



Department of Architecture

2007 ANNUAL REPORT

to the

National Architectural Accrediting Board

June 17, 2007

Table of Contents

PART I

**RESPONSE TO CONCERNS STATED IN THE
PREVIOUS VISITING TEAM REPORT**

Conditions Not Met

A. Physical Resources.....	page 1
B. Professional Degrees & Curriculum.....	page x

Student Performance Criteria Not Met

C. Construction Cost Control.....	page x
D. Architect's Administrative Roles.....	page 3
E. Architectural Practice.....	page 3
F. Legal Responsibilities.....	page 3

Causes of Concern

G. Exposure to Modernism in History/Theory Sequence.....	page 3
H. Structure of Elective Courses.....	page 3
I. Faculty Participation in Strategic Planning	page 3
I. More Emphasis on Speaking, Writing, Critical Thinking & Research.	page 3

PART II

REPORT OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

A. Addition of General Studies Credits.....	page 4
---	--------

PART III

2006-07 NAAB STATISTICAL REPORT

2006-07 NAAB Statistical Report.	page x
---------------------------------------	--------

PART I

RESPONSE TO CONCERNS STATED IN THE PREVIOUS VISITING TEAM REPORT

A. Physical Resources

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

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

Increased hours

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

Plotting in Main Building

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

Nothing in this area.

B. Professional Degrees & Curriculum

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

Responding to this curriculum requirement received the highest priority this year. Last summer and fall the Curriculum Committee developed a strategy to respond to these points. To meet the 19.5 credit shortfall in General Studies credits, 12 general studies credits will be added to the degree requirements,

and to replace the General Lecture Series (ARCH 321,322,323) with 9 additional general studies credits. These two changes raise the total credits in the B.Arch. program from 209 to 221, while assigning 21 additional credits to general studies. The 21 new credits in General Studies raised that total to 69 credits, thus fulfilling the General Studies requirement with 1.5 credits to spare.

<u>General Studies Required Courses</u>	<u>Evening Program</u>	<u>2+4 Option</u>
English	9 credits	9 credits
Math	9 credits	8 credits
Physics	9 credits	8 credits
University Seminar		2 credits
<u>General Studies Required Electives</u>		
Humanities	6 credits	6 credits
Ethics for Architects (PHILxxx)	3 credits	3 credits
Social Sciences	9 credits	9 credits
Free Electives	24 credits	24 credits
Total	69 credits	69 credits

Having met the shortfall of General Studies credits this year, The Curriculum Committee will turn its attention to the four credit shortfall in total credits next year by addressing the interesting challenge of satisfying Professional Practice Performance Criteria in a Work Study Program.

C. Faculty Involvement in Strategic Planning

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

Faculty participation in strategic planning.

New Auxiliary Faculty in Representation.

D. Room for Improvement in Writing, Critical Thinking & Research Criteria

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

Thesis

PART II
REPORT OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

A. Credits

At the beginning of the 2003-04 academic year the total required credits for the Bachelor of Architecture degree were raised from 192 to 209 quarter credits. The process and the reasons for these changes, primarily in upper level studios, were discussed fully in the 2003 Annual Report. The credit increase was given final approval by the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Affairs in late May 2003, and the student body received official notice of the changes in the department's annual summer memo in July 2003. Predictably, many students were upset by an increase in required credits since tuition for part-time students is charged by the credit. Most could agree with the need to equate the Drexel program with other B.Arch. programs, and the need to validate the demands of upper level studios. However, many also interpreted the increased credits as a distinct rise in the cost of their education with no corresponding improvement in its quality. To air opinions in a formal setting the AIAS Chapter scheduled a general discussion on the issue at its October Meeting. This meeting began with a presentation by Department Head Paul Hirshorn about the rationale behind the credit changes, followed by a question and answer session, and a frank and open discussion on a variety of issues.

Causes of Concern

E. Exposure to Modernism in History/Theory Sequence

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

F. Structure of Elective Courses

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

G. Faculty Participation on Strategic Planning

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

H. More Emphasis on Speaking Writing, Critical Thinking and Research

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

13.25 Construction Cost Control

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

13.29 Architect's Administrative Roles

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

13.30 Architectural Practice

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

2006-07 NAAB STATISTICAL REPORT

2007 NAAB STATISTICAL REPORT

SCHOOL: **Drexel University**

Completed by: **Paul Hirshorn**

ACSA REGION: EC **NE** SE SW WC W (circle one)

PUBLIC or **PRIVATE** (circle one)

STUDENT DATA

	For Accredited Programs Only						
	4 Year **PreProf	B.Arch Five-year	B.Arch **PostPreProf	B.Arch **PostNonProf	M.Arch Five-year	M.Arch **PostPreProf	M.Arch **PostNonProf
Full-Time Students		53					
Part-Time Students		325					
FTE Students		182					
Arch Design Studio Students		365					
Students Working Part-Time		325					
Outside Stud. Serv. by Dept.		193					
African-American Students		23					
Native American Students*		0					
Asian/Pacific Isle Students		18					
Hispanic Origin Studentst		15					
Women Students		128					
Foreign Students		0					
Total Degrees Awarded		46					
Grads. Fin. Estb. No. Yrs.		40					
Degrees Awarded to Women		17					
Degrees Awarded to Afri-Amer		1					
Degrees Awarded to Amer. Ind.		0					
Degrees Awarded to Asi/Pac. Isl.		1					
Degrees Awarded Hispanics		3					
Min Req. SAT/ACT/GRE Score	1200*	NA					
Number of Applicants	725*	91					
Number Accepted	88*	51					
Enrollment Target/Goal	28*	40					
Student Studio/Faculty Ratio		8.83					

**full-time, 2+4 Option*

*Includes Eskimos and Aleuts

**Includes four-year program component of 4+1 yrs. B.Arch degree and 4+2 yrs. M.Arch degree.

***Non-Professional: baccalaureate degree that is not part of an accredited professional program.

FACILITY/RESOURCE DATA

Departmental Library LCNA or 720-729 Collection	NA
Total Architecture Collection in Departmental Library	NA
University Library LCNA or 720-729 Collection	8297
Total Architecure Collectoin in University Library	34,594
Departmental Library Architecture Slides	33,000
University Library Archiecture Slides	NA
Departmental Library Architecture Videos	100
Staff in Dept. Library	NA
Number of Computer Stations	142
Amount Spent on Information Technology	NA
Annual Budget for Library Resources	\$29,650
Per-Capita Financial Support Received from University	\$6,106
Private Outside Monies Received by Source	\$8,362
Studio Area (Net Sq. ft.)	9715
Total Area (Gross Sq. ft.)	15770

SCHOOL: **Drexel University**

Completed by: **Paul Hirshorn**

FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARIES	<u>Number</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Univ. Avg.</u>
Professor	1				\$118,732
Associate Professor	2				\$92,145
Assistant Professor	0				\$83,607
Instructor	2				\$53,365

FACULTY DATA

Department Total

Full-Time Faculty	5	NO. FULL-TIME FACULTY CREDENTIALS
Part-Time Faculty	64	
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Faculty	14.9	Ph.D. 1
Tenure Faculty	3	D. Arch
Tenure-Track Positions	3	M.A. or S.
FTE Administrative Positions	1.5	Prof. M. Arch 4
Faculty Engaged in Service to Comm.	34	B. Arch
Faculty Engaged in Service to Univ.	18	Post Prof. Masters
FT Faculty who are U.S. Licensed Registered Architects	4	Other
PT Faculty who are U.S. Licensed Registered Architects	46	
Practicing Architects	45	
FTE Graduate TA s	0	
FT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk	9.73	
PT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk	3.34	

	<u>FT</u>	<u>PT</u>	<u>Tenured</u>	<u>Prof.</u>	<u>Assoc.</u>	<u>Assist.</u>
African-American Faculty	0	3	0	0	0	0
Native American Faculty*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian/Pacific Island Faculty	0	4	0	0	0	0
Hispanic Origin Faculty	0	0	0	0	0	0
Women Faculty	1	10	1	0	1	0

*Include Eskimos and Aleuts