



UNIVERSITY
OF
LOUISIANA
L a f a y e t t e

UL Lafayette Undergraduate Program Review Documentation

Degree Name:

Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies

Concentrations and Certificates Awarded in Conjunction with Degree Program (with submajor codes and/or CIP codes if known):

Mission. Describe the program’s mission, goals, and core values as they relate to the:

- University’s mission and goals, particularly as articulated in the strategic plans of each.
- Describe how the program’s mission and values relate to the national context in this field
- Attach the department’s/program’s strategic plan.

Mission: The University of Louisiana at Lafayette, the largest member of the University of Louisiana System, is a public institution of higher education offering bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees. Within the Carnegie classification, UL Lafayette is designated as a Research University with high research activity. The University’s academic programs are administered by nine Colleges: Arts, Education, Engineering, General Studies, Liberal Arts, Nursing & Allied Health Professions, B. I. Moody II College of Business Administration, the Ray P. Authement College of Sciences, and the Graduate School. The University is dedicated to achieving excellence in undergraduate and graduate education, in research, and in public service. For undergraduate education, this commitment implies a fundamental subscription to general education, rooted in the primacy of the traditional liberal arts and sciences as the core around which all curricula are developed. The graduate programs seek to develop scholars who will variously advance knowledge, cultivate aesthetic sensibility, and improve the material conditions of humankind. The University reaffirms its historic commitment to diversity and integration. Thus, through instruction, research, and service, the University promotes regional economic and cultural development, explores solutions to national and world issues, and advances its reputation among its peers.

Vision: To further the University’s evolution as a distinctive institution recognized as a catalyst for transformation – of students, faculty, staff, Acadiana, Louisiana, and the globe – through its engagement in research, scholarship, creativity, and the enhancement of our unique culture.

Values: UL Lafayette’s core values reflect the principles in which we believe and to which we aspire as we collaborate and persist toward the fulfillment of our mission.

1. Access, opportunity and success for all students as we synergistically partner with them in their development as globally responsible, productive citizens.
2. An informed appreciation for and desire to contribute to our culturally-rich and unique community, which simultaneously embodies a progressive spirit of creativity, a dedicated work ethic, a resilient value for family, and a robust joie de vivre.
3. The creation and dissemination of knowledge that elevates the stature of our community of scholars and contributes to the betterment of our world.
4. Civility and integrity in all of our interactions to promote a collegial, diverse and healthful learning environment.
5. Engagement of all our stakeholders in our pluralistic quest to fulfill our mission.

6. Stewardship that demonstrates an appreciation and respect for all the resources that we can impact, and which have been entrusted to us.
7. Commitment to open communication and constructive dialogue to foster a shared understanding of our progress, challenges and accomplishments.

(Approved and adopted by the University Council in February 2009. For full text of the document, "*Tradition, Transition, Transformation*", refer to: <http://www.louisiana.edu/Faculty/Senate/Bruderfiles/Strategic.pdf>)

Institution in the Context of 21st Century Higher Education

The University's 2009-14 Strategic Plan identifies 8 Strategic Imperatives that serve to guide University initiatives in the 21st century:

1. Strengthening student recruitment and enrollment processes.
2. Enhancing student engagement and success.
3. Facilitating quality teaching and learning.
4. Supporting the research portfolio of our community of scholars.
5. Preparing our students to thrive as global citizens.
6. Creating an institution our stakeholders will highly regard.
7. Optimizing administrative effectiveness and efficiency.
8. Fostering economic and community development.

Each of these imperatives is a call for action to be accomplished as the institution moves forward. (The specific institutional actions being undertaken to address these imperatives are outlined in the "*Tradition, Transition, Transformation*" document available at: <<http://www.louisiana.edu/Faculty/Senate/Bruderfiles/Strategic.pdf>>.

SoAD Mission: The educational mission of the SoAD is to cultivate student-centered professional programs in architecture, industrial design, and interior design through pedagogy based on responsiveness to material, technological, cultural and societal environments.

SoAD Vision: The vision of the SoAD is to contribute a critical, ethical, and poetic voice to the ongoing development of the design professions through engagement with multiple and diverse communities. We strive to integrate our curricula with community-based research and scholarship that ultimately improves the public good.

SoAD Values: The SoAD has developed a set of design values that inform our pedagogy and our curricula. These are intended to complement the University Values expressed in the document *Tradition, Transition, Transformation* <<http://www.louisiana.edu/Faculty/Senate/Bruderfiles/Strategic.pdf>>:

- We value *Collaboration*. Design is a social act born out of collaboration.
- We value *Cultural Specificity*. Cultural specificity is integral to the understanding of design at all scales, from the local to the global.
- We value *Diversity*. Effective design collaboration demands an environment in which diversity of freely expressed positions and approaches is respected.
- We value *Integrity*. Effective education demands an environment characterized by individual and community integrity, honesty and empathy.
- We value *Environmental Responsibility*. As designers and citizens, we have a responsibility to proactive stewardship of the buildings and the products we make and the environments in which these live and interact.
- We value *Critical Discourse*. The condition that makes the academy relevant is honest and open engagement with the issues critical to our environment and our future.

Our architectural curriculum going forward in the 21st century is based on the following understanding and interpretation of our mission and vision: Our physical environment is the world we have inherited. Our social/cultural environment is what we make of the world. Our technological environment includes the ever-developing tools and techniques we use to modify our physical environment into a social and cultural one. Our professional environment includes the discipline and ethics that guide us in making decisions about how to use technology to transform our physical environments into a socially generous, culturally rich, life affirming and cooperative environment for human life to reach its highest potential. It is these four environments that we believe are at the heart of the world in which we live, and it is around these four categories that we structure our pedagogy.

SoAD STRATEGIC PLAN

Strategic Imperative I: Strengthening Student Recruitment, Retention, and Enrollment Processes

- I.A *To Raise Awareness and Enhance the Visibility of our Programs*
 - 1. Create a unified and integrated website with appropriate interactivity, utility, comprehensiveness, aesthetics and communicative capacity.
 - 2. Showcase the programs through marketing and promotion.
 - a. Support student travel to professional conferences.
 - b. Support student participation in international and national competitions
 - c. Promote our graduate program more vigorously.
 - 3. Pursue strategies to grow our Graduate Program, including the pursuit of resources to offer out-of-state student assistantships.
- I.B *To Advance our Positioning as a Program of 'Choice'*
 - 1. Focus on the professional development of the architecture student
 - 2. Collaborate with Honors students and Honors department.
 - 3. Develop and enhance our current service learning efforts on campus and in the community.
 - 4. Establish our School as a leader in environmental responsibility, safety, and physical accessibility on campus.
 - 5. Support Certificates, Programs and Institutions, e.g., preservation, sustainability, urban design, design/build, history/theory, as a means of promoting graduate program.
 - 6. Maintain the highest standards of professionalism through accreditation and professional organizations
- I.C *To Better Manage our Enrollment Process*
 - 1. Establish articulation agreements with the local community colleges.
 - 2. Coordinate the diversity of incoming students through clearly stated curricula, tracks, minors, etc.
 - 3. Continue to support Preview Day as a critical opportunity to communicate with incoming students.
- I.D *To Address Issue of Student Retention*
 - 1. Establish mentoring program for incoming students.
 - 2. Track impact of admission criteria and evaluation process on the student body.

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVE II-Enhancing Student Engagement and Success

- II.A *Create a Meaningful First-Year Experience*
 - 1. Support the integration of design faculty into the UNIV 100 course.
- II.B *Improve the Campus Climate for Students*
 - 1. Track Fletcher Hall improvements and additions.

2. Participate in and support the University's Master Plan through our professional involvement in its development.

II.C *Increase Number of Students Graduating*

1. Track changes of majors within the design curricula.
2. Evaluate current advising efforts based on the specific needs of a design student.
3. Encourage third-year students to begin the IDP experience while still in school.

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVE III: Facilitating Quality Teaching and Learning

III.A *To Recruit, Hire, and Maintain the Best Faculty for Student Learning*

1. Reinforce quality teaching and student research through recognition at Annual Awards Ceremony.
2. Encourage faculty to provide more course offerings in the summer.
3. Promote faculty diversity by adhering to the University's EEOC policy on hiring
4. Enhance commitment to faculty development by instituting a faculty-to-faculty mentoring program.

III.B *To Enhance the Classroom Experience*

1. Develop a matrix regarding current use, needs, and long-term goals of information technology.
2. Create enticements (financial, time, or other) to encourage faculty to attend distance-learning seminars, and develop distance-learning courses.
3. Identify and analyze cross-disciplinary degrees and coursework on campus.
4. Raise the profile of graduate study and create the environment and funding structure for growth.
5. Offer distance learning to select markets and assure high quality delivery.

III.C *To Improve Learning Through Evidence Based Assessment*

1. Develop integrated system of student assessment.

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVE IV – Supporting the Research Portfolio of our Community of Scholars

IV.A *To Plan Strategically for Enhanced Research Efforts and Results*

1. Pursue a regular rotation of STEP and Board of Regents grant proposals from each of the programs.
2. Continue to apply for grants.

IV.B *To Foster the Creation of Rigorous Research and other Eminent Intellectual Contributions*

1. Sponsor thematic symposia.
2. Write, publish and present peer-reviewed research and scholarship regularly.

IV.C *To Focus on Signature Initiatives Supporting the Future of our Earth and Society*

1. Continue to develop and support our signature specialized institutes, such as Community Design Workshop, Building Institute, Resilience Studio, and Civic Development Studio.
2. Support sustainability initiatives.

IV.D *To Grow Successful Academic Centers and Programs to Enable Greater Levels of Achievement*

1. Continue to seek out projects, competitions and other opportunities for promoting and showcasing our faculty and students' achievements.
2. Establish a truly integrated collaborative studio that includes architecture students, interior design students and industrial design students working with faculty from each discipline.

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVE V: Preparing Our Students to Thrive as Global Citizens

V.A *To Widen our Global Perspective*

1. Centralize international functions of SoAD and coordinate with University.
2. Pursue an increased number of international students and faculty.
3. Engage international students in campus life.
4. Expand and invest in Study Abroad course offerings.
5. Pursue and develop a coordinated 'travel curriculum' of studio field trips.

- V.B *To Ensure our students are Poised to Face Major Challenges of the 21st Century*
1. Reinforce a studio culture and pedagogy that values cultural diversity.
 2. Evaluate the curriculum and course offerings based on global and sustainability issues.

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVE VI-Creating an Institution Our Stakeholders Will Regard Highly

- VI.A *Creating A Department our Stakeholders Will Highly Regard*
1. Improve branding and marketing of current endeavors through available advertising, marketing, and social media venues.
 2. Publicize high-profile initiatives, research contributions and academic programs.
 3. Educate the community on the values of design.
- VI.B *To Provide Support for the Athletic Programs and Ragin' Cajun Athletic Foundation*
1. Where possible support and engage the athletic programs and the Ragin' Cajun Athletic Foundation.
- VI.C *Increase Voluntary Contributions for Educational Purposes*
1. Develop master plan for continual fundraising.
 2. Develop optimal relationships between the University, School, students, and affiliated organizations.
 3. Elevate the role and responsibility of student organizations in fund-raising initiatives.
 4. Develop an integrative master plan for donor relations, fund raising and stewardship with the collaboration of the UL Lafayette Foundation.
- VI.D *Plan for the Growth Needs of the School*
1. Support the master plan for the use and future expansion of university properties and facilities.

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVE VII-Optimizing Administrative Effectiveness and Efficiency

- VII.A *To Focus on Human Resource Management Challenges*
1. Create a hiring and search committee policy that optimizes national, regional and local advertising opportunities and is ethical in hiring, evaluation and compensation practices.
- VII.B *To Optimally Structure the School of Architecture and Design*
1. Periodically examine its formal and informal administrative organization and reporting structures to ensure the appropriate level of decentralization; such review will be conducted in a transparent manner.
 2. Foster communication among internal stakeholders.

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVE VIII - Fostering Economic and Community Development

- VIII.A *To Support Internal Stakeholders Working to Generate a Positive Economic, Scientific, Cultural or Social Impact*
1. Continue to market and license designs developed by our specialized institutes and/or our faculty.
 2. Submit Intellectual Property Disclosure Forms to the Research Office for possible future patents (for example, Synthetic Masonry Units or SMU's).
 3. Provide opportunities for collaborative research among faculty members in the School.
- VIII.B *To Further Develop the Research Park to Enable Both Research Generation and Economic Development*
1. Seek opportunities to make connections between our specialized institutes and Research Park.
- VIII.C *To Increase the Interface Between the Community and the School of Architecture and Design*
1. Seek opportunities for faculty to sit on regional and local boards and committees.
 2. Continue to develop urban projects for local and regional cities, small towns, and neighborhoods.
 3. Seek opportunities to partner with not-for-profits like Ragin' Cajun Facilities and Habitat for Humanity.
 4. Seek opportunities to offer continuing education programs for the architectural community.
- VIII.D *To Enhance the Vibrancy of the State of Louisiana*
1. Continue to provide professional education for architects and designers who will serve the state of Louisiana.

2. Coordinate with Career Services to offer effective Career Days for our students.

A description of the data and information sources used to inform the development of these objectives.

The information sources used by the SoAD to develop these objectives and initiatives are the UL Lafayette 2009-14 Strategic Plan and the eight Strategic Imperatives that have been defined within it.

<http://www.louisiana.edu/Faculty/Senate/Bruderfiles/Strategic.pdf>). In addition, the 2011 Draft of the Master Plan for Public Postsecondary Education in Louisiana has provided guidelines for the future of higher education in the state.

Our discussions and deliberations to develop our long-range planning objectives were driven by data gathered by the Institutional Research Office, and included such information as comparative statistical reports on the GPA's and ACT scores for entering freshmen, Graduate School enrollment statistics for the SoAD, 2006-11 and Arts Headcount Enrollment Statistics, 2006-11 that included a demographic comparison between students in Louisiana compared to other states and possessions and foreign countries.

Our concerns about enrollment were especially acute due to the University's move in 2011 to increase standards for selective admissions, and its elimination of all remedial course offerings for students who could not meet the standards. We referred to data comparing enrollments between Fall 2010 and Fall 2011 at UL Lafayette by School or College and the statistical breakdown of eligible/ineligible first-time freshman (FTF) in the College of the Arts by major. This data outlines the number of deficiencies in English, Math, Math and English together, and the high school GPA and ACT composite number. We used this data to determine how many first-time freshmen would be admissible meeting the 2012 admission standards. We also used enrollment data from University Enrollment Services.

Data showing pass rates for 1st to 2nd year students, 3rd year and 4th year pass rates, Graduate Program entry numbers, and Master's Thesis pass rates as well as continual tracking of ARE Pass Rates keep us informed about the status of our enrollments and our students' progress.

Peers. List three to five peer programs at other U.S. institutions. Refer to list of peer institutions submitted to and approved by the Board of Regents. If the list of peers is not adequate for your discipline, please submit the names of other institutions with comparable programs in your field.

University of Texas - San Antonio, School of Architecture Clemson University, School of Architecture University of Tennessee, School of Architecture Oklahoma State University, School of Architecture

Program Data: Students

Table 1: Enrollment over a 7-year cycle – All Majors (regardless of submajor or concentration)

Under Student

	FA09	FA10	FA11	FA12	FA13	FA14	FA15
MAJORS: Freshmen	89	92	85	69	49	42	60
MAJORS: Sophomores	40	56	45	34	29	31	24
MAJORS: Juniors	43	38	49	24	31	23	28
MAJORS: Seniors	64	73	68	76	61	62	50
TOTALS	236	259	247	203	170	158	162

Table 2: Enrollment over a 7-year cycle – Transfer Majors*

	FA09	FA10	FA11	FA12	FA13	FA14	FA15
TRANSFER MAJORS: Freshmen							2
TRANSFER MAJORS: Sophomores							4
TRANSFER MAJORS: Juniors							3
TRANSFER MAJORS: Seniors							1
TOTALS							10

* Does not include transfer re-entry students.

Table 3: Completers - Course and Graduation Data over a 7-year cycle

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
AY Graduates Degree Program	25	28	40	38	36	26	22
AY Graduates Certificate Program(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AY Minors Awarded at Graduation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	25	28	40	38	36	26	22

Enrollment, Retention, and Degree Productivity. Analyze and explain trends in the program's enrollment, student persistence in the major, and student completion.

Over the past seven years, there have been 218 graduates with an average of 31 per year. The School of Architecture and Design has implemented several programs for retention. Advisors specifically to handle freshmen student questions have been assigned to each freshman student. Mentors have been assigned each student consisting of upper classmen in each discipline to advise them on the school, curriculum, and studio culture. In addition, we have re-invigorated AIAS and NOMAS through membership drives as well as establishing faculty advisors.

Table 4a: Undergraduate Course Drop and Fail Rates over a 7-year cycle, AY 08-09 to AY 14-15

Name of Courses with DROP rates at least 40% (grades of "W")	OL Trad Hy	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Name of courses								

Table 4b: Undergraduate FAIL Rates over a 7-year cycle, AY 08-09 to AY 14-15

Name of Courses with FAIL rates at least 35% (grades of "F")	OL Trad HY	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Name of courses								

Table 4c: Undergraduate COMBINED DROP and FAIL Rates over a 7-year cycle, AY 08-09 to AY 14-15

Name of Courses with combined DROP and FAIL rates at least 40% (grades of "W" and grades of "F")	OL Trad HY	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Name of courses								

Analyze the drop and failure data and describe courses that seem to be obstacles to progression through the program. Describe strategies used to decrease the identified problems.

→

Student Recruiting, Retention, and Engagement.

- Describe innovative actions taken to recruit highly qualified students
- Describe how students are engaged once recruited
- Describe opportunities for funded or unfunded undergraduate research projects
- Describe the most academically enriching experience your students have in the program

Student Employment, Graduate Study, etc.

- Provide any data-based information you have regarding the disposition of graduates within their first one to five years after graduation.
- Provide data-based information regarding employment demands for graduates with this major
- Provide data-based information about the future outlook for employment.
- If your program is a high-cost, high-demand one, what would be your reaction to charging differential tuition or extra fees to students?

US Bureau of Labor statistics states from 2016 through 2024 there will be a 7% growth documenting a fast average year with salary of \$74,500 yearly; \$35.83 hourly. Current jobs advertised on the AIA site advertised 408 architecture positions available for March 2016. Job Outlooks website estimated that over the next five years, architecture jobs will increase an average of \$10,000-\$25,000 per position which is considered very high. School of Architecture and Design student Steven Oubre Jr. was awarded the 2014 Outstanding Alumni Award.

Licensing in architecture requires a four-year undergraduate plus 45 hours of study in the Masters of Architecture curriculum. The Master of Architecture is the terminal degree for the architecture profession. 80% of the schools in the United States consist of this 4-2 year combination. It is the Master of Architecture that allow students to sit for the licensing exam. 68% of all our undergraduate students in Architecture go on to complete studies with the Master of Architecture degree. Most of these students complete their Masters degree in our program; only 13% attend other institutions. Surveying the alumni from the last seven years (121 graduates) 115 are working in architectural offices pursuing licensing. Two alumni work in engineering-related fields. Two alumni work with building contractors. One alumnus is working as a tool designer at General Electric. One alumnus has begun their own business in photography.

Student Satisfaction and Other Surveys. Provide information gathered from exit interviews, student satisfaction and other surveys that indicate student attitudes toward and perceptions of their educational experience in this degree program.

- Attach a copy of exit interview if used.
- Attach a copy of any survey or instrument used by the department to measure student attitudes toward and perceptions of their educational experience in this degree program.

Exit interviews, which are conducted before grades are submitted, offer an opportunity for students and the faculty to speak about expectations and outcomes. Reflective and critical discussion about a student's performance as well as the course structure, content and teaching effectiveness allows for personal growth on the part of the student and course and teaching improvement on the part of the faculty. Self-efficacy questions assist students in reaching an understanding of their final grade, but more importantly these sets of questions allow students to evaluate their ability to complete tasks and reach their goals.

As the final studio in the Program's curriculum, faculty inquire about the students goals, interests and job prospects and offer guidance. Future and goal setting questions assist students in thinking about the necessary steps to achieve what they seek to do and is an opportunity for faculty to answer questions about the profession.

Ultimately, the intent of the exit interview is to discuss perceptions and interpretations of how the students see themselves relative to how they approach academic and or professional goals, tasks and challenges.

ADVISING CHECKLIST
School of Architecture and Design University of Louisiana at Lafayette
March 2016

Student Name _____
Semester/Year _____
Major _____
CLID _____
Current Address _____

Current Email _____
Current Cell Phone _____
Current Home Phone _____

Curriculum Sheet
 All grades transferred _____

Advising Form
 Alternate courses listed _____
 Faculty signature on form _____
 Student signature on form _____

ULink
 Advising hold lifted _____

Status
 Re-entry portfolio _____
 Transfer student _____
 International student _____
 Honors class/seminar _____
 TOPS minimum GPA _____
 (<http://studentsuccess.louisiana.edu/content/support/tops>)
 TOPS minimum credit hours-24/year _____

Resources (Does student know about . . .)
 Website _____
 Writing center _____
 Academic Success Center _____
 Student organizations _____
 Tutoring _____
 Counseling _____
 Services for disability students _____
 Campus diversity _____

Current Semester Schedule
 Number of credits _____
 Drops/repeats (Fr/So-2, Jr-1, Sr-1) _____
 Balance credit hours/work hours _____

Future Schedule
 Required major course _____
 Necessary pre/co-requisites _____
 Alternates suggested (summer, intercession) _____

Progress Toward Degree
 BOR/Core _____
Junior Division requirements
 (ENGL 102, MATH 103-104 [Arch MATH 109],
 Science, 2.4 GPA, 30 non-developmental credit
 hours, C or better all classes) _____

Sophomore requirements
 (Portfolio review, 2.4 major GPA, DSGN 101-102) _____

Junior requirements
 (2.4 major GPA [ARCH 2.6], all 1st year courses
 complete) _____

Senior requirements
 (2.4 major GPA [ARCH 2.6], all 2nd year courses
 complete) _____

45 Hours 300-400 level courses _____
 Internship working for ARCH/DSGN _____
 NCARB IDP record (for ARCH) _____

Seniors
 Degree plan/minors _____
 Graduation fees, etc. _____
 Apply as entr e student if nine hours or less in final semester _____

Minor
 Obtain minor sheet from department; place in student folder _____

SOAD elective
 Choose electives on new curriculum sheet _____

Career Development
 Graduate School _____
 ULL GPA 3.0 _____
 ULL Portfolio February 15-October 15 _____
 GRE 287 minimum _____
 Licensing exam _____
 Career services _____
 Job placement _____

NOTES:

Prerequisites and Limitations on Student Access.

- Describe any mechanisms (such as course prerequisites, “gateway” courses, GPA requirements, upper division admission criteria, “weed-out” courses, etc.) used to limit access to the degree as a student progresses through the curriculum.
- Describe how these mechanisms are examined to determine effectiveness in achieving desired goal

Program Data: Faculty

Table 5: Current Faculty Demographics

	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other	Total	Anticipated Retirements/Resignations in next two years
Instructors	2		2					2	
Senior Instructors									
Master Instructors									
Asst Profs	2	5	6	1				7	
Assoc Profs		1	1					1	
Profs	6	1	6		1			7	1
Total	10	7	15	1	1			17	
FTE Adjunct Faculty (based on 15 credit hour)									N/A
Total number of adjunct faculty current semester AND Total number of credit hours per adjunct	1 (3)	1 (9)	2					2	N/A
Total number of TAs current semester		1	1					1	N/A

Table 6: Faculty Salaries

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2011-12 CUPA Survey (Public Only)	2013-14 OK STATE Survey
Instructors (all): # and Salary Average						
Asst Profs: # and Salary Average						
Assoc Profs: # and Salary Average						
Profs: # and Salary Average						
Adjuncts: # and Salary Average						

Table 7: Faculty Workload Data

	AY 2010-11	AY 2011-12	AY 2012-13	AY 2013-14	AY 2014-15
Instructors (all): Average SCH Production					
Asst Profs: Average SCH Production					
Assoc Profs: Average SCH Production					
Profs: Average SCH Production					
FTE Adjunct Faculty: Average SCH Production					
Instructors: Average Indirect Costs from Grants & Contracts					
Asst Profs: Average Indirect Costs from Grants					
Assoc Profs: Average Indirect Costs from Grants & Contracts					
Profs: Average Indirect Costs from Grants & Contracts					

Table 8: Continuing Faculty Course Assignments

List continuing faculty with assigned courses, credit hours, and student enrollment from the most recent two AY semesters (note any who are hired as exceptions to SACS credential qualifications). Please indicate for each the workload track; note which faculty members (if any) are 12-month hires, which are DL certified, and which hold Graduate Faculty status.

Name	Courses	Credit hours	Enrollment	Track	12-month hire?	DL certified?	Grad Fac?
Burkett, Dan	SP16 ARCH 410 ARCH 432 <u>DSGN 235</u> FA15 ARCH 332 ARCH 501 ARCH 534 DSGN 235	6 3 3 3 6 3 3	12 3 24 17 12 1 20	1			Yes
Cline, Thomas	DSGN 102 DSGN 114 <u>DSGN 362</u> ARCH 201 DSGN 101	3 3 3 6 3	22 24 31 14 21	2			Yes
Edwards, Jean	<u>ARCH 530</u> DSGN 121	3 3	23 42	5		Yes	
Feld, Adam	DSGN 114 DSGN 311 <u>DSGN 495</u> DSGN 376	3 3 3 3	25 1 2 16	2			
Gjertson, Geoff	ARCH 302 ARCH 405 ARCH 464 <u>ARCH 482</u> ARCH 501 ARCH 540	6 6 3 3 6 3	11 1 25 5 11 19	2			Yes
Kozinets, Nadya	<u>ARCH 464</u> DSGN 235 DSGN 121	3 3 3	11 20 42	2			
Latiolais, Ashlie	ARCH 202 <u>DSGN 311</u>	6 3	13 39	2			Yes
LaSala, Hector	ARCH 301 ARCH 302 ARCH 403 ARCH 404 DSGN 102 <u>DSGN 311</u> ARCH 301 ARCH 403 DSGN 101 DSGN 103	6 6 6 6 3 3 6 6 3 3	3 12 1 1 21 2 17 2 21 4	2			Yes
McClung, Kiwana	ARCH 502 <u>DSGN 101</u> ARCH 409	6 3 6	7 25 14	2			Yes
Miller, Annika	ARCH 202 <u>DSGN 114</u>	6 3	13 23	2			Yes
Powell, Brian	<u>DSGN 102</u> ARCH 201 DSGN 101	3 6 3	18 15 21	2			

Saft, Corey	ARCH 410	6	12	3			Yes
	ARCH 477	3	15				
	ARCH 599	3	1				
	<u>DSGN 485</u>	3	1				
	ARCH 509	6	10				
	ARCH 532	3	23				
	ARCH 599	3	1				
Sammataro, Andrew	DSGN 102	3	16	1			
	DSGN 104	3	7				
	<u>DSGN 114</u>	3	23				
	DSGN 101	3	19				
Sammons, Thomas	ARCH 502	6	8	5			Yes
	<u>ARCH 598</u>	3	2				
	ARCH 409	6	14				
	DSGN 311	3	4				
Smith, Kari	<u>ARCH 502</u>	6	8	5			Yes
	ARCH 441	3	30				
	ARCH 509	6	9				
	ARCH 597	3	2				
Young, Sarah	ARCH 560	3	24	2		Yes	Yes
	DSGN 101	3	25				
	<u>DSGN 121</u>	3	38				
	ARCH 201	6	15				
	ARCH 521	3	23				
McClure, Michael	<u>ARCH 565</u>	3	23				Yes
	ARCH 321	3	38				
	ARCH 520	3	2				
Aldridge, Chad	<u>DSGN 380</u>	3	15				
	DSGN 379	3	15				

Faculty Resources. Describe and analyze:

- Trends, successes, and challenges in staffing the program. (Consider recruiting, anticipated retirements/resignations, diversity, etc.)
- Describe how teaching loads are determined
- Describe how and how often faculty teaching loads are re-evaluated

The SoAD hired six new assistant professors over the past three years. Four of these new hires were in Architecture, one for Interior Design and one for Industrial Design. All of these new hires teach in the undergraduate program and all other architecture faculty teach in the graduate program (studios, lecture classes, sit on thesis committees). These new faculty hires establish the faculty composition as five women and six men. The diversity among the faculty was increased with one of the new hires being an African-American woman. Our diversity is further enhanced with one Latino male, one who comes to us from the Ukraine and one originally from Finland. The next retirement from the School of Architecture will be within the next 3-4 years, therefore our faculty is stable at this point in time. Teaching loads for a typical faculty member of the School of Architecture is: one six-hour studio class and one three-hour lecture class or one six-hour studio class and one four-hour studio class. This classifies most architecture faculty as Track II on the workload form in which teaching is either 72% or 74%, research is 15% and service is at 13% or 11%.

The core of instruction is focused around the architecture studio in which a student matriculating through the program is required to take a studio class every semester. From second year to sixth year, the studio classes are composed with six hours of instruction and meet three times per week. First year studio is four hours of instruction time and meets three times per week. This mechanism for instruction dictates the teaching load for all faculty since all faculty are engaged in teaching a studio. Individual faculty teaching loads are re-evaluated each year depending on their service or research demands.

Program Information

Assessment Protocols.

- Describe how the program evaluates its success in achieving its goals in student learning
- Describe how the program evaluates its success in achieving its goals in scholarship/research
- Describe how the program evaluates its success in achieving its goals in service
- Attach a "Detailed Assessment Report (DAR) from WEAVE

We have been systematically reviewing our program mission and its goals to be in alignment with the University's 2009-2014 Long Range Plan and its Strategic Imperatives, as outlined above. (Section reference I.2.4) This review is taking place in the context of our annual fall Faculty Retreat and the spring Studio Review. Every fall semester, the faculty, Director and staff meet to evaluate the mission statement, strategic plan, and key issues facing the School. Each spring semester, the faculty, Director and staff meet to review all studio coursework and the work of selected technical courses to ensure that the semester and academic year outcomes respond to both the mission and accreditation objectives. This review occurs in two parts: one is a review of senior work exhibited at the University Art Museum, and the other, conducted in Fletcher Hall, is a review of student work from all levels of the curriculum and all programs. These reviews are immensely significant to the development of the program as it allows the faculty and the School administration together to review, discuss and offer recommendations regarding the development of learning outcomes for all School programs. This dialogue is the cornerstone of our self-assessment process. The process is thus rooted in the day-to-day operations of the School and its programs. Our process also engages a wide variety of formal and informal instruments for both internal and external reviews. The regular administration of surveys and assessment instruments to students, faculty, administrators and alumni constitute the formal methods. More informal methods include regularly scheduled and ad hoc meetings, and administration and faculty open-door policies.

(Architectural Education and the Academic Community)

All faculty members complete annual *Faculty Workload Forms* to document their teaching, research, and service activities for the year and to project activities for the upcoming year. These workload forms are used by the Director to conduct annual *Faculty Evaluations* with each faculty member in person. The faculty member's analysis and assessment of her/his teaching effectiveness and completed *Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI)* forms are used to evaluate teaching; peer-reviewed projects, publications, and presentations at academic conferences, are reviewed for significance to the academy and the profession. Faculty service on and contribution to University, College and School committees, in capacities ranging from member to chair, are reviewed annually during the *Faculty Evaluation* session with the Director. Each faculty member is encouraged to be active within the larger academic community.

Faculty members also complete *Administrative Performance Reviews* to assess the administrative performance of Directors, Deans and Vice Presidents. These anonymous questionnaires are reviewed by each administrator's immediate supervisor as well as by the administrators themselves for developmental purposes.

Monthly SoAD *Faculty and Coordinator Meetings* provide forums for open discussion of all aspects of the program. The undergraduate and graduate architecture Coordinators along with the interior design and industrial design Coordinators meet monthly with the Director. The Coordinators also meet monthly with their cohorts to solicit comments on various aspects of the programs and to provide opportunities for individual faculty members to express concerns regarding the academic environment. The Director maintains an open door policy to encourage informal open dialogues from all constituents of the School.

University of Louisiana at Lafayette Detailed Assessment Report (DAR) 2014-2015 Architectural Studies BS

As of: 2/11/2016 10:46 AM CENTRAL

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked *One-Time, Recurring, No Request.*)

Mission / Purpose

Evaluate the architectural plan and to succeed with 80% passing rate as a target goal.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: The Program

Evidence of translation of thesis into the built environment; Exploration and inventory of spatial strategies in plan and section; Development of specific uses and equipment requirements.

Related Measures

M 1: Program in Notebook Form

All students were assessed through rubric that were scored by 4 faculty members and 3 professional architects. The program was in notebook form and was reviewed after the semester. The rubric scored emerging skill level, competence skill level, and mastery. Number of students assessed = 33 Our target objective was obtained, over 80% scored mastery or competent out of 33 students.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Connected Document

[ARCH 401 Evaluations from 2010-2011](#)

Target:

A score of at least 80% on the rubric is defined as either competent or mastery.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Although our previous Finding wanted to assess The Program, we did not activate this task. Therefore, we plan to assess this in the upcoming year.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

Monitor Yearly Levels

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010 With reevaluation happening every other year, monitoring of these year levels should reveal if these scores remain above our 80%...

SLO 2: Tectonics of Architecture

Ability to assess, select, and integrate structural, environmental, and life safety systems into the building design.

Related Measures

M 3: Tectonics of Architecture

All students were assessed through rubric that were scored by 2 faculty members and 8 professional architects. The program was in notebook form and was reviewed after the semester. The rubric scored emerging skill level, competence skill level, and mastery. Number of students assessed = 26 Our target objective was obtained, over 80% scored mastery or competent out of 26 students.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document

[ARCH 401 Evaluations from 2010-2011](#)

Target:

A score of at least 80% on the rubric is defined as either competent or mastery.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

We did not assess this area this current year, but plan to assess this in the upcoming year.

SLO 3: Study of Building Envelope

Understanding the basic principles of the membrane, materials, and assembly through the study of the wall section.

Related Measures

M 2: Study of Buildings Envelope

All students were assessed through rubric that were scored by 2 faculty members and 8 professional architects.

The program was in final drawing form and was reviewed after the semester. The rubric scored emerging skill level, competence skill level, and mastery. Number of students assessed = 26 Our target objective was obtained, over 80% scored mastery or competent out of 26 students.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document

[ARCH 401 Evaluations from 2010-2011](#)

Target:

A score of at least 80% on the rubric is defined as either competent or mastery.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met

The achievement in the competent and mastery level was 86%. Target was met with 6% in the plus column. This semester there were added lectures, more professional critiques, and 6th year teacher assistants to give additional critiques on wall sections, notebooks, site analysis, plans, sections, details, and building envelopes. Our goal was to try to get this to 85% competent, we exceeded our goal by 1%. We will continue to monitor this and introduce some of this material earlier and more formally since it has proven to be successful.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

Concentrated Study in Earlier Years

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010 This area of concentrations can be improved by the introduction of more concentrated study in earlier year levels. Steady improvement.

Building Envelope

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012 The building envelope is a study of how the membrane is connected to the primary and secondary structure. This includes roof s...

SLO 4: Plan Development

Expose students to development lectures on plan with emphasis on structure, circulation, code and egress issues. Another objective is to allow interns and architects to participate more thoroughly in the review process.

Related Measures

M 4: Plan Development

All students were assessed through rubric that were scored by 4 faculty members and 3 professional architects. The rubric scored emerging skill level, competence skill level, and mastery. The plan developed ideas of program, structure, skin and circulation as well as code review. The format is in drawing form, reviewed by faculty and professionals. Number of students assessed = 33 Our target objective was obtained, over 80% scored mastery or competent out of 33 students. Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document

[ARCH 401 Evaluations from 2010-2011](#)

Target:

A score of at least 80% on the rubric is defined as either competent or mastery.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

Plan Development

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012 Plan Development which is the study of the buildings program, structure, and circulation scored in the 80% with 33 students being

SLO 5: Principle of Sustainability

Understand the principles of sustainability design natural and built resources creating a healthy building

Related Measures

M 5: Principles of Sustainability

All students were assessed through rubric that were scored by 4 faculty members and 3 professional architects. The program was in notebook form and was reviewed after the semester. The rubric scored emerging skill level, competence skill level, and mastery. Number of students assessed = 38

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document

[ARCH 401 Evaluations from 2010-2011](#)

Target:

A score of at least 80% on the rubric is defined as either competent or mastery.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Although our previous Finding wanted to assess Sustainability, we did not activate this task. Therefore, we plan to assess this in the upcoming year.

SLO 6: Architectural Plan Development

Our objective was to concentrate on the development of the architectural plan. We cited four categories to be assessed on. 1) Structure: that the student understands the integration of structure into a comprehensive project. This was implemented through the design of the architectural plan, but also in a structural diagram showing the framing of a third or fourth story of their building. 2) Egress: the study of egress is evident in the design of the architectural planning. Stairs and hallways were clearly marked as well as windows to be rescued from a bedroom in an apartment. This was supplemented by an egress diagram integrated into the notebook. 3) Accessibility: study accessibility was highlighted in two factors require the students to design an accessible apartment layout in plan as well as require the students to understand refuge in their stairwells. 4) Room Design: students were required to develop well designed apartments and commercial spaces. This was implemented within the general floor plans.

Related Measures**M 6: Architectural Plan Development**

The target of 80% in competent area was met in all four of the categories of the Architectural Plan Development out of 26 students.

Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target:

To achieve 80% on all four the levels of assessment for the Architectural Plan Development.

Finding (2014-2015) - Target: Met

The achievement in the competent and mastery level was 93%. Target was met with 13% in the plus column. This semester there were added lectures, more professional critiques, and 6th year teacher assistants to give additional critiques on wall sections, notebooks, site analysis, plans, sections, details, and building envelopes. Our goal was to try to get this to 85% competent, we exceeded our goal by 8%. We will continue to monitor this and introduce some of this material earlier and more formally since it has proven to be successful.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**Companion Class**

Principles of Sustainability should see notable improvement with the required lecture class that accompanies the 401 Architectural Studio. This new class Arch 441, Principles of Sustainability, came on line for the first time this fall. This class is a companion class to Arch 401. Better coordination between these two classes is expected. Additional information that was needed in the notebook review was not due until after the Arch 401 review. Allowing this information due before the review will allow outside reviewers access to this additional material. Simply asking the 441 class notebook to be completed and included into the 401 notebook before the assessment takes place.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010 **Implementation Status:** In-Progress **Priority:** High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): **Measure:** Study of Buildings Envelope | **Outcome/Objective:** Principle of Sustainability

Concentrated Study in Earlier Years

This area of concentrations can be improved by the introduction of more concentrated study in earlier year levels. Steady improvement has been observed by the introduction of the wall section, materials, and methods classes 334 and 432. This additional instruction has added to the sophistication of students entering the comprehensive studio with a more general understanding of systems, materials, and assembly. In addition, the better coordination with professionals and interns has expanded the coverage of material and processes evolved in the design of the wall section and building section. Additional lectures accompanying the 401 Studio has also increased the productivity of the detailing and design process at a comprehensive level. Precedents, in the example of previous studio work (fall 2007, fall 2008, and fall 2009), added to the insight of the students and faculty in the production of the wall section and the tectonics of architecture. Additional classes in graphics and

technology will also facilitate the speed in which the students are required to complete the overall comprehensive design. Additional lecture and lab time as well as coordination between the profession and the faculty can be devoted to increase our pass rate.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010 **Implementation Status:** Planned **Priority:** High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Study of Buildings Envelope | **Outcome/Objective:** Study of Building Envelope

Monitor Yearly Levels

With reevaluation happening every other year, monitoring of these year levels should reveal if these scores remain above our 80% projected for success.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010 **Implementation Status:** Planned **Priority:** High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Program in Notebook Form | **Outcome/Objective:** The Program

Yearly Monitoring

With reevaluation happening every other year, monitoring of these year levels should reveal if these scores remain above our 80% projected for success.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010 **Implementation Status:** Planned **Priority:** High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Study of Buildings Envelope | **Outcome/Objective:** Plan Development

Yearly Monitoring

With reevaluation happening every other year, monitoring of these year levels should reveal if these scores remain above our 80% projected for success.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010 **Implementation Status:** Planned **Priority:** High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Study of Buildings Envelope | **Outcome/Objective:** Tectonics of Architecture

Building Envelope

The building envelope is a study of how the membrane is connected to the primary and secondary structure. This includes roof systems, wall systems, and window systems.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012 **Implementation Status:** Finished **Priority:** High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Study of Buildings Envelope | **Outcome/Objective:** Study of Building Envelope

Implementation Description: Over the past year the building envelope has scored 80% or higher. The School of Architecture continues to develop programs for a consistent envelope design. Third year studio (302) and its companion materials course (432) has just implemented a three-dimensional wall section. This should continue an increased rate of our scores.

Responsible Person/Group: Thomas Sammons

Plan Development

Plan Development which is the study of the buildings program, structure, and circulation scored in the 80% with 33 students being reviewed. The plan development needs to be measured for at least three years to understand its success rate. The first year was under 80% (78%) and this year we scored over the 80%.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012 **Implementation Status:** Finished **Priority:** High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective): Measure: Plan Development | **Outcome/Objective:** Plan Development

Implementation Description: Additional lectures have been added to the curriculum to enhance the program's success. Lectures on codes has been completed as well as developing a lecture on the plan. **Responsible Person/Group:** Thomas Sammons

System Knowledge + Code Development

Improvements are needed on the Notebook investigations. This action item will allow the students to focus their research and gain more knowledge of systems through the cut sheet exercise. Improvements on plan development are also needed. A focus on the floor plan will increase students knowledge on building codes and issues of life safety.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013 **Implementation Status:** Planned

Priority: High

Notebook + Codes

Improvements are needed on the Notebook investigations. This action item will allow the students to focus their research and gain more knowledge of systems through the cut sheet exercise. Improvements on plan development are also needed. A focus on the floor plan will increase student knowledge on building codes and issues of life safety.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014 **Implementation Status:** Planned **Priority:** High

Next year's evaluations to include Program, Sustainability, & Tectonics.

Evaluations conclude that areas of study in the comprehensive project have surpassed our goals and expectations from last year. Our target for success is a percent. The categories that scored over 80% success are: Wall Section Development and the Architectural Plan Development. Both of these categories have increased their pass rate and decreased their failure rate. Additional improvement can be continued. When adding the competent and mastering scores total, the total is 90%. This is 10% above our targeted 80%. Next year, other categories which have not been assessed in proceeding years shall be reviewed. These categories shall be the following: The Program: Evidence of translation of thesis into the built environment; Exploration and inventory of spatial strategies in plan and section; Development of specific uses and equipment requirements. Tectonics of Architecture: Ability to assess, select, and integrate structural, environmental, and life safety systems into the building design. Principles of Sustainability: Natural and Built resources to create a healthy building Principles of Sustainability should see notable improvement with the required lecture class that accompanies the 401 Architectural Studio. Arch 441, Principles of Sustainability, came on line for the first time in Fall 2009. This class is a companion class to Arch 401. Better coordination between these two classes has improved and therefore should be assessed next year. Information from Arch 441 shall be due before the review which will allow the outside reviewers to access this additional material in student's notebooks.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015 **Implementation Status:** Planned **Priority:** High **Projected Completion Date:** 12/2015

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

How were assessment results shared within the unit?

Assessment results were shared amongst the three full-time faculty members teaching the ARCH 401 course. This exchange of assessment data allows the faculty members to prepare for next years coursework. However, next academic year, it would be beneficial to discuss these results at our faculty retreat to receive feedback from a wider audience of architectural faculty. Potential discussions of how elective or earlier year coursework can be more beneficial to student senior studio coursework.

Are there any measurable or perceivable effects of the action plans implemented following last year's assessment cycle?

The main action plan item of collaborating ARCH 441 with the studio has occurred for the past few years. However, the "Sustainability" assessment item was not assessed this past cycle, therefore no measurable data can be sure of it's success. A more accurate review of it's success and involvement within the course will be launched in the upcoming assessment for 2015-2016.

What changes are you making this year to improve outcomes next year?

A few changes are coming into affect next year to improve outcomes. The first being the reduction in time dedicated to the Conceptual Analysis drawing phase of the course. This change will provide students with more time for the drawings which are assessed at the conclusion of the semester. The integration of Building Integration Modeling will also be a change this upcoming year. By utilizing BIM this will allow for students to learn new change this upcoming year. By utilizing BIM this will allow for students to learn new relevant software and integrate their building systems more effectively. The "Building Envelope" and "Tectonics of Architecture" measures should see an increase in success with this integration. Changes are also being made to the companion ARCH 441 Sustainability course. Improved efforts to collaborate these two classes to support the coursework should show an increase in "Findings" for the "Sustainability" Measure.

What has the unit learned from this year's assessment cycle? What is working well, and what is working less well in achieving desired outcomes?

This year's assessment cycle was successful when looking at the targeted goals as compared to our results.

Consistent critiques and Monday due dates maintains a rigorous rhythm that the students get accustomed to. This rigor allows more projects to reach a level of professionalism that we then assess. Weekly reviews with local professionals also works well to encourage our students to work at a high level of detail. The integration of the professional in addition to the professors in the classroom has proven to be successful when looking at Life Safety information and wall section detailing. The attention to student's Notebooks could show improvement next year by giving more attention to them. The integration of sustainable concepts, precedent research, and building envelope data is all recorded and organized in the Notebook. If more emphasis was placed on this item higher Findings may result in the Tectonics, Building Envelope, and Program assessment measures.

Curriculum. Provide a copy of the current curriculum for the program.

- Describe the rationale behind changes in the curriculum during the last seven years (or since the program's last review)
- Describe how the department ensures curricular currency.
- Does the program feature a capstone course or other culminating experience for students?
- Is the program accredited? By whom? Provide the date of last accreditation review and the date of next anticipated visit or review.

The architecture school is required to be accredited every six years by NAAB. This accreditation process has just been raised to an eight-year cycle. The accreditation team is a collaboration of all three collateral units that make up the registration of a licensed architect. They are ACSA, NCARB and NAAB. The accreditation team visited the School of Architecture in the fall of 2014 and the School of Architecture received its eight-year accreditation approval in March 2015. The next accreditation visit will be in 2022. Within this accreditation process, the collateral organizations mentioned above collectively organize the criteria for accreditation evaluation every 6-8 year cycle. Therefore, the School of Architecture responds to these changes in our curriculum by adjusting class structure to meet the new criteria. The School of Architecture has just received the new criteria for the 2022 visit and has already implemented changes to the curriculum to accommodate the new criteria. The School of Architecture is required to adjust its curriculum to comply with all NAAB recommendations in order to receive future accreditation.

The matriculation of an architecture student from first year to graduation is about 62 percent completion rate. 90 percent of the reduction occurs during the first two years. The causes for this reduction are varied but many student reductions can be traced to students not performing at the School of Architecture requirement of a C level grade or better within the general core classes, particularly with the math sequence (109, 110), the physics sequence (207, 208) and the design and architecture studio sequence (101, 102, 201, 202). The professional years in architecture beginning in third year obstacles to graduation include the Civil Engineering cores (335, 336) and the comprehensive studio (ARCH 409). Once students enter into the third-year sequence, graduate rates are at 95 percent.

ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES 2015-2016

CODE: C085 (040201-01)

Bachelor of Science

Name _____ CLID _____

Freshman Year									
First Semester				Second Semester					
	Cr	Gr	Note		Cr	Gr	Note		
UNIV 100	Freshman Seminar	3	_____	DSGN 102	Basic Design II	3	_____		
DSGN 101	Basic Design I	3	_____	DSGN 114	Design Cmcn	3	_____		
ENGL 101	Intro to Acad Writing	3	_____	ENGL 102	Writing & Research	3	_____		
MATH 109	Pre-Calc Algebra ¹	3	_____	MATH 110	Pre-Calc Trig	3	_____		
	Elective (SCI) ²	3	_____		Elective (BHSC) ⁴	3	_____		
		15				15			
Sophomore Year									
First Semester				Second Semester					
	Cr	Gr	Note		Cr	Gr	Note		
ARCH 201	Arch Design I ³	6	_____	ARCH 202	Arch Design II	6	_____		
PHYS 207	Intro to Physics I	3	_____	DSGN 235	Design & Computer	3	_____		
DSGN 121	Survey of Design	3	_____	PHYS 208	Intro to Physics II	3	_____		
	Elective (LIT) ⁵	3	_____	ENGL 360	Advanced Writing	3	_____		
		15			Elective (HIST) ⁶	3	_____		
						18			
Junior Year									
First Semester				Second Semester					
	Cr	Gr	Note		Cr	Gr	Note		
ARCH 301	Arch Design III	6	_____	ARCH 302	Arch Design IV	6	_____		
ARCH 321	Hist of Architecture	3	_____	ARCH 332	Building Systems I	3	_____		
ECON 300	Fund of Economics	3	_____	CIVE 336	Struct Engineering II	3	_____		
CIVE 335	Struct Engineering I	3	_____		Elective (SOAD) ⁷	3	_____		
		15				15			
Senior Year									
First Semester				Second Semester					
	Cr	Gr	Note		Cr	Gr	Note		
ARCH 409	Arch Design V	6	_____	ARCH 410	Arch Design VI	6	_____		
ARCH 432	Building System II	3	_____	ARCH 464	ProPrac/ContractDoc	3	_____		
	Elective (SOAD) ⁷	3	_____	ARCH 433	Building Systems III	3	_____		
	Elective ⁸	3	_____		Elective ⁸	3	_____		
		15				15			

123 credits. All developmental coursework must be completed prior to enrolling in DSGN 101. Architecture majors are required to make a "C" or better in all courses.

- ¹ If ACT requirement is not met for MATH 109, MATH 100/105 must be taken before proceeding.
- ² SCI elective. Three hours biology or ENVS 150; PHYS 207 and PHYS 208 complete requirements.
- ³ Laptop computer required for class.
- ⁴ BHSC elective. ANTH any, GEOG any, POLS any, SOCI any, CJUS any; with 3 hours at the 200+ level.
- ⁵ LIT elective. ENGL 201, 202, 205, 206, 210, 211, 212, 319, 320, 321, 333, 342, 350, 380, 381, or a foreign language literature.
- ⁶ HIST elective. Any HIST except 390 and 410G; 300-400 level recommended.
- ⁷ SOAD elective. Consult with advisor. May be selected from ARCH, DSGN, INDN, INDS 300-400 level.
- ⁸ Elective. Selected from outside SoAD. Consult with advisor.

* **Upper Division Requirements:** University requirements; a) ENGL 102 (ESOL 102) with a grade of "C" or better, b) MATH 100, 105 or 107 with grade of "D" or better, c) 3 hours or more in BIOL, CHEM, GEOL, PHYS, or ENVS 150 with a grade of "D" or better, d) 30 non-developmental hours, **Architecture 2.4 CUM GPA; C or better in the following course(s):** DSGN 101; DSGN 102; DSGN 114; MATH 109/110 or 143, and a science elective.

- 2nd year: Portfolio review, 2.4 major gpa and completes DSGN 101 & 102
- 3rd year: complete all first year courses, maintain 2.6 CUM GPA
- 4th year: complete all second year courses and maintain 2.6 CUM GPA

Quality of Instruction.

- Describe the methods used to evaluate the quality of teaching in the program.
- Describe any incentives in place to reward faculty contributions to the teaching enterprise
- Describe any professional development opportunities that exist for the improvement of teaching
- Attach college or department rubric for evaluation of teaching

Evaluation Methods:

The most rigorous evaluation of quality of teaching is conducted by the Program's accreditation agency- the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). The steps involved include a self-study written summary of performance based on *NAAB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation* and a review and site visit by a team of educators, practitioners, regulators and students. Following the visit, the team prepares a report with their accreditation recommendation. The accreditation cycle was completed in fall 2014 and the Program reaffirmed its accreditation for the maximum allowed time- 8 years.

Beyond accreditation and Student Evaluation of Instructor (SEI's), there are two notable methods used to evaluate and make improvements to the quality of teaching in the program. The first is peer-to-peer teaching and the second is peer-to-peer assessment.

Each studio course, a 6-credit course that is the core of architectural education, is co-taught by two to three faculty members. Collaborative team teaching facilitates an immediate feedback loop allowing each faculty to adjust their performance and improve the quality of teaching. Peers hold each other accountable and are able to make assessments of the quality of teaching on a daily basis.

Longer-term evaluation includes assessment held at the conclusion of each semester, and intermediately as needed in coordinator's meetings. Each semester concludes with a faculty retreat where faculty present to one another the learning objectives, methods and outcomes for studio courses. Following the presentation there is a critical discussion among the faculty to evaluate the quality of teaching.

Faculty Incentives:

Faculty with funded grants are in rotation to teach one of two studios and a three-credit project-based summer course which facilitate design research.

Faculty have been nominated for Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) architectural education awards for demonstrated excellence in teaching performance.

Professional Development Opportunities:

In addition to University sponsored programs such as the Graduate School's lunch and learn workshops, faculty are engaged with programming and credential maintenance with professional organizations including the American Institute of Architects, the U.S. Green Building Council, and the Construction Specifications Institute. As a professional program, it is essential to the quality of graduate teaching that faculty participate in professional programming to best prepare our graduates for practice. Faculty have frequently held officer positions with each of these organizations.

Faculty are regularly involved with Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) programming including: scholarly meetings, workshops, publications, awards and competitions –that facilitate teaching, research and scholarly and creative activities. Faculty have served as councilors and on the Board of Directors.

Academic Partnerships and Agreements. List academic partnerships between this degree program and programs/coursework at another institution or any memoranda of understanding with outside entities for academic or service enterprises. Include relationships with centers and institutes both within and outside the University.

- Professor Hector LaSala has been a member of the Kennedy Center’s Partners in Education program since 1995. “The Partners in Education program of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is designed to assist arts organizations throughout the nation to develop or expand educational partnerships with their local school systems. The primary purpose of these partnerships is to provide professional learning in the arts for teachers.”
- Associate Professor Kari Smith is a Faculty Researcher and serves on the Advisory Council for the Institute of Coastal and Water Research at UL Lafayette. “ICaWR houses faculty of diverse expertise in the areas of coastal and water resources with the goal of addressing complex linkages between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems in an ever-changing environment.”
- Associate Professor Kari Smith is a Center for Louisiana Studies Fellow at UL Lafayette. “The Center for Louisiana Studies is dedicated to researching, publicizing, promoting, and preserving Louisiana’s cultures and history.”

Distance Learning.

- Describe your program’s experiences with distance learning delivery
- Describe your program’s plans for distance learning delivery

Within the past few years, the SOAD has developed distance learning opportunities for students within our program and the greater university. Currently, two of our faculty have undergone training and certification through the Quality Matters Program and the Office of Distance Learning. In Fall 2011, DSGN 121 “Survey of Design,” was first offered as a hybrid course. This is an undergraduate arts elective mandatory for all SOAD students and available to all undergraduates. In Fall 2013, ARCH 521 “History of Architecture,” was transitioned to fully online delivery. From Fall 2014 – Spring 2015, the possibility of creating an online delivered Master of Science in Architectural Studies degree was investigated. Due to resource constraints, a lack of prospective student interest, and an inability to gauge distinct attainment benefits, the proposal was ultimately withdrawn. While this proposal was deemed unfeasible, the SOAD has an ongoing commitment to cultivating our distance learning offerings courses and exploring opportunities to transition more existing courses to online. With the development of our new undergraduate Design Degree program in particular, we see the potential of increasing our distance learning offerings for students within the SOAD and the university at large.

Nontraditional Programmatic Initiatives.

- Describe nontraditional formats, schedules, etc. provided for students (e.g., weekend classes, early class starts, rolling term starts, compressed or accelerated sessions, etc.)

The School of Architecture and Design provides entry level classes – DSGN 101, 102, 114, 121 which are designated as the first year studio sequence. These studio classes are designated for freshmen entering either in the fall or in the spring. DSGN 101 is offered twice (fall and spring) and DSGN 102 is offered twice (spring and summer) DSGN 114 is offered twice (spring and summer), DSGN 121 is offered three times (fall, spring, summer). These classes help students orientate themselves and keep them on-track with their curriculum for entering their second year of architecture.

We have been systematically reviewing our program mission and its goals to be in alignment with the University’s 2009-2014 Long Range Plan and its Strategic Imperatives, as outlined above. (Section reference I.2.4) This review is taking place in the context of our annual fall Faculty Retreat and the spring Studio Review. At

the end of every fall semester, the faculty, Director and staff meet to evaluate the mission statement, strategic plan, and key issues facing the School. At the end of each spring semester, the faculty, Director and staff meet to review all studio coursework and the work of selected technical courses to ensure that the semester and academic year outcomes respond to both the mission and accreditation objectives. This review occurs in two parts: one is a review of senior work exhibited at the University Art Museum, and the other, conducted in Fletcher Hall, is a review of student work from all levels of the curriculum and all programs. These reviews are immensely significant to the development of the program as it allows the faculty and the School administration together to review, discuss and offer recommendations regarding the development of learning outcomes for all of the School's programs. This dialogue is the cornerstone of our self-assessment process. The process is thus rooted in the day-to-day operations of the School and its programs. Our process also engages a wide variety of formal and informal instruments for both internal and external reviews. The regular administration of surveys and assessment instruments to students, faculty, administrators and alumni constitute the formal methods. More informal methods include regularly scheduled and ad hoc meetings, and administration and faculty open-door policies

(Architectural Education and the Academic Community)

All faculty members complete annual *Faculty Workload Forms* to document their teaching, research, and service activities for the year and to project activities for the upcoming year. These workload forms are used by the Director to conduct annual *Faculty Evaluations* with each faculty member in person. The faculty member's analysis and assessment of her/his teaching effectiveness and completed *Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI)* forms are used to evaluate teaching; peer-reviewed projects, publications, and presentations at academic conferences, are reviewed for significance to the academy and the profession. Faculty service on and contribution to University, College and School committees, in capacities ranging from member to chair, are reviewed annually during the *Faculty Evaluation* session with the Director. Each faculty member is encouraged to be active within the larger academic community.

Faculty members also complete *Administrative Performance Reviews* to assess the administrative performance of Directors, Deans and Vice Presidents. These anonymous questionnaires are reviewed by each administrator's immediate supervisor as well as by the administrators themselves for developmental purposes.

Monthly SoAD *Faculty and Coordinator Meetings* provide forums for open discussion of all aspects of the program. The undergraduate and graduate architecture Coordinators along with the interior design and industrial design Coordinators meet monthly with the Director. The Coordinators also meet monthly with their cohorts to solicit comments on various aspects of the programs and to provide opportunities for individual faculty members to express concerns regarding the academic environment. The Director maintains an open door policy to encourage informal open dialogues from all constituents of the School.

Research/Scholarship/Creative Productivity.

- Describe faculty work including consideration of how it compares to productivity seven years ago (or at the time of your last program review).
- Compare the productivity of your faculty in research/scholarship/creative productivity to that at selected peer institutions.
- Attach the rubric(s) used by the department to evaluate faculty performance in research/scholarship/creative productivity.

The various Institutes in the SoAD are not only vehicles for faculty and student research, they are generators of funding that help to support the program and undergraduate and graduate research for the School. Funding criteria is listed below:

Community Design Workshop

In the past six years the Community Design Workshop has completed 16 projects with a total funding of \$1,789,500.00. Of that funding, 1.5 million covers construction costs for the University Bike Path, phases I and II. The remainder of the funding \$289,500.00 has been allocated to faculty summer salaries, supporting teacher assistantships, in addition to student stipends, travel, and materials. Approximately 24% of the total funding is returned back to the University.

Building Institute

Funding for Building Institute projects has contributed to the travel budget for both faculty and students. It has completed \$1,427,955 in projects over the past six years with another \$264,000 on the drawing board in 2013. In 2007, the Institute received a state-funded service-learning grant of \$10,000 and a \$30,000 grant from the AIA to perform master-planning and to fabricate installations for the Boy's and Girl's Clubs of Acadiana. In 2008-2009, the Building Institute raised \$509,730 in cash and \$498,954 in in-kind goods and services to produce the BeauSoleil Louisiana Solar Home and participate in the 2009 Solar Decathlon. A Habitat for Humanity home was designed and built by the Building Institute students at a cost of \$73,271 in 2010-2011. In 2010-2012, the Building Institute designed, built and sold two sustainably designed, market-rate homes. The EVENT House sold for \$153,000 and the NEXHouse also sold for \$153,000. The Building Institute has financing for its next market-rate home, the COUR House, which it will build in 2013 with an asking price of \$179,000.

The Coastal Community Resilience Studio

Since its inception in 2010, the Coastal Community Resilience Studio has received \$220,000 from Chevron Corporation in cooperation with America's Wetland Foundation, \$1,000 from The Nature Conservancy, \$9,800 from the UL Lafayette STEP program, and \$30,000 from the Louisiana SeaGrant College Program. Funding for the Resilience Studio supports the following: tuition and monthly stipends for two graduate assistants, monthly stipends for one undergraduate assistant, summer salary for three research-faculty and the Associate Director, 50% salary for the Director, travel expenses for student site visits, and 100% of the computational and material supplies necessary for instruction and research. Approximately 17% of the SeaGrant funding was returned to the University for indirect expenses. A two-year proposal for \$300,000 was submitted to Chevron Corporation and is currently under review.

Civic Development Studio

The Civic Development Studio, in a few different incarnations over the past four years, has been involved with a series of projects leading up to its current effort to implement a public/private development entity to focus on social and physical energy generation through environmentally-focused real estate and alternative energy projects.

In 2010 we worked under a \$20,000 Coastal Community Resilience Studio grant to develop strategies to re-integrate a major chemical waste stream of a regional Honeywell Corporation plant into the rehabilitation of the deteriorating wetlands across the Louisiana coast. Through this project we provided three faculty members with partial summer salaries and three students with an on-going stipend throughout the fall semester.

Between 2010 and 2011 we were consultants on a 16 million dollar tax-credit, mixed-use, multi-family Work Force Housing project to assure a high level of energy efficiency and LEED rating. Through this project two faculty members were given a stipend through a fall semester and we were able to place two of our graduating master's students as lead designers on the project.

We are currently in the pre-design stage of what we anticipate to be a three million dollar real estate project that will allow us to continue to integrate a few of our best graduating masters students into meaningful civic work as well as fund an on-going graduate assistant to manage our studio and to pay for faculty summer salaries. The strategy is to continue developing real estate projects and expand our ability to support graduate students and faculty summer salaries.

Geoff Gjertson	<i>Thinking While Doing: Connecting Insight to Innovations in the Construction Sector.</i> Canadian Partnership Grant, shortlists, number 8 or 100, awarded \$20,000. Entire Grant: \$2.2 million.
*Geoff Gjertson/ Brian Powell/Kari Smith/Dan Burkett	Solar Decathlon 2009. <i>BeauSoleil Louisiana Solar House</i> Proposal. Sponsored by the Dept. of Energy. PI: Gjertson, Co-PI: Powell, Smith, Burkett. Awarded: \$100,000.00. Jan. 2008.
*Kari Smith	SeaGrant College Program, "Improving coastal resilience in the Chenier Plain and Atchafalaya Basin through a student-driven multidisciplinary research program." through a student-driven multidisciplinary research program with Whitney P. Broussard III, Ph.D. funded \$30,000.
Kari Smith/Corey Saft	Louisiana Board of Regents Enhancement Grant, "Learning Through Design: A Curriculum for Teaching Design" with Corey Saft, RA, LEED AP; Doug Williams, Ph.D., Director and Yuxin Ma, Ph.D. funded \$106,000 Co-Investigator.
Kari Smith/Corey Saft/Brian Powell	Student Technology Enhancement Program (STEP), Environmental Toolbox, with Corey Saft, RA, LEED AP and Brian Powell, funded \$10,845 Principal Investigator.
*Kari Smith/Corey Saft/Hector LaSala	Chevron Studio "Ecologies Design Ecologies: A Collaborative" with Hector LaSala; Corey Saft RA, LEED AP; Sandra C. Duhé, Ph.D, APR.; Keith Core, SR/WA, funded \$20,000 Co-Investigator.
*Kari Smith	Gannett Foundation with TEAM BeauSoleil funded \$3,000 Co-Investigator, 95% project credit.
*Kari Smith	Lafayette Visitor Enterprise Fund with TEAM BeauSoleil funded \$20,000 Co-Investigator, 95% project credit.
*Kari Smith	Department of Energy Solar Decathlon with TEAM BeauSoleil funded \$100,000 Co-Investigator.
*Tom Sammons	University Bike Path Phase I funded by the Department of Transportation and Development, first Phase of a \$1 million project; development of bicycle and jogging paths along major thoroughfares including lighting and landscaping design. Completed Fall 2011.
*Tom Sammons	University Bike Path Phase II funded by Federal Transit Administration. Second phase of the bike path will connect the Phase I existing bike path from University Commons through existing neighborhoods using shared space and crossing Johnson Street at Julia Street through Youth Park and connecting to Rex Street. 2012-present \$500,000.
*Tom Sammons	Campus Tree Survey, the CDW and Mike Hess with the University Facilities Planning Committee are photographing, measuring, and documenting each tree on the campus of the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. This project was

<p>*Tom Sammons</p> <p>*Tom Sammons</p> <p>*Tom Sammons</p>	<p>initiated in the Summer of 2011 and three-fourths of the main campus is documented. UL Lafayette is supporting two graduate students and supplies for the project. Summer 2011-present \$22,000.</p> <p>Re-envisioning the McKinley Strip, funded by Lafayette Consolidated Government. Redevelopment of streets, sidewalks, landscaping and street lighting to promote connection between downtown Lafayette and the University. 2012 \$7000.</p> <p><i>Youngsville Master Plan</i> funded by the City of Youngsville and Lafayette Economic Development Authority. Unprecedented growth has forced the City of Youngsville to consider land use options for it's downtown, major arteries, and residential areas. 2011-present \$22,000.</p> <p>Re-envisioning the Oil Center. The CDW, working with LEDA, the Oil Center Renaissance Association, Lafayette Consolidated Government, and MPO produced a master plan and urban code for the Oil Center. The emphasis of the plan and the code focuses on mixed-use housing to be developed within the confines of the Oil Center, funded by LEDA. 2010 \$46,000.</p>
<p>*Tom Sammons</p> <p>*Tom Sammons</p> <p>*Tom Sammons</p> <p>*Tom Sammons</p> <p>*Tom Sammons</p> <p>*Tom Sammons</p>	<p>Maurice, Louisiana: Urban Design For A Small Town. Master Plan studies were produced for the City of Maurice which included a publication that referenced not only the importance of the Master Plan but also policy suggestions for the development of a land-use plan. Funded by State of Louisiana. 2009 \$26,000 .</p> <p>Non-Structural Design Study for Vermilion Parish, Co-Pi with the Department of Sociology and the University of New Orleans. Housing design for the city of Delcambre, Louisiana, hurricane mitigation. 2009 \$90,000.</p> <p>Redesign of Campus Quadrangle. Working with student Government Association and the President's Office, the CDW was commissioned to redesign the campus quadrangle. Funded by the University. 2009 \$4,500.</p> <p>Campus Walkway; Redesign of the existing walkway between the swamp and Lewis Street was commissioned by Dr. Savoie. This included integration of existing walkways, landscape, lighting, hardscape, and seating. 2009 \$4,500</p> <p>"Campus Master Plan Revised". With the entry of the new president, Dr. Savoie, a revision of the 2004 master plan was updated. Funded by the University. 2008 \$6,000.</p> <p>"Dry Prong Phase II". The CDW was asked to produce an animated three-dimensional model and movie for the design of a two-way roadway being developed for Highway 167 through Dry Prong. The CDW produced a base model animation and attended public meetings. Funded by the Department of Transportation and Development. 2008 \$12,000</p>

*Tom Sammons	"NIMSAT, Homeland Security, Governor's Office of Emergency Response". Modeling the campus so that the information can be linked with Homeland Security in the event of natural disasters and/or acts of terrorism; funded two graduate students.
*Tom Sammons	"Broussard, Louisiana Master Plan. Master plan for a quadrant of Broussard, Louisiana. Funded by the City of Broussard. \$8,000.
*Tom Sammons	"Master Plan for Kaplan, Louisiana". Urban design for a small town, included redevelopment of a small town residential district, redevelopment of the traditional neighborhoods, and strategies of how to develop the periphery of the small town. Funded by the Department of Transportation and Development. 2008 \$24,000.
*Tom Sammons	"Dry Prong Phase I". Animated video integrating a new five-lane roadway Highway 167 through Dry Prong, Louisiana. Video integrated existing context and new infrastructure to illustrate the impact of the roadway for property owners. Funded by the Department of Transportation and Development. 2008 \$15,000.
*Tom Sammons	"Board of Regents Visualization Enhancements Grant". Co-author of grant visualization enhancement for high-end computers and software to interface with LITE (Louisiana Immersive Technologies Enterprise). Funded by the Board of Regents of Louisiana. \$105,000.
*Tom Sammons	"New Iberia". Hopkins Street Corridor Redevelopment Plan. The Urban Design Plan focused on streetscape, infill architecture and housing to redevelop this African-American neighborhood. Funded by the City of New Iberia. \$24,000.
*Tom Sammons	"Cameron: Urban Design for Small Business". Development and Urban Design plan for Cameron Parish, Louisiana. Funded by the Center for Planning Excellence, Cameron, Louisiana. \$14,150.
*Tom Sammons	Washington Main Street Design". Development and redesign of Main Street for the City of Washington, Louisiana. Funded by the City of Washington. \$11,312.
*Tom Sammons	"Scientific Equipment Grant". Community Design Workshop was awarded approximately \$5,000 for new computer lab equipment and software for the new downtown studio from the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. Fall 2004 \$5,000.
*Tom Sammons	"Lafayette Parish School Board Section 16 Property Development". Master Plan of School Board Section 16 property to develop schools as well as economic benefit for the School Board Property. \$21,700.
*Geoff Gjertson	<i>"GENERATING HOPE: How to Build a Solar House -THE STORIES OF THE BEAUSOLEIL LOUISIANA SOLAR HOME"</i> Graham Foundation Organization Grant. 2013. Pending Award.

*Geoff Gjertson	<i>Thinking While Doing: Connecting Insight to Innovations in the Construction Sector.</i> Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Partnership Grant. Cavanagh, Project Director. Gjertson, Co-Applicant. Awarded March, Peer-Reviewed. 2013 \$2,483,150.00.
*Geoff Gjertson	<i>Delivering Architectural Construction: Culture, Originality, Rural Development (aACCORD.)</i> Partnership grant with Dalhousie University. PI: Edwin Cavanagh. UL Lafayette: Partner. Contact/Co-PI: Gjertson. Shortlisted- Refer Revised Grant Above. Peer-Reviewed. \$2,019,000.00. 2011-2015.
*Geoff Gjertson	<i>Building Institute.</i> Neighborhood Housing Infill Proposal. Granted a resolution from the Lafayette Public Trust Financing Authority for a loan of \$400,000 to construct three sustainable market-rate homes in surrounding neighborhoods. 2010-present.
*Geoff Gjertson	<i>Solar Decathlon Performance Tracking of the BeauSoleil Home. National Renewable Energy Lab.</i> PI: Henry, Co-PI: Gjertson. Awarded \$121,266.00 (Grant Program Canceled.) Peer-Reviewed. 2010-2012.
*Geoff Gjertson	<i>Solar Decathlon 2009. BeauSoleil Louisiana Solar Home. Louisiana Contractor's Educational Trust Fund.</i> PI: Gjertson. Awarded \$30,000. 2010.
*Geoff Gjertson	<i>Solar Decathlon 2009. BeauSoleil Louisiana Solar Home. Cash Donations and Grants from Private, Academic and Community Groups.</i> PI: Gjertson, Co-PI: Powell, Smith, Burkett \$435,900 2007-2009.
*Geoff Gjertson	<i>Solar Decathlon 2009. BeauSoleil Louisiana Solar House Proposal.</i> Sponsored by the Department of Energy. PI: Gjertson, Co-PI: Powell, Smith, Burkett. Peer-Reviewed. Awarded: \$100,000.00. Jan. 2008.
*Michael McClure	2011 Investigative Team Member, "Strategies and Speculations – Historical Preservation Methods for at-risk Coastal Sites, Case Study 1 – Fort Proctor," Academic Year 2011-12, project funded by the Louisiana State University Coastal Sustainability Studio, \$20,520 monies granted.
*Michael McClure	2010 "Hurricane Architecture Study: An Architectural Site Analysis and Land Use Proposal Regarding Hurricane Protection And An Eco-Tourism Park On the Gulf Coast Between Freshwater Bayou and Southwest Pass," Summer 10, Co-PI, project funded by the Louisiana Department of Economic Development for the University of Louisiana at Lafayette School of Architecture Building Institute, \$14,250 monies granted.
Michael McClure	2008 Gorham P. Stevens Rome Prize for Architecture, American Academy in Rome.
Robert McKinney	Project Director. Longwood Plantation, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Historic American Building Survey research funded by Environmental Design.

Robert McKinney	Project Director. Longwood Plantation, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Historic American Building Survey research funded by Environmental Design.
Robert McKinney	Project Director. Alexander Mouton House, Lafayette, Louisiana. Historic American Building Survey research funded by Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism. Project Cost \$30,119. Grant awarded then transferred to another Project Director.
Robert McKinney	Project Director. Lafayette Hardware Store, Lafayette, Louisiana. Historic American Building Survey research funded by Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism. Project Cost \$31,234. 2011-2012
Robert McKinney	Project Director. Old City Hall, Lafayette, Louisiana. Historic American Building Survey research funded by Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism. Project Cost \$30,179. 2010-2011
Robert McKinney	Project Director. Academy of the Sacred Heart School, Grand Coteau, Louisiana. Historic American Building Survey research funded by Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism. Project Cost \$31,489. 2009-2010
Robert McKinney	Project Director. Academy of the Sacred Heart Chapel, Grand Coteau, Louisiana. Historic American Building Survey research funded by Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism. Project Cost \$29,466. 2008-2009
Robert McKinney	Project Director. Academy of the Sacred Heart Barn, Grand Coteau, Louisiana. Historic American Building Survey research funded by Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism. Project Cost \$26,098. 2007-2008> Recieved Honorable mention in the Charles E. Peterson Prize sponsored by the National Park Service.
Robert McKinney	Project Director, Andy Loewy, CO-Investigator. Lutzenberger Foundry and Pattern Shop, New Iberia, Louisiana. Historic American Building Survey research funded by Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism. Project Cost \$35,317. 2006-2007
Robert McKinney	Project Director, Edward Cazayoux, CO-Investigator. Lafleur House, Grand Prairie, Louisiana. 2005-2006 Historic American Building Survey research funded by Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism. Project Cost \$33,792. 2006-2007

School of Architecture and Design Faculty Evaluation Rubric

Distinctive/Exemplary Performance	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Poor Performance	Unacceptable
Teaching					
is an expert/authority in the major field of interest and produces exemplary research/creative work in the area of teaching	is accomplished in the major field of interest and produces notable research/creative work in the area of teaching	is competent in the major field of interest and produces adequate research/creative work in the area of teaching	demonstrates limited knowledge about the major field of interest and produces limited research/creative work in the area of teaching	knowledge of the major field of interest does not meet normal standards; little evidence of research/creative work in the area of teaching; improvement needed	no evidence of interest or knowledge in field of teaching
excels in developing flexible pedagogical approaches and maximizes active student learning	is accomplished in developing flexible pedagogical approaches; often precipitates active student learning	demonstrates the ability to develop flexible pedagogical approaches; encourages active student learning	limited ability to develop flexible pedagogical approaches; some evidence of techniques that foster active student learning	ability to develop flexible pedagogical approaches does not meet normal standards; little evidence of techniques that foster active student learning	inflexible; destructive pedagogical approaches; no evidence of techniques that foster active student learning

Distinctive/Exemplary Performance	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Poor Performance	Unacceptable
excels as mentor of students; students' potential, limitations and difficulties are a top priority; exemplary in exhibiting fairness	accomplished as mentor of students; students' potential, limitations and difficulties are a clear priority; accomplished in exhibiting fairness	competent mentor of students; demonstrates personal interest in students' potential, limitations and difficulties; exhibits appropriate fairness	displays uneven mentorship of students; personal interest in students' potential, limitations and difficulties are a priority at times; usually exhibits fairness	does not mentor students adequately, personal interest in students' potential, limitations and difficulties is not usually evident; does not exhibit fairness	no mentoring of students; unfair dealings with students
exemplary in keeping courses up-to-date and incorporating teaching technology into classroom materials with outstanding effectiveness and innovation	accomplished at keeping courses up-to-date; incorporates appropriate teaching technology into classroom materials with distinguished effectiveness	competent at keeping courses up-to-date; usually incorporates appropriate teaching technology into classroom materials with sufficient effectiveness	inconsistently keeps courses up-to-date; uneven incorporation of teaching technology into classroom materials with limited effectiveness	courses are generally not up-to-date; appropriate teaching technology is mostly lacking in course content and delivery	courses are not up-to-date; appropriate teaching technology is non-existent in course content and delivery
Research					
generates exemplary new research or creative work that is recognized or refereed at a prestigious level	accomplished at generating new research or creative work that is recognized or refereed at a distinguished level	generates new research or creative work that is recognized or refereed at an adequate level of quality	incomplete record of generating research, scholarship or creative work that is refereed or recognized at an adequate level of quality	inadequate record of research, scholarship and/or creative work	no record of research and/or scholarship; engages in destructive research activities, i.e. plagiarism
exemplary collaborative leader, who excels in providing opportunities through research or creative activity to maximize engagement and effectively mentor both students and faculty	accomplished collaborator often assuming lead roles, often precipitates opportunities through research or creative activity to effectively engage and mentor both students and/or faculty	competent collaborator, demonstrates ability to provides opportunities through research or creative activity to usually engage and mentor students and/or faculty	uneven record of collaboration, sometimes provides opportunities through research or creative activity to inconsistently mentor students and/or faculty	fails to collaborate, provide inadequate opportunities to engage others through research or creative activity	provides no opportunities to engage others through research or creative activity
exemplary ability in securing external resources or support for research or creative works	accomplished in securing external resources or support for research or creative works	competent in securing external resources or support for research or creative works	limited success in securing resources or support for research or creative works	fails to secure adequate support for research and or creative works	fails to secure any support for research and or creative works
Advising					

Distinctive/Exemplary Performance	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Poor Performance	Unacceptable
exemplary student advising; excels in highly effective communication; outstanding knowledge of curriculum, campus resources, and tracking student academic progress is a top priority	accomplished advising; communicates very effectively with students, very knowledgeable of curriculum, campus resources, and tracking student academic progress is a clear priority	competent advising; communicates successfully with students, knowledgeable of curriculum, campus resources, and tracking student academic progress is of interest	uneven advising; inconsistent communication skills, some knowledge of curriculum, campus resources, and demonstrates inconsistent interest in tracking student academic progress	displays minimal advising skills and communication; relies on others for information on curriculum, campus resources, and does not track student academic progress	improper advising and communication; does not meet with assigned advisees
Service					
outstanding engagement in the governance of the institution, college, department; assuming effective leadership roles in committee work to improve educational and research efforts; demonstrates the strengths of a visionary leader to lead initiatives	notable engagement in the governance of the institution, college or department; enthusiastically participates in committee work to improve educational and research efforts; demonstrates accomplished leadership skill to organize groups	Consistent participation in the governance of the college or department; adequately participates in committee work to improve educational and research efforts; demonstrates competent leadership on specific tasks	inconsistent participation in the governance of the department; limited work to improve educational and research efforts; demonstrates limited competency in completing specific tasks	inadequate participation; minimal interest in governance of the institution, college, or department	impedes others' participation and leadership; no interest in governance of the institution, college, or department
is exceptional in making valuable contributions to professional and community organizations, assuming leadership roles at local, state, and national levels	is an accomplished member in professional and community, very effective engagement of organizations at the local and state levels	demonstrates competent service in professional and community activities, at the local level	demonstrates uneven participation in professional and community activities	is lacking as a participant in professional and community activities	shows no participation in professional and community activities
is distinguished in demonstrating collegiality	is accomplished in demonstrating collegiality;	is competent in demonstrating collegiality	limited competency in demonstrating collegiality	is lacking in demonstrating professional collegiality	destructive to the collegiality of the unit;
is extraordinarily reliable in carrying out faculty responsibilities in a timely manner thoroughly and as a top priority	is exceptionally reliable in completing faculty responsibilities in a timely matter completely and as a clear priority	is consistently reliable in completing faculty responsibilities typically on time, and typically meeting expectations	can sometimes be relied on to meet schedules and deadlines and sometimes completes faculty responsibilities	is often not reliable; does not usually meet basic faculty responsibilities	does not meet basic faculty responsibilities

Economic and/or Cultural Development.

- Describe how the program faculty, in their role as a faculty member, interact with industry, non-profit agencies, and/or government in ways that contribute to regional or state economic or cultural development.
- If applicable, describe how the program fits with the FIRST Louisiana initiative (Service learning activities may be relevant)

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

Students prepared to be active, engaged citizens

A project that began in 2010 and continues as of this writing is the *Joie de Vivre* Work-Force Housing tax-credit project in downtown Lafayette with a construction budget of approximately 16 million dollars. This project grew out of a 10-year working relationship between the architecture program and an area non-profit. Two faculty members and two students led the design team and explored an alternative IDP program modeled on the medical profession's teaching hospital. To support the City of Lafayette's Comprehensive Planning initiative, several faculty members have organized a nation-wide competition, *Envision Lafayette* to help the regional community visualize the material and aesthetic potential that comprehensive planning offers if the citizenry participates. The faculty regularly works with area non-profits on design charrettes for their facilities, with local arts organization to assist with such things as set design, pedagogy development and small and large design-build projects.

The Acadiana region offers many opportunities for practical and productive involvement with the regional community. The history of architectural response to the region's hot and humid climate makes excellent research material for students and faculty. One SoAD faculty member has designed the first certified *Passive House* in this climate zone. Students worked with the faculty member to gather and publish the energy, environmental and comfort data for the house. Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and Historic American Engineering Report (HAER) projects teach students how architecture was approached at various times in history and how social, economic, and environmental influences create challenges for design and construction.

Several entities within the SoAD provide opportunities for students to engage with the community for the public good. The Community Design Workshop, for example, helps cities, small towns and neighborhoods visualize their potential by providing expertise in urban and community planning, landscape design, architecture, housing, and interior design. The CDW develops its projects through public workshops and charrettes in collaboration with the communities. A permanent office for the CDW was established in 2011 in Abdalla Hall located in the University's Research Park. This location allows faculty and students to engage their projects in the community context, and gives the public easy access to the CDW. By collaborating with the public, the Workshop is effectively able to integrate the ideas of the public with established planning and urban design principles. The CDW is currently linked with the ARCH 502 studio, and is committed to rebuilding neighborhoods and downtown areas, and helping communities reclaim their assets. In its 16 year history, it has completed 85 projects totaling over \$3,000,000 including community design and planning strategies in Carencro, Opelousas, Jonesboro, Breaux Bridge, post-Hurricane Rita Cameron Parish, and various neighborhoods in Lafayette

including the Oil Center, the Johnston Street and the Simcoe Street Corridor Projects, the design of the I-49 Corridor through Lafayette, and a campus bike path that connects outlying University buildings to the main campus.

Another SoAD asset, the Building Institute, is a project delivery, design-build program that brings architecture students, architects, engineers and contractors together in the design and construction of single-family, market-rate homes. The homes are built on infill property in the urban core neighborhoods of Lafayette, and then publically sold at a market-rate. Students work hand-in-hand with local contractors to build the homes, which achieve sustainability standards such as the National Homebuilder's Green Building Standard or LEED. The Building Institute is structured through a graduate design studio (ARCH 501) offered in the fall, a construction documents course in the spring and a construction course in the summer. Students receive academic credit for each course and in addition, several team leaders receive paid summer internships allowing them to accrue IDP credit. The Building Institute is not a simulation - it is hyper-reality.

Other Resources.

- Briefly describe and evaluate the program's spatial, library, travel, technology, and equipment resources.

The School of Architecture and Design is located in Fletcher Hall towards the southwest corner of the University campus at the corner of East Lewis Street and Girard Park Drive. To accommodate the School's growth and enrollment, until the construction of the new work is completed, the School of Architecture and Design also utilizes additional on-campus facilities in Madison Hall and Abdalla Hall. Both ARCH 401, fourth-year studio, and ARCH 502, graduate studio, are currently located in UL Lafayette's Research Park, more specifically, Abdalla Hall. In addition to those studios, the Coastal Community Resilience Studio and the SoAD's Community Design Workshop are also located in the same facility. Descriptions of the mentioned physical resources, as well as others, are as follows.

J.L. Fletcher Hall (JLF)

Design Studios. The architecture program's studios are in Fletcher Hall rooms 104, 122, and 109. Rooms 122 and 104 both house first-year studio space, each with dedicated personal desks and storage lockers for the students. Between both of the rooms, first-year studio is dedicated approximately 2,160 square feet. Room 104 houses the second-year studio in 5,125 square feet. The third and fourth year/graduate studios are housed in room 122 in 5,125 square feet. The fourth year/graduate studios alternate between Room 122 and Abdalla Hall. Room 109 houses the graduate-level studio in 1,225 square feet. These studios (and the entire Fletcher Hall) are wirelessly networked to provide Internet access to each individual student. The studios also have electrical systems providing outlets serving each desk. In addition, each room accommodates critique areas that also serve as work areas for large or collaborative projects. The interior design and industrial design studios are located conveniently in Fletcher Hall in rooms 207 and 110 respectively.

Faculty Offices. Each faculty member in the architecture program has a dedicated office space, 80% of which are directly adjacent to the design studios on the first floor. Each faculty member has at least one computer for University work, although many faculty (through grant funding) have multiple computers. All faculty have access to printing in the School's main office though most faculty have printers and scanners in their private offices.

Media Center. The Media Center, Room 134, is an auditorium for students separated by a covered breezeway. It accommodates facilities for DVD, videotape, and data projection for theatre performances, multimedia art performances, and lecture classes. The stage area also serves as a work area for large design projects when available.

Smart Classrooms. Rooms 203, 207, 211, 101, and 134 are fully networked and include multimedia podiums. They are outfitted with equipment for DVD, videotape, and data projection.

Woodshop. The Woodshop in JLF 113 provides sufficient equipment and adequate space for students to work on a variety of projects. The woodshop has a full-time supervisor and student workers to enable the shop to keep extended hours. The shop consists of a combination of traditional equipment and CNC equipment, which permit working in wood, plastics and basic metal operations. The shop equipment has been organized into various levels depending on a student's abilities with Level One being the most basic for first-year students working up to the most advanced Level Five. The *Shop Safety Manual* is posted on the School's website.

LEVEL ONE:

Hand tools: marking and layout, handsaws, hammers/chisel

Hand-held power tools: hand drill, orbital sanders, finishing sanders, belt sander, dremel, die grinders, brad nail gun/stapler, jig saw

Stationary power tools: large band saw, 14" band saw, scroll saw, spindle sander, belt/disk sander, floor drill press, drill bits

LEVEL TWO:

Laguna band saw, sliding compound miter saw, reciprocating saw, circular handsaw, hollow chisel mortise, panel saw

LEVEL THREE:

Table saw, jointer, thickness planer, wood lathe, router table, router

LEVEL FOUR:

Metal lathe, hand mill

LEVEL FIVE:

CNC router, CNC milling machine

3 Axis Mill. JL Fletcher now houses a 'Centriod' 3 Axis mill. It mills pieces of varying densities up to a size of 32"x10"x4". It accepts materials as soft as insulation foam to materials as hard as high-density polyethylene. In the past year both the Industrial and Architectural departments have used it.

2.5 Axis Table Router. JL Fletcher also houses an 'XYZ' table router. It mills pieces of varying densities up to a size of 48"x96"x4" and cuts large vector based artwork. The difference between this router and the 3 Axis Mill is that it must stair step with each level where the 3 axis can flow up and down while moving along the x and y axis. The machine is available to all majors in the School of Architecture & Design.

Photo Documentation. A photo documentation studio is located in JLF 110A/B for faculty and students to use to document student work. The room is equipped with lighting and backdrops.

Art Studios. The visual arts spaces include ceramics studios and kilns, photography studio with darkroom facilities, metal working and jewelry studio, drawing and graphics studios, sculpture and painting studios and an advertising design studio. Although primarily used by visual art majors, students are able to take elective course work in these areas.

Community Design Workshop (CDW). In addition to the large off-site facility, the CDW maintains a three-room office suite in Fletcher Hall room 212 that also houses computers and serves as a meeting facility for the workshop.

Administration Suite. The Administration Suite provides for additional space and workstations for administrative staff and student workers.

Security. The building is outfitted with swipe card access. Faculty and students are able to use their ID cards for access. This system provides additional security and allows after-hour access to the building during scheduled hours.

Existing Facilities:

Metal Casting and Forging Workshop. The faculty secured approved funding to expand the current metals studio. Located adjacent to the Woodshop, this Workshop is dedicated to a plaster-casting area, and a plastics and molding workshop.

Spray Booth. A spray booth was added to the first floor of Fletcher Hall (currently located in the second-year architecture studio space) for students to be able to safely control the fumes of spray painting. The booth is available to all programs in the School of Architecture and Design.

Laser Cutter. JLFletcher houses a 'Universal 600' laser cutter. This new equipment cuts a wide range of materials up to a size of 18"x32" and 3/8" thick. It most commonly cuts chipboard, cardboard, masonite, acrylic, foam core, and card stock. This is the most popularly used machine in the building and can be used by the architecture, industrial, interior, and graphic design students.

3-D Printer. The 3-D printer is a 'Dimension BST 768' and it prints pieces out of ABS plastic up to a size of 8in x 8in x 12in. It is accurate up to .01 inch. The 3-D Printer is only available to students past their second year studio level work in the School of Architecture & Design.

Security – Green Card Access. Green Cards have been assigned to students enrolled in College of the Arts courses in an effort to protect them during the facility's late hours. The University's Campus Police Department developed this security provision with the College of the Arts in the fall of 2012. The Green Cards allow eligible students to work on schoolwork during hours when the facility is officially closed. The challenge for University Police to monitor Fletcher Hall after hours and to identify the students who are permitted to be in the building has been alleviated. The Green Cards have proven to be an excellent addition to increase the security of students working after hours in Fletcher Hall.

Exhibition:

Dean's Gallery and Conference Room. The Dean's Gallery (Room 202) is a 650 square foot space located in the Dean's suite in Fletcher Hall and is used for faculty and student exhibits throughout the year. The Dean's Conference Room is a 405 square foot 'Smart Classroom' available for meetings, critiques, and graduate seminar courses.

JLF Room 101. This area is a dedicated critique/gallery space of 1,560 square feet. It is a 'Smart Classroom' and includes chairs, a large table, and model stands to accommodate many uses. It is outfitted with a portable immersive 3D projection system.

University Art Museum (UAM). The Paul and Lulu Hilliard University Art Museum is a state of the art facility. The building enables the museum to present compelling exhibitions that offer audiences a dramatic look at the timeless influence of art. The museum presents great works of the past and challenge conventional artistic thinking by presenting the work of artists who are making significant contributions today. This award winning design is located approximately two blocks away from Fletcher Hall. It has active programs in traveling exhibits, lectures, interdisciplinary workshops, etc. Additional space is available at the adjacent antebellum style mansion of 4,800 square feet. Our senior and thesis exhibits are held at the UAM annually, as well as other School of Architecture and Design student exhibitions, lectures, and presentations. The Paul and Lulu Hilliard University Art Museum's permanent collection consists of more than 2,000 works of art, including paintings, prints, drawings, sculpture, and photographs. This collection represents 18th, 19th and 20th century Louisiana, as well as the United States, Europe and Japan.

Planned Changed to Physical Plant

Fletcher Hall

Since the last NAAB visit, the University placed JL Fletcher Hall on a top priority list for a building renovation after the induction of Dr. Joseph Savoie as University President in 2008. This renovation plan includes enclosing exterior decks and terraces to increase available studio space and other amenities. The primary concern is waterproofing the existing building. In 2010, the University acquired funding for Fletcher Hall from the State of Louisiana, Facility Planning & Control, to undergo a \$3.5 million dollar renovation and addition. Public bidding occurred in March of 2013 with completion projected for January 2014. The project consists of emergency repairs to the 71,000 square foot building, originally constructed in 1976. The repairs include the replacement of the exterior finish system with new wall cladding, the provision of a cover over the existing three-story courtyard space and conditioning for the entire interior space, repair of the existing terrazzo walk flooring, replacement of the wood ceilings of all three floor balconies, and other needed repairs to floors, walls, ceilings, lights, doors. In addition, the project includes the construction of approximately 10,000 square feet of new studio spaces to replace the open decks/ terraces at the second floor level. (See following page for proposed changes to 2nd floor Fletcher Hall.)

The budget was found to be inadequate to accommodate all of Fletcher Hall's needs. The selected architect faced this challenge as well as the aesthetic unification of the building with the rest of the campus. The initially approved aesthetic detailing caused a revolt with the current students and alumni of the School. Through social media, the dissatisfaction with the approved design for Fletcher Hall became extremely evident. Faculty of the SoAD contacted President Savoie to gain permission to develop an alternative option to the design as a response to this revolt. As a result in two weeks, interested faculty, alumni and local professionals developed a more aesthetically acceptable option while maintaining the primary purpose of the renovation – waterproofing.

Phase I: This 3.5 million dollar phase of the Fletcher Hall renovation is essentially a water mitigation project and will include: exterior cladding, covering the exterior decks on the second floor with minimal air-conditioning and lighting for the interiors. These additions to JLF are to be completed as "White Box" spaces, meaning they will not be completed with final mechanical systems and interior finish. They will provide 21,652 square feet of additional studio space to house the fourth-year architecture studio, the interior design studios, and a Visual Arts studio.

Fire Alarm & Sprinkler Systems. The Fire Alarm system will be upgraded and a sprinkler system installed to meet local, state, and national codes.

Phase II – Renovation of Interiors: The newly enclosed spaces will allow all studios of the School of Architecture and Design to be under one roof. Eventually, the need for off-site additional space will not be required as a result of the 10,000 square foot addition.

Exhibition. The new exhibition space that replaces the existing interior design studio provides another gallery on the second floor for display of student work. This will augment the gallery space located in the existing Dean's Administrative Suite.

Facility Concern

The most significant challenge is the impact of the renovation process on the daily operations of the School. Although it is challenging to maintain class schedules in the midst of construction, the benefits of the project in terms of eliminating water intrusion, the increased life safety with new fire alarm and sprinkler systems, the addition of functioning fire stairs, and the increased studio space square footages make the challenge worth it. If additional funding is provided to the University, then the construction progress will continue. The learning environment will continue to be improved for students, faculty, and staff.

Computer Resources

Digital Media Resource Center (DMRC). The Digital Media Resource Center is located in room 209 in JL Fletcher Hall and is a resource for all students enrolled in the College of the Arts. This department serves as two classrooms/labs during weekdays and as an open lab during the evenings and weekends. The Macintosh lab supports 25 iMac computers and offers current software programs for 2D and 3D coursework. The animation classroom houses 18 Windows configured iMac computers, all of which run Maya, 3D Studio Max, Rhino, and other software for 3D animation creation.

This center offers access to digital video cameras, DVD projection, video editing software and hardware, slide and flatbed scanners, and a large format printer. In addition there is an extensive media collection consisting of over 400 DV/Videotapes and 100,000 slide images of art, architecture, industrial design, and interior design. We offer a preview room in support and promotion of the use of this collection for faculty.

The DMRC contains a collection of more than 100,000 art and architecture slides, including a special collection of 25,000 Louisiana architecture images and videotape programs on various subjects related to art and architecture. Approximately 55,000 of the collection's slides document architecture. The architecture collection is organized and filed chronologically by location, architect, and as appropriate, style. Also available from the Dupré Library, digital resources via the web are digital images of art and architecture.

The DMRC is supported through grants and University funding and is open to faculty and students in the College of the Arts.

The computer resources include:

Hardware:

- 25 iMac Computers
- 2 Power PC iMac Computers
- 18 Windows Configured iMac Computers
- 2 Flatbed Scanners
- 1 Slide Scanner
- 1 Epson Large Format Printer
- 2 LCD Projectors

Software:

- Adobe Creative Suite: After Effects, Illustrator, Photoshop, Premiere, Flash
- Maya
- Final Cut Pro X
- Rhino
- 3D Studio Max
- Microsoft Office

The square footage is adequate to support the activities and services of the DMRC. It's central location on the second floor of Fletcher Hall is convenient for the architecture students and faculty who are housed on the first floor of the same building. There are two separate places for reading as well as viewing slides and working at the computer workstations. The

environmental control is of good quality for archival purposes. The entire collection is housed in this space, so there are no remote storage facilities. Storage for existing materials is sufficient. There is also sufficient equipment for use of the faculty and students.

The DMRC is protected from theft by a security system and the building is properly alarmed for fire and other hazard. Emergency procedures are posted throughout the building.

Each faculty office has a computer workstation and the building is networked and has WiFi for student access. Students are required to have their own laptops by second year, but many have them already in first year. Software requirements are indicated in course syllabi, and may vary from course to course and year to year. Every effort to stay current with software is made. Students also have access to WiFi in Abdalla Hall. There are ten computer workstations in the CDW office in Fletcher Hall, Room 212 that are available to students who are working for the CDW. The Resilience Studio has two dedicated computer workstations in Abdalla Hall.

Previous Reports.

- List any Board of Regents Progress Reports, Low-Completer documentation, Accreditation Reports, and the like from the last seven years.
- Attach copies of the original documents to the report(s).

The School of Architecture was accredited by NAAB in the spring of 2015. This eight-year accreditation cycle will return in 2022. See report attached. The masters is the accredited program but the criteria for accreditation includes undergraduate courses, ARCH 409, 410, 464, 441, 331, 301, 302, 202.

SWOT Analysis. List three to five respective strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to the program. These can include both internal and external factors.

Strengths

- 1) A talented and dedicated senior faculty which engages in a high level of teaching, research and service.
- 2) A talented and resourceful class of freshman faculty that engage the School at a high level of teaching, are enthusiastic about service to the School and who are developing their research.
- 3) Completion of Phase I of Fletcher Hall renovation. This completion improves the external appearance of the building which encourages and helps with recruitment and retention. Renovation has also improved the safety aspect for students and others and has improved the environmental quality of the building.

Weaknesses

- 1) Phase II funding for Fletcher Hall renovation has been stalled in the Legislature due to higher education budget cuts. Phase II would complement Phase I by adding additional 20,000 square feet of classroom space.
- 2) Limited monetary support for travel and supplies to support freshman class of assistant professors in aiding their tenure efforts with their research, teaching and service.
- 3) Lack of monetary support for technical upgrades and replacements for aging technology and equipment in the School.

Opportunities

- 1) Senior faculty have developed research capabilities classified as the SoAD Research Institutes. These have become a viable research arm for the School of Architecture and Design. This includes funding for faculty, graduate and undergraduate students.
- 2) With the construction and/or poor condition of Fletcher Hall, the faculty have mobilized to develop Design Day and high school visits as recruiting strategies.
- 3) Development of a new design degree to increase enrollment and to increase retention.

Threats

- 1) Lack of funding to complete the planned renovations to Fletcher Hall.
- 2) Lack of funding for assistant, associate and professors to continue to develop their teaching and research.
- 3) Lack of funding to recruit and/or retain quality new faculty.
- 4) Lack of funding for technological support to the School.

Action Plans. List five to ten proposed actions that will address challenges, weaknesses, or items of concern identified in the program or that will strengthen the program's faculty, students, facilities, and other resources. Identify any new programs, certificates, or minors that you anticipate proposing in the next few years.

1. Design Day. The SoAD has developed an event that helps with recruiting. Design Day was instituted two years ago to allow high school students to visit Fletcher Hall and participate in mock studio projects. These projects consisted of a self-portrait with use of materials being restricted to items found in their pockets. Another project was the shoe box project which gives students a sense of what a real studio would be like. It incorporates a spatial and materials exercise. In addition, there is an overall lecture by faculty that explains the range of design – including interior, industrial and architecture. The parents are allowed to meet the faculty, ask questions regarding the programs, while the university supplies personnel to discuss scholarships, housing, etc.
2. Summer Design Discovery Program. The SoAD has developed a summer school program for current high school students as an introduction into the design fields. The program includes a studio experience, field trips, and lectures from faculty and local professionals. The program is broken into a one-week and a two-week experience with students choosing which they want to attend.
3. Design Program. The SoAD is developing a new program for design majors. This program fuses entrepreneurship and business practices with business classes. There is a collaboration between the SoAD and the School of Business. The program becomes less studio focused and integrates business and entrepreneurship classes into the curriculum. The SoAD views this as an opportunity for recruitment and retention. The program is currently being reviewed in the Provost's Office.
4. The SoAD will continue to engage the administration in Martin Hall to pursue strategies for finding funding to complete Phase II of Fletcher Hall. Phase II is the completion of the studio shells which will provide the College of the Arts with an additional 20,000 square feet of studio, classroom and office space.
5. Rapid Prototype Facility. The SoAD is currently pursuing funding to build a new 10,000 square foot Rapid Prototyping Center to house our three-dimensional printers and C and C machines.

Submitted by:

Thomas C. Sammons, Director
School of Architecture and Design

*Date:



4-1-16

*This report is due to the Strategic Program Review Committee on or before April 1, 2016.

10.29.15