stage for a continuing productive dialog within the department.

The past academic year has been marked by changes in college and university senior leadership. In spring 2004 COMAD Dean Estrin resigned his position to become Vice President of the American Film Institute. The current search schedule calls for the appointment of a new dean by fall 2005. Once again the major challenge for the new dean will be insufficient and inadequate space and facilities for an expanding College of Media Arts & Design. Also Dr. Stephen Director was appointed Provost in spring 2005 after a search process lasting more than a year. Dr. Director will be taking on the challenge of Drexel's ambitious aspirations over the coming decade. Both the university and the department were very well served in this transitional year by interim leaders in these important positions. Nevertheless, the department looks forward to working with new leadership, briefing them about the unique strengths and potential of architecture at Drexel.

The Department of Architecture is in a stronger position today than it was six years ago. Since the 2000 Visit *the Two + Four Option* has matured. Eight classes have graduated, and twelve classes have been launched into professional practice. The effectiveness of this concept can now be confirmed with greater confidence. The students are certainly performing with increasing confidence – continuing to work with distinction in both classroom and in the office, raising their student organization to national prominence, and seeking a more active voice in issues which affect the quality of their education. Department facilities have improved markedly for both full-time (new studio) and part-time (studio air-conditioning) students, although there are still facility issues that demand continuing attention. Looking forward, the department expects to continue its integral role as a productive component of Philadelphia's architectural community, and as a major advocate of the work/study format for architectural education. The faculty and students are confident in the effectiveness of Drexel University's alternative system of architectural education, and all expect it to remain agile in response to the evolving professional environment.

4.   Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2005 Drexel University Architecture Program Report:

The Department of Architecture should educate competent practitioners and prepare them for continuing self-education.
Graduates should be able to identify human and environmental needs and answer these needs in creating the built environment. Graduates should master professional knowledge and skills, understanding them within a broad social and environmental context, and should absorb the methods and logic of architectural processes which address the practice of architecture as a continuing learning process. Graduates should develop a vision of architecture's future contributions to society in ordering and giving meaning to the physical setting for human events.

The Department of Architecture should maintain and nurture a program that is offered primarily in the evening so that students are able to undertake their studies in a work/study format.
The work/study format integrates the Department of Architecture into the Drexel University system of cooperative education while making the study of architecture available to a wide range of students who might otherwise be excluded. Furthermore, the evening format enables

the Department to draw from the expertise and experience of the professional community to assemble its faculty. This is the only architectural program in the region which directly addresses the needs of the working student. The work/study aspect of our program was highlighted in the Boyer Report, Building Community, under *diversity of missions,* and reinforced in the discussion of Goal Six, *A Unified Profession.*

The mission of the Department of Architecture creates a perfect fit with the Mission of Drexel University since it combines a commitment to technical expertise developed with a strong experience in the work place in an urban setting. This Mission Statement was first published by the Department of Architecture in the 1986 APR. This Mission Statement has been reaffirmed by the Faculty of the Department of Architecture on numerous occasions, most recently in August 2005.

5.   **Program Strategic Plan**

The following text is taken from the 2005 Drexel University Architecture Program Report:

The Students: The student body is mature and dedicated. They are highly disciplined, having to balance work and school as well as family responsibilities and long commutes. Since the program enables the entire student body to enter the profession during their course of study, Drexel students fully understand the characteristics of practice, and they overwhelmingly affirm their commitment to it.

The Faculty: The faculty is composed of dedicated and experienced teachers. A large adjunct staff of sixty, many with over 20 years of service, have distinguished practices and are considered leaders of the profession. They have made a long-term commitment to teaching at Drexel, and are uniformly generous in their support of the program and of their students.

Open Access: Drexel's part-time evening program is one of only five accredited part-time evening architecture programs in the country (BAC, Drexel, Florida Atlantic, Morgan State, and the New School), and the only one in the Philadelphia region. (By comparison there are 89 law schools in the country with a part-time option, at least two located in every major metropolitan region). Drexel has always provided an opportunity for non-traditional students who must work to pursue a career in architecture. The importance of this option was heightened when the possibility of becoming licensed without an accredited degree was eliminated. Drexel has kept the door open. Admission requirements to the part-time program are modest, and part-time tuition is affordable. Clearly Drexel's part-time program makes an important contribution to social equity in our profession, providing access for those who have no other option.

The Work-Study Format and Professional Support: The ability to launch a career before one's formal course of study is completed is a great opportunity. First, students discover early in their program the character of the profession to which they are committed, and the quality of the experience which will govern their working lives. Second, students can place their academic work in the context of practice to better comprehend its value and purpose. Third, students dovetail the IDP process with the final years of their academic program. Fourth, students earn full-time salaries before graduation. Finally, students receive the support of a caring profession which accepts an obligation to mentor its young practitioners.

The Two + Four Option: This unique educational experiment combines the best aspects of two worlds for a small group of traditional college students who are suited to this approach. Two years of full-time study are followed by four years of concurrent work and study, providing an

accelerated entry into the fession. The quality of students attracted to the program is superior, and their collective success in the workplace is both gratifying and reaffirming.

Philadelphia: The Philadelphia region is graced with a large and active architectural community. The AIA and the Design Advocacy Group of Philadelphia are quite active in creating public discussion on regional design and planning issues. There are four accredited architectural programs in Philadelphia. There is a lively interaction among the programs which often share faculty and public lectures. Most importantly, Philadelphia and its region is an extraordinary resource of three hundred years of landmark architecture, urban planning, urban and suburban environments. The architecture of the city plus its network of museums and other cultural institutions place Drexel in an architectural laboratory to which the program makes constant reference.

Program Challenges

Facilities: The studios serve Drexel's two student populations well, but they are located three blocks apart. This is a gulf that .prevents significant student interaction. Generous work space is provided for the students in the first two years *of the 2 + 4 Option, but no* work space is available for their evening counterparts. At present no central computer and plotting facility has been provided for part-time architectural students. Part-time students, particularly those in the early years who are not yet employed in architectural firms, need more support.

Supporting Adjunct Faculty: Our professional program relies on the expertise and enthusiasm of accomplished practitioners. It is one of our strengths. In recent years university hiring procedures has made it increasingly difficult for them to access the web and to use the library in a timely manner to prepare their courses. A solution to this problem must be found. At the same time salary raises for adjuncts lag behind raises for full-time employees, and their benefits, modest at best, have been slowly eroded. Adequate support and recognition for excellent adjunct faculty is critical to the continued vitality of the many programs at Drexel.

Reinforcing Community: Because the architectural students at Drexel are diverse, working in separate facilities, and working on exceedingly tight schedules, it is important to work extra hard at building community. The Summer Study Tours frequently provide the most memorable highlight in the education of our students, for social as well as academic reasons. Scholarships exist for the study tours, but the program could use three times the current level of support to underwrite greater participation in this valuable enrichment opportunity. AIAS Drexel plays an important role in the life of the program, but it still needs to attract a greater proportion of evening students into its active membership. By its nature the Drexel program is constantly challenged to explore all activities and strategies which foster interaction between students, faculty, and the profession.

The Departments goals and objectives are constantly reassessed through the interaction of the faculty, the faculty committees, the Department Head, the students, the alumni, and the professional community. The following five year Strategic Plan has been endorsed by the faculty in August 2005.

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE STRATEGIC PLAN
Introduction

The Bachelor of Architecture program at Drexel is unique. Its part-time evening format, which links working students with practicing faculty, has provided a flexible approach to architectural education for over a century. In the last decade *the 2 + 4 Option has* enabled a small, highly motivated group of high school graduates to enjoy the advantages of the Drexel work-study approach, along with the non-traditional students who cannot afford full-time study. By drawing on a student body in diverse circumstances the Department of Architecture provides a rich and stable learning environment. By depending on practitioners for the majority of its instruction, the department remains agile in adapting to changing professional expectations and requirements. The Drexel program can be a national model for an alternate approach to architectural education, and a national magnet for a severely underserved population.

A VISION STATEMENT, 2005-2010

Achieving Excellence
Over the next five years the department must create a single physical environment to unify the two streams of its unique program. All architecture programs operate as unified communities, with younger students absorbing standards and expectations by observing senior students work and work habits. The work/study nature of Drexel's program makes student networking even more important as students build their careers. Although the department's two studio facilities are each well suited to their purpose, their distance from one another is a barrier to the integration of the two streams,. The department strives for a unified program. A consolidated facility is the key to achieving it.

Over the next five years the Department of Architecture must work within the university structure to improve support for all adjunct faculty. Our professional program relies on the expertise and enthusiasm of accomplished practitioners. It is one of our strengths. In recent years university hiring procedures has made it increasingly difficult for them to access the web and to use the library in a timely manner to prepare their courses. A solution to this problem must be found. At the same time salary raises for adjuncts lag behind raises for full-time employees, and their benefits, modest at best, have been slowly eroded. Adequate support and recognition for excellent adjunct faculty is critical to the health of the architecture program.

Over the next five years the department expects to maintain a stable and productive work/study program in large part due to its strengths - a strong faculty of practicing architect educators and a highly motivated, mature student body. The Department of Architecture will continue its integral role as a productive component of Philadelphia's architectural community, and the only resort for the non traditional architectural student in the region. The department expects to improve its curriculum continually, keeping a focus on an urban agenda while maintaining broad coverage of the concerns of our society and the needs of the profession. Staying current means that the Bachelor of Architecture program must stay continuously at the cutting edge of digital technology. All computer-based aspects involved in our program must be given continuous attention, from web-based instruction to the use of increasingly sophisticated CADD applications. Because of our practicing faculty and working students the Department of Architecture can be trusted to continuously monitor evolving issues of contemporary practice.

Over the next five years the department must continue to solicit external support from alumni, firms, and friends for minority support, travel stipends, and scholarships in general. These are all priorities for the support and enrichment of our students..

Maximizing Potential
Over the next five years the unique program in Architecture at Drexel has the potential to expand its recruitment nationally. There are 120 accredited architecture programs in the United

States, but only 5 offer it in a part-time evening format. This means there is an extensive pool of non-traditional learners going unserved, those who wish to continue their education but must work full-time, and the department has the capacity to serve more of them. Currently the Evening Program is local in scope, attracting only students who already live in the Delaware Valley. With proper recruiting at community colleges around the country, Drexel can easily target and attract students with developed job-related skills who would relocate to Philadelphia to take advantage of our work-study opportunity. Increased support services for the placement and housing of part-time students, and better work environments for part-time students would be necessary to realize this potential, but these are areas that need attention in any case. Similarly, *the 2 + 4 Option,* because of its unique characteristics and popularity, could be placed in the vanguard of Drexel's national recruiting effort. This sort of recruitment effort would contribute to increased national visibility of the university, while making a national statement about the nature of architectural education.

Over the next five years the department should become a center for post-professional and continuing education in architecture. The Department of Architecture's experience in delivering part-time education and its wealth of expertise in its adjunct faculty can be the basis for post-professional certificates and perhaps degrees, as well as continuing education programs and short courses. Annual continuing education credits are required by the AIA and by some states. The challenge is to identify topics of interest to the professional community of the Delaware Valley, and to deliver them at a competitive cost.

GOAL AND OBJECTIVE, 2005-2010
These goals and objectives have been moled to achieve the vision set forth in this Strategic Plan. They focus on addressing improvements which will pay the greatest dividends in program quality and efficiency, and on maintaining and taking advantage of the department's unique strengths.

GOAL 1: Provide adjacent facilities for full-time and part-time students. Provide working facilities for part-time students

Action Steps	*Time Line*
Create review space for evening students adjacent to the Department's facility at 3201 Arch Street. Create new 10,000 sf open Studio facity to serve 12 sections concurrently.	2007-2010
Renovate rm. 410 in Main Building for evening drawing sections.	2005-2006
Provide access to plotting for part-time students.	2005-2006
Provide evening and weekend access to COMAD woodshop for part-time students, and adequate arrangements for their certification on the equipment.	2005-2006
Provide dedicated studio workspace for part-time students.	2006-2008

GOAL 2: Improve support for adjunct faculty in the university

Action Steps	*Time Line*
Provide year round library access to specified adjuncts	2005-2006

Provide year round access to email and WebCT for qualified adjuncts   2005-2006

Propose linking adjunct raises to full-time faculty raises   on-going

Propose expanded benefit opportunities for long-term adjunct faculty on-going

**GOAL 3: Provide the most professionally integrated approach to architectural   education
in the region.**

Action Steps   *Time Line*

Maintain and strengthen the infrastructure for computing for   on-going
architecture

Establish the use of WebCT in all courses   2005-2006

Develop aDesign-Build course for part-time students   2005-2007

Maintain a flexible mode of program delivery based on the strengths   on-going
of the faculty and needs of the students

Maintain and strengthen job placement procedures and monitoring   on-going

Maintain and strengthen the monitoring of student participation in the   on-going
Intern Development Program.

Continue to monitor national and regional trends about first   on-going
professional degree nomenclature to ensure Drexel can position
its programs effectively

Monitor NAAB accreditation conditions and procedures and respond   on-going
to changes

**GOAL 4: Expand external support from alumni, practitioners, and
friends to contribute in three areas –scholarships, student travel,
minority support**

Action Steps   *Time Line*

Channel giving to honor significant contributors to the Drexel   on-   going
program

Develop annual giving program to fund student travel   on-going

**GOAL 5: Expand visibility of both the Evening Program and the
2 + 4 Option through national recruiting**

Action Steps   *Time Line*

Recruit for Evening Program nationally at community colleges which   2006-2010
offer architecture or architectural technology

Incoordination with efforts of the Office of Admissions, expand national recruitment for 2 + 4 Option with targeted mailing and email to high performing high school seniors

2006-2010

Provide expanded placement services for part-time students relocating to Philadelphia area, with support from Steinbright Career Development Center

2006-2010

Provide housing advice for part-time students relocating to Philadelphia area

2006-2010

GOAL 6: Establish part-time architectural education at the post-professional level

Action Steps   *Time Line*

Develop post-professional certificate program in Health Facilities Design incoordination with the School of Public Health, and the Interior Design Program

2005-2006

Explore possibility ofpart-time .post-professional masters in specialty areas for which there is a demonstrable demand

2005-2007

Develop Continuing Education programs to serve the profession.

2005-2007

Develop funding for additional minority scholarships

on-going

Appendix B: The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the NCARB
Cornelius (Kin) DuBois, AIA, NCARB
Klipp
1512 Larimer St.-Bridge Level
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 893-1990
(303) 893-2204 fax
kin@klipparch.com

Representing the AIA
Catherine M. Roussel, AIA
Director of Education
The American Institute of Architects
1735 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 626-7417
(202) 626-7527
croussel@aia.org

Representing the AIAS
Najahyia L. Cinchilla
1617 S. Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009
(313) 205-6735
nchinchi@umd.edu

Representing the ACSA
Norman R. Millar, Architect
1450 Lakeshore Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90026
(213) 484-2733
(213) 484-0885
nrmillar@earthlink.net

Observer
Ms. Gray Read
School of Architecture
Florida International University
Miami, FL 33199
(305) 348-2672
readg@fiu.edu

Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Drexel University – Department of Architecture

Schedule for NAAB Visiting Team

Saturday evening, March 4, 2006 to Wednesday morning, March 8, 2006

Saturday, March 4, 2006

4:00 PM	Department Head Meets Team Chair in Great Court, Main Building, 32nd & Chestnut Streets
4:15 PM	Review of Team Room by Team Chair
6:00 PM	Team Arrival Introductions at The Sheraton University City
6:30 PM	Team Dinner with Department Head *Pod,* 3600 Sansom Street
8:00 PM	Team Orientation @ Hotel (Team Chair Suite)

Sunday, March 5, 2006

8:00-9:00 AM	Breakfast, Team alone The Sheraton University City
9:00 – 9:30 AM	Walk to Campus Brief Overview of Team Room by Department Head & Assistant Department Head
9:30-12:00 noon	Team Initial Review of Exhibits and Records Team Room
12:30-1:45 PM	Lunch Meeting Visiting Team with Department Head & Assistant Department Head *White Dog Cafe,* 3420 Sansom Street Walk to Campus
2:00-5:00 PM	Continued Review of Exhibits and Records Team Room, Architecture Studios, Main Building
5:00-6:00 PM	Reception All Architectural Faculty Architecture Studios, Main Building

6:00-7:00 PM	Meeting with Faculty
	All Architecture Faculty
	Architecture Studios, Main Building
7:00-9:00 PM	Dinner with Senior Faculty
	White Dog Cafe, 3420 Sansom Street
	Walk to Hotel
9:15-9:45 PM	Team Meeting
	Team Chair's Suite, The Sheraton University City

Monday, March 6, 2006

8:30-9:30 AM	Breakfast Meeting
	Visiting Team with Department Head
	The Sheraton University City
	Walk to Campus
10:00-10:30 AM	Visiting Team Meeting with
	President **Constantine Papadakis** and
	Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs **Dr. Stephen Director**
	President's Office, 1st Floor, Main Building
10:30-12:15 noon	Tour of the University
10:45 - 11:15	1. Library Tour with *Ann Keith Kennedy & Mark Brack*
11:15 – 11:30	2. Design Arts Annex: Woodshop with *Dino Pelliccia*
11:30 - 12:15	3. 3201 Arch: Studios / Offices / Exhibit of Faculty & Alumni Work
12:15-1:00 PM	Luncheon
	Team alone, Team Room
1:15-1:45 PM	Visiting Team Meeting with
	Dean **Allen Sabinson,** Westphal College of Media Arts & Design, and
	Dean **Ali Houshmand,** Goodwin College of Professional Studies
	Room 110, Nesbitt Hall
2:00-2:45 PM	Visit classes:
	ARCH 102, Studio 1-B: Rm.111a, 3201 Arch
	Professors Bing & Oskey
	ARCH 105, Studio 3-A: Rm.111b, 3201 Arch
	Professors Burns & Nixon
2:45-4:45 PM	Continued Team Review of Exhibits and Records
	Team Room
5:00-6:30 PM	Reception & Dinner Meeting with Student Leaders
	Drexel University Club, MacAlister Hall, 6th Floor

6:30-7:30 PM	Visiting Team Meeting with Student Body
	Stein Auditorium, Nesbitt Hall

7:30-9:00 PM   Visit classes:

ARCH 342, Theories of Architecture II: Rm.018, 3201 Arch
Professor Benaissa
ARCH 442, Urban Design Seminar II: Rm. 414, Main Bldg.
Professor Stainbrook
ARCH 497, Thesis II: Arch. Studios, Main Bldg.
Professors Arfaa, Blatteau, Bronstein, Dagit,
Matzkin, Schade, Sheikholeslami, Ytterberg
CIVE 262, Materials & Structural Behavior II: Rm. 279, Main Bldg.
Professor Robert Brehm

Team Debriefing, Team Room
Walk to Hotel

Tuesday, March 7, 2006

8:30-9:15 AM   Breakfast Meeting
Visiting Team with Department Head
The Sheraton University City

Walk to Campus

9:30-11:30 AM   Team Time, Team Room

11:30-12:00 noon   Visit class:
ARCH 142, Architecture & Society II: Room 505, Nesbitt Hall
Professor Brack

12:00 noon-1:00 PM   Luncheon, team alone
Drexel University Club, MacAlister Hall, 6th Floor

1:00-2:00 PM   Visiting Team Meeting with Design Faculty
Team Room

2:00-2:30 PM   Visiting Team Meeting with History and Theory Faculty
Team Room

2:30-3:00 PM   Visiting Team Meeting with Technology and Professional Practice Faculty
Team Room

3:00-4:30 PM   Team Time
Complete Review of Exhibits and Records
Team Room

4:30- 5:00 PM   Visit class:
ARCH 150, Intro to CADD: Rm.018, 3201 Arch
Professor Kurian

5:00-6:30 PM   Visiting Team Reception with Alumni and Architectural Community
                                 Pearlstein Gallery, Nesbitt Hall

6:30-9:00 PM   Accreditation Deliberations and Drafting the VTR

                                 Visit classes (Optional), 7:30 – 9:30
                                 1. ARCH 232, 3rd Year Studio: Rms. 414, 415, 421, Studios, Main Bldg.
                                      Professors Bonitatibus, Howard, Nixon, Varenhorst
                                 2. ARCH 352, 5th Year Studio: Rm. 418, Arch Studios, Main Bldg.
                                      Professors Jones, Castner, Defazio, Kearney, McCoubrey
                                 3. ARCH 156, Graphic Communications I: Rm.322, Nesbitt Hall
                                      Professors Dundon & Bracali
                                 4. CIVE 262, Materials & Structural Behavior II: Rm.279, Main Bldg.
                                      Professor Donch
                                 5. ARCH 345, History of Modern Movement II, Rm. 111, Academic Building
                                      Professor Bing

9:00-10:00 PM   Dinner, team alone
                                 Zocalo, 3600 Lancaster Avenue

                                 Walk to Hotel

Wednesday, March 8, 2006

8:30-9:30 AM   Breakfast Meeting
                                 Visiting Team with Department Head
                                 The Sheraton University City

                                 Check out of Hotel
                                 Taxis to Main Building

10:00-10:30 AM   Visiting Team Meeting with
                                 Dean **Allen Sabinson,** Westphal College of Media Arts & Design, and
                                 Dean **Ali Houshmand,** Goodwin College of Professional Studies
                                 Team Room

10:30-11:00 AM   Visiting Team Meeting with
                                 President **Constantine Papadakis** and
                                 Provost & Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs **Stephen Director,**
                                 President's Office, 1st Floor, Main Building

11:00-11:30 AM   Visiting Team Meeting with
                                 Faculty and Students
                                 Team Room
                                 Architecture Studios, Main Building

11:30 AM   Departure

IV. **Report Signatures**

Respectfully Submitted,

Cornelius DuBois, AIA, NCARB   **Representing the NCARB**
Team Chair

Catherine Roussel, AIA   **Representing the AIA**
Team member

Najahyia Chinchilla, AIAS   **Representing the AIAS**
Team member

Norman Millar, AIA   **Representing the ACSA**
Team member

Gray Read, PhD   **Observer**