

# NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report

## SECTION A. INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

### 1. Program Contact Information:

Name	Louisiana State University
Title	School of Architecture
Office Phone Number	225.578.6885
Fax Number	225/388-2168
Email	sarch@lsu.edu

### 2. Institution Type:

Public

### 3. Carnegie Classification:

<b>a. Basic Classification:</b> research activity)	RU/VH: Research Universities (very high
<b>b. Undergraduate Instructional Program:</b> high graduate coexistence	Bal/HGC: Balanced arts & sciences/professions,
<b>c. Graduate Instructional Program:</b> with medical/veterinary	CompDoc/MedVet: Comprehensive doctoral
<b>d. Size and Setting:</b>	L4/NR: Large four-year, primarily nonresidential

### 4. Which regional accreditation agency accredits your institution?

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)

### 5. In which ACSA region is the institution located?

Southwest

### 6. Who has direct administrative responsibility for the architecture program?

Name	Jori Ann Erdman
Title	Director and Professor
Office Phone Number	225.578.6885
Fax Number	225.578.2168
Email	jerdman@lsu.edu

### 7. To whom should inquiries regarding this questionnaire to be addressed?

Name	Jori Erdman
Title	Director
Office Phone Number	225.578.6885
Fax Number	225.578.2168
Email	jerdman@lsu.edu

### 8. Who is the university administrator responsible for verifying data (and completing IPEDS reports) at your institution?

Name	Sandra Walker
Title	Director of Budget and Planning
Office Phone Number	225.578.3139
Fax Number	225.578.5963
Email	lnwalk@lsu.edu

### 9. Institutional Test Scores

#### a. SAT

##### *Critical Reading*

25th percentile SAT score:

75th percentile SAT score:

##### *Mathematics*

25th percentile SAT score:

**NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report**

75th percentile SAT score:

*Writing*

25th percentile SAT score:

75th percentile SAT score:

**b. ACT**

25th percentile ACT score: 23

75th percentile ACT score: 28

**c. Graduate Record Examination (GRE)**

Verbal: 477 (200-800)

Quantitative: 618 (200-800)

Analytical: (0.0 – 6.0)

**SECTION B – NAAB-ACCREDITED ARCHITECTURE PROGRAMS**

**1. DEGREE PROGRAMS**

**a. Which NAAB accredited / candidate degree programs were offered during the last fiscal year? (B. Arch, M. Arch, D. Arch)**

**Accredited**

B. Architecture, M. Architecture

**Candidate**

N/A

**b. Did your institution offer any pre-professional architecture degree programs during the last fiscal year? No**

Degree Type	Available?	Full Degree Title
-------------	------------	-------------------

**c. Did your institution offer any post-professional architecture degree programs during the last fiscal year?**

Full Degree Title
-------------------

**2. Does your institution have plans to initiate any new NAAB-accredited degree programs?**

No

**3. Does your institution have plans to discontinue any of its NAAB-accredited degree programs?**

No

**4. What academic year calendar type does your institution have?**

2 Semesters or Trimester

**5. Credit Hours for Completion for each program:**

- a. Indicate the total number of credit hours taken at your institution to earn each NAAB accredited/candidate degree program offered by your institution:
  - a. B. Architecture: 160
  - b. M. Architecture undergraduate (five years, no baccalaureate degree awarded prior): 0
  - c. M. Architecture Pre-Professional (degree designed for candidates who have a pre-professional degree in architecture): 0
  - d. M. Architecture Non-Pre-Professional (degree designed for candidates who have an undergraduate degree in a discipline other than architecture): 78
  - e.
- b. By degree, what is the distribution of credit hours in the following: General Education, Professional, and Electives?

## NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report

- a. B. Architecture:
- b. General Education: 39
- c. Professional: 99
- d. Electives: 27
- e. M. Architecture undergraduate:
- f. General Education: 0
- g. Professional: 0
- h. Electives: 0
- i. M. Architecture Pre-Professional:
- j. General Education: 0
- k. Professional: 0
- l. Electives: 0
- m. M. Architecture Non-Pre-Professional:
- n. General Education: 0
- o. Professional: 75
- p. Electives: 3
- q.

### 6. Average credit hours per student per term by degree program?

B. Architecture: 16

M. Architecture undergraduate: 0

M. Architecture Pre-Professional: 0

M. Architecture Non-Pre-Professional: 13

### 7. Is your degree program(s) offered in whole, or in part, at more than one campus or location? [no response needed in ARS print out]

## SECTION C – TUITION, FEES AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN NAAB-ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

### 1. Tuition is defined as “the amount of tuition and required fees covering a full academic year most frequently charged to students for instructional services.”

#### a. What were the tuition and fees for the institution for the last fiscal year?

B. Architecture: Full-Time Student (In-State) \$1990.00 (Tuition), \$895.00 (Fees); Full-Time Student (Out-of-State) \$1990.00 (Tuition), \$6287.00 (Fees); Part-Time Student (In-State) \$1508.00 (Tuition), \$553.00 (Fees); Part-Time Student (Out-of-State) \$1508.00 (Tuition), \$4966.00 (Fees)

M. Architecture: Full-Time Student (In-State) \$2485.00 (Tuition), \$901.00 (Fees); Full-Time Student (Out-of-State) \$2485.00 (Tuition), \$6317.00 (Fees); Part-Time Student (In-State) \$1698.00 (Tuition), \$445.00 (Fees); Part-Time Student (Out-of-State) \$1698.00 (Tuition), \$3749.00 (Fees)

#### b. Does the institution offer discounted or differential tuition for a NAAB-accredited degree program? No

#### c. Is a summer session required for any portion of your accredited degree program(s)? If yes, what is the additional tuition and fees for the summer program? No

**NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report**

d. Does the institution offer discounted or differential tuition for summer courses for a NAAB accredited degree program? No

**2. Financial Aid:** What was the percent of students financial aid at both the institutional and architecture program levels (grants, loans, assistantships, scholarships, fellowships, tuition waivers, tuition discounts, veteran’s benefits, employer aid [tuition reimbursement] and other monies [other than from relatives/friends] provided to students to meet expenses? *This includes Title IV subsidized and unsubsidized loans provided directly to student) provided by the institution to students enrolled in each program(s) leading to a NAAB accredited degree during the last fiscal year.*

Grant Type	% Students Receiving Aid	Average Amount by Types of Aid
a. Institution Federal Grants	18%	5000
a. Institution State/Local Grants	42%	4200
a. Institution Institutional Grants	41%	4500
a. Institution Student Loans	32%	10800
b. Architecture Program Federal Grants	21%	5000
b. Architecture Program State/Local Grants	48%	4500
b. Architecture Program Institutional Grants	48%	4600
b. Architecture Program Student Loans	39%	12000

**3. Graduate Assistantships** (What was the total number of graduate-level students employed on a part-time basis for the primary purpose of assisting in classroom or laboratory instruction or in the conduct of research during the last fiscal year (Jul 1 – Jun 30) within the NAAB-accredited programs offered by your institution? *Please include: graduate assistant, teaching assistant, teaching associate, teaching fellow or research assistant in your calculation.* **8**

**SECTION D – STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS FOR NAAB-ACCREDITED AND PREPROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS**

**1. Entering Students:**

B. Architecture: 64

Race	Male Full Time	Male Part Time	Female Full Time	Female Part Time	TOTAL Full Time	TOTAL Part Time	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	2	0	2	0	4	0	4
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	3	0	4	0	7	0	7
Hispanic/Latino	3	0	1	0	4	0	4
White	24	0	23	0	47	0	47
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	2	0	0	0	2	0	2

**NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report**

TOTAL	34	0	30	0	64	0	64
-------	----	---	----	---	----	---	----

M. Architecture: 18

Race	Male Full Time	Male Part Time	Female Full Time	Female Part Time	TOTAL Full Time	TOTAL Part Time	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	8	0	10	0	18	0	18
TOTAL	8	0	10	0	18	0	18

**2. Total undergraduate/graduate architecture enrollment in NAAB accredited program by race/ethnicity.**

B. Architecture 168

Race	Male Full Time	Male Part Time	Female Full Time	Female Part Time	TOTAL Full Time	TOTAL Part Time	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	3	0	6	0	9	0	9
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	5	0	4	0	9	0	9
Hispanic/Latino	4	0	5	0	9	0	9
White	75	0	58	0	133	0	133
Two or more races	2	0	0	0	2	0	2
Nonresident alien	0	0	3	0	3	0	3
Race and ethnicity unknown	2	0	1	0	3	0	3
TOTAL	91	0	77	0	168	0	168

M. Architecture 36

Race	Male Full Time	Male Part Time	Female Full Time	Female Part Time	TOTAL Full Time	TOTAL Part Time	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Black or African American	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Hispanic/Latino	2	0	0	0	2	0	2
White	14	0	14	0	28	0	28
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Race and ethnicity unknown	2	0	1	0	3	0	3

**NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report**

TOTAL	19	0	17	0	36	0	36
-------	----	---	----	---	----	---	----

**SECTION E -- DEGREES AWARDED**

**1. What is the total number of NAAB-accredited degrees that were awarded in the last fiscal year?**

B. Architecture:

Race	Male	Female	TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0
Asian	0	1	1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	1	1
White	19	12	31
Two or more races	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0
TOTAL	19	14	33

M. Architecture:

Race	Male	Female	TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0
Asian	1	0	1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0
White	3	3	6
Two or more races	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	1	0	1
TOTAL	5	3	8

**2. Time to Completion/Graduation**

a. Time to completion equals the total number of semesters/quarters to complete the degree:

b. Percentage of students that graduate in “normal time to completion”:

3. Graduation rate for B. Arch programs: 36

**SECTION F -- RESOURCES FOR NAAB-ACCREDITED PROGRAMS**

1. Total number of catalogued titles in the architecture library collection within the institutional library system (Main Campus; Other locations – links from B8). 10546

2. Total number of catalogued titles that have Library of Congress NA or Dewey 720-729 (Main Campus; Other locations – links from B8). 44495

3. What is the total number of permanent workstations (studio desks) that can be assigned to students enrolled in design studios? 280

4. Please indicate which of the following: labs, shop, and other learning resources available to all students enrolled in NAAB-accredited degree program(s). Yes

**NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report**

5. Please indicate which of the following learning resources are available to all students enrolled in NAAB-accredited degree programs(s). [no response needed in ARS print out]

**6. Financial Resources**

a. Total Revenue from all sources \$1531530

**b. Expenditures**

- i. Instruction \$1412403
- ii. Capital \$7500
- iii. Overhead \$73827

c. **Per Student Expenditure:** What is the average per student expenditure for students enrolled in a NAAB accredited degree program. *This is the total amount of goods and services, per student, used to produce the educational services provided by the NAAB-accredited program.*  
**Instruction + Overhead / FTE Enrollment: 6421**

**SECTION G - HUMAN RESOURCE SUMMARY (Architecture Program)**

**1. Credit Hours Taught** (needs definition and perhaps example)

- a. Total credit hours taught by full time faculty: 270
- b. Total credit hours taught by part time faculty: 69
- c. Total credit hours taught by adjunct faculty: 0

**2. Instructional Faculty**

**a. Full-time Instructional Faculty (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor):**

Full Time Professor

Race	Tenured Male	Tenured Female	Tenure-Track Male	Tenure-Track Female	Non-Tenure-Track Male	Non-Tenure-Track Female	TOTAL Male	TOTAL Female	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	5
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>

Full Time Associate Professor

Race	Tenured Male	Tenured Female	Tenure-Track Male	Tenure-Track Female	Non-Tenure-Track Male	Non-Tenure-Track Female	TOTAL Male	TOTAL Female	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	5





**NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report**

Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Part Time Associate Professor**

<b>Race</b>	<b>Tenured Male</b>	<b>Tenured Female</b>	<b>Tenure-Track Male</b>	<b>Tenure-Track Female</b>	<b>Non-Tenure-Track Male</b>	<b>Non-Tenure-Track Female</b>	<b>TOTAL Male</b>	<b>TOTAL Female</b>	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Part Time Assistant Professor**

<b>Race</b>	<b>Tenured Male</b>	<b>Tenured Female</b>	<b>Tenure-Track Male</b>	<b>Tenure-Track Female</b>	<b>Non-Tenure-Track Male</b>	<b>Non-Tenure-Track Female</b>	<b>TOTAL Male</b>	<b>TOTAL Female</b>	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

**Part Time Instructor**

<b>Race</b>	<b>Tenured Male</b>	<b>Tenured Female</b>	<b>Tenure-Track Male</b>	<b>Tenure-Track Female</b>	<b>Non-Tenure-Track Male</b>	<b>Non-Tenure-Track Female</b>	<b>TOTAL Male</b>	<b>TOTAL Female</b>	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	2	8
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>

**NAAB – Annual Report -- Part I – Statistical Report**

**c. Adjunct Faculty Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor):**

Race	Professor Male	Professor Female	Associate Professor Male	Associate Professor Female	Assistant Professor Male	Assistant Professor Female	Instructor Male	Instructor Female	TOTAL Male	TOTAL Female	GRAND TOTAL
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic/Latino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Two or more races	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race and ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**3. Faculty Credentials:**

Highest Degree Achieved	Professor Male	Professor Female	Associate Professor Male	Associate Professor Female	Assistant Professor Male	Assistant Professor Female	TOTAL Male	TOTAL Female	GRAND TOTAL
D. Arch. (accredited)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
M. Arch. (accredited)	1	1	3	1	1	1	5	3	8
B. Arch. (accredited)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ph.D. in architecture	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Ph.D. in other discipline	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	3
Post-professional graduate degree in architecture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other degrees	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Registered in U.S. Jurisdiction	3	1	4	1	0	0	7	2	9

**4. Salaries**

Instructional Faculty Type	Number	Minimum	Average	Maximum	University Average
Professor	6	80563	101630	138049	108027
Assoc. Prof.	5	60822	68544	71822	77367
Assist. Prof.	2	60000	60000	60000	68684
Instructor	1	34000	49595	65191	43921

- Louisiana State University
- School of Architecture
- Jori Erdman, AIA, NOMA, LEED AP
- Last Team Visit: March 14, 2007

**Part II (Narrative Report)** is the narrative report in which a program responds to the most recent Visiting Team Report (VTR). The narrative must address Section 1.4 Conditions Not Met and Section 1.5 Causes of Concern of the VTR. Part II also includes a description of changes to the program that may be of interest to subsequent visiting teams or to the NAAB. In addition, this part is linked to other questions in Part I for which a narrative may be required. If a program had zero “not mets” in the most recent VTR or was “cleared of future reporting” in subsequent annual reports, no report is required in Part II.

From most recent VTR:

#### 1.4. Conditions/Criteria Not Met

##### 4. Social Equity

*The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff-irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation-with an educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. The school must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources. Faculty, staff, and students must also have equitable opportunities to participate in program governance.*

	Met	Not Met
B. Arch.	[ ]	[ X ]
M. Arch.	[ ]	[ X ]

Overall, the educational environment seems to be supportive of a diverse community of students. The number of women and minority students in the student body meets commendable levels of representation in the current years and has shown sustained progress. The focused efforts of the administrative staff to recruit minority students and to reach out to high school students with the one-week summer program deserve special recognition. The establishment of NOMAS to strengthen the support network for students of diverse background is likewise applauded.

The tenured and tenure-track faculty is a complement of 15, with one woman, and two faculty members with international backgrounds, including a recently hired ethnic minority, R. Singh. There is one additional woman architect who is term-appointed as a professional-in-residence. Her primary responsibility is administering the programs and research of the Office of Community Design and Development, including some teaching assignments supportive of this role.

The program has been cited in the last two consecutive VTRs for the lack of diverse faculty. The low percentage of tenured or tenure-track women faculty is particularly egregious, given the general availability of many fine women candidates and practitioners nationally. There are also no African-American faculty, even among the adjuncts, which is a concern given the racial makeup of the region and state that the school serves.

The inability of the facilities to accommodate students and faculty with disabilities creates significant challenges as outlined in the team's response to condition 8. Some progress has been made, with the addition of the lift at the first floor east entry to Atkinson Hall and the exterior ramp to the basement, and flexibility in the arrangement of studios is marginally acceptable in the short term.

2008 Report -- Since the Team's visit, the School has hired two new full-time women – an assistant professor and a director/full professor. During the previous semester, the assistant professor was hired away by one of our neighboring institutions. Women and minorities continue to be a priority in our upcoming faculty searches. The other component of social equity that we were cited for had to do with our building not being ADA accessible. We are pleased to report that the University has

committed funds to this cause and will be selecting an architect during the spring '09 semester.

2009 Report – The School has continued to recruit and support the enrollment of a diverse student body. One of our administrative staff members dedicates a percentage of her time to this effort, along with members of the faculty. The School supports the NOMAS chapter including various mentoring activities and opportunities for student leadership training.

The new Director began in January 2009. She is a full professor as well as Director and is the first woman holding an administrative leadership position in the School.

During the spring of 2009 we conducted a search to fill two faculty positions. That search was successfully conducted and resulted in the interviewing of four candidates from whom two were selected to make offers. All four of the final candidates were of diverse populations: one Asian male, two European females, and one African American male. It should be noted that the successful candidates were the most qualified applicants from the pool.

Although the candidates did not ultimately accept our offers, we are optimistic about our ability to recruit and attract a diverse coterie of people in our upcoming search. This year we are searching for three positions and we continue to actively recruit a diverse applicant pool.

Please see the response to Condition 8 below for updates on our response to the concern about facilities.

2010 Report – The NAAB Board has determined that this deficiency has been satisfactorily corrected and we are no longer required to report on this item. Please see the Focused Evaluation Report information below in italics. Our new faculty members have begun and are doing exceptionally well. We anticipate that they will significantly contribute to a more diverse atmosphere within the School of Architecture. Recruiting efforts for student continues and we are actively pursuing stronger relationships with associated organizations.

*From the 2010 FE Report: The School conducted a successful search this year for two new faculty members who will be joining the faculty in the Fall 2010 academic year. A third position remains unfilled at this time. Due to aggressive recruiting by the Search Committee five of our top six candidates were women or minorities. With these new hires, our current faculty composition (15 total faculty) now includes: 4 full-time women and one full-time Hispanic American male. Of these, one woman is a Full Professor and Director, one woman is an Associate Professor, one woman is a Professional in Residence, and the remaining two are Assistant Professors.*

*This shift in the demographics within the School administration and faculty composition marks a complete change from the 2007 VTR. While we will continue to aggressively recruit qualified minorities and women, we are no longer in such a difficult position and we are optimistic that our efforts to recruit students will be positively impacted by these changes.*

*Our recruiting and support of minority students continues to improve as we have developed stronger relationships with high schools, colleges and professional organizations. This coming year we will begin working closely with Morehouse College in Atlanta to recruit their students into our 3-year Master of Architecture program. Initial meetings with them have been very positive. We also continue to develop our relationship with our NOMA regional director, Antoine Bryant. The NOMA and NOMAS chapters related to the School have provided a great source of support to our students and a productive connection to the profession.*

2011 Report – The NAAB Board has determined that this deficiency has been satisfactorily corrected and we are no longer required to report on this item. Our new faculty members continue to develop and contribute to a more diverse cultural composition within the School. In addition, we will be hiring 2 new faculty members in the coming years and anticipate a diverse candidate pool. We also continue to seek diversity in our adjunct and non-permanent faculty appointments.

## **8. Physical Resources**

*The accredited degree program must provide the physical resources appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class;*

*lecture and seminar space to accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member and related instructional support space. The facilities must also be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and applicable building codes.*

	Met	Not Met
B. Arch.	[ ]	[ X ]
M. Arch.	[ ]	[ X ]

Progress continues to be made in physical resources, although slowly and not maintaining the schedule presented to previous visiting NAAB teams or those included within more recent school facility documents. Atkinson Hall and other buildings used by the school were observed to be clean, and orderly, with student work displayed and well-organized along the corridors. This building has yet to be made completely ADA compliant. Apparent code violations include missing stair handrails and a dead-end corridor system in the basement.

It should be noted that the school uses space within other college and university buildings, most of which are nearby, with the exception of the library located at the far end of the quadrangle. Since this report, the school has also gained rights of use to additional basement areas within Atkinson Hall. An exterior ramp forms the only accessible access to the basement level.

Design studio space appears adequate for the number of students with a desk available for each student. Securable storage for each student is lacking. Desk and table conditions vary from studio to studio, with the lesser quality furnishings being located among the earlier years. The school has received funding to improve the condition of furnishings for entering students with these improvements scheduled to occur with next year's entering class. It was reported by the faculty that studio space is tighter in the fall semester when a greater number of students are in the school. Studio space in the basement is not of the quality of the studios on the upper two floors regarding natural light and access to other students and faculty.

Lecture and seminar space is lacking, and what is available is of low quality. Within Atkinson Hall, acoustics (particularly poor) and lighting is lacking and not conducive to group student work reviews or juries. Corridors are often used for juries, leading to interruptions and a lack of focus for the participants. These spaces lack projection technologies creating frustration for faculty and students alike. Space in adjacent college buildings is available on a scheduled basis but this remoteness is viewed as problematic and disruptive.

Office space for faculty is adequate, although sharing of offices is common. This lack of privacy may lead to lower productivity for faculty and challenges to students during office hours. It should be noted, however, that some faculty have elected to remain in shared offices when offered a private office.

Instructional support spaces and materials, such as reference books, periodicals, model shops, printing and computers, and image archives are available but located in adjacent college buildings. Although not at great distance to Atkinson Hall, the lack of proximity is less than ideal.

A report, entitled "Facilities Assessment, College of Art and Design", produced by Eskew+Dumez+Ripple Architects, New Orleans, LA, was delivered to the college in October 2004. This report states the school occupies a total of 37,400 gross square feet (GSF) and 23,400 usable square feet (USF) located within Atkinson Hall, and that 88% of this space is either adequate or functional, with the remaining 12% falling into an inadequate category. This report includes an allowance figure of \$5.6m for renovations and fees. ADA issues are described in the report and, presumably, costs to rectify these issues are included in this figure. Other facility goals developed with the school and included in the report are: creating additional interaction space, improving security, upgrading the studio environment, and window replacement.

Because of the preponderance of deficiencies noted by the team, in particular those related to code and accessibility issues, this condition is not met.

2008 Response -- This citation primarily had to do with our building not having an elevator. We are pleased to report that the University has committed funds to this cause and will be selecting an architect during the spring '09 semester.

2009 Response – Please see the response here from the University Architect:

The State of Louisiana, Division of Administration, authorized by Act 27 of 2006 (Supplement from A7 2008) provided \$975,000 for the facility enhancements which supports the School of Architecture premier program and will address facility conditions of a historical building constructed in 1924. These funds will provide for the installation of a new three story, ADA compliant elevator,

renovations to and creation of ADA toilets within Atkinson and the replacement of the original windows. These strategic enhancements will address not only code issues, but will provide energy savings and interior environmental atmospheric control by addressing moisture entrance.

Also, through funding by student fees, University funds and matching funds by the Division of Administration access will be provided at the northwest Basement entrance on the historical University Quadrangle. This access will provide those with impairment to easily access the new three story elevator at the Basement level.

Over the past 5 years the University replaced the clay tile roof and expended \$180,000.

Renovation funds are in place and the bid documents for the projects are actively being prepared. The renovations are anticipated to occur beginning May 2010 with a phased completion to accommodate the academic programs that will occur during the next 12 months. Atkinson is an extremely active building supporting the students with design labs and computer labs and the physical heavy construction will be scheduled around the students learning activities.

2010 Report – The NAAB Board has determined that this deficiency has been satisfactorily corrected and we are no longer required to report on this item. Please see the Focused Evaluation Report information below in italics. It should be noted that the planned elevator renovation is now on schedule to be completed in the Summer of 2011.

*2010 FE Report – LSU, as many other schools, is experiencing unprecedented budget restrictions and budgetary shortfalls. As of this writing we are waiting to hear from the State about the renovation project scheduled for this summer. The Chancellor has frozen all projects supported by state funding so there is a very good chance that this construction will not proceed this summer.*

*However, the existing ADA ramp into the basement was upgraded from a wooden ramp to a more substantial and stable concrete ramp. This has greatly improved the access to the basement levels classrooms and facilities.*

2011 Report – The NAAB Board has determined that this deficiency has been satisfactorily corrected and we are no longer required to report on this item. It should be noted that the planned elevator renovation is now behind schedule but anticipated for completion in the Fall of 2013.

### **13.13 Human Diversity**

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

Met	Not Met
[ ]	[ X ]

This criterion is not met. The program's focus almost exclusively on the surrounding region and its familiar constituencies has limited its ability to give students an adequate exposure to the full range of issues affecting human diversity and the architect's response. There is no required coursework that is tied to diverse perspectives in social sciences, environmental behavior responses, or cultural or international exploration to allow student to develop this understanding. Highly commendable individual investigations in elective coursework and individual study examples were presented, but are neither widespread nor part of the core area of study.

2008 Report -- Following Hurricane Katrina, the School focused considerable effort on projects in and around New Orleans. In order to address this citation, a number of studios at various year-levels have undertaken more diverse and non-traditional projects. For example, our second-year graduate studio (ARCH 7003) recently did a project sited in Afghanistan, and one of our fifth-year studios (ARCH 5002) did a project sited in Detroit.

2009 Report – The School continues to seek ways to fulfill this Student Performance criterion. One highlight continues to be our participation in the Virginia Tech Washington Alexandria Architecture Consortium, which brings together an international body of students and architectural educators at their campus in Alexandria, Virginia. Approximately 40% of our upper level students choose to participate in this program for either one or two semesters.

In addition to encouraging our students to participate in the WAAC program, we augment our curriculum with field trips, the lecture series and LSU Programs Abroad. For example, this spring our third year class used their mandatory field trip to travel to Mexico City and used the information and experiences from that trip for a design project. Our second, third and fourth year students all have a required field trip that is intended to take students out of their familiar environment and engage with diverse human environments.

In addition, our sequence of history courses, ARCH 3005, 3006, and 4007 draw on a diverse set of cultures and built environments to develop this understanding in our student body.

2010 Report – The NAAB Board has determined that this deficiency has been satisfactorily corrected and we are no longer required to report on this item. Please see the Focused Evaluation Report information below in italics.

*2010 FE Report – Our history sequence has addressed this deficiency through a revision to the course outline and schedule. In addition, we continue to offer summer programs that develop this understanding within our students.*

2011 Report – The NAAB Board has determined that this deficiency has been satisfactorily corrected and we are no longer required to report on this item. However, we believe that we are getting even better with a wide array of project types and conditions, environmental and societal, for our students to learn from.

*For each Condition/Criterion Not Met, please include the Team Comments from the last site visit along with narrative from program on*

### **1.5. Causes of Concern**

**A. Low salaries for tenure track assistant professors:** The relatively low salaries (significant when compared to national averages) for assistant professors impact the program in several ways. The program is adversely affected in the areas of recruitment, retention, and the ability to hire minorities and women. The program will be positioned better to achieve some important goals when this is addressed.

2008 Report -- The School continues to work with the College to resolve this issue by utilizing College resources as well as those provided by the University. Although slightly deviating from the intention of merit raises, a recent University-wide merit raise was utilized to address this problem.

2009 Report – In the faculty search described above (see *Social Equity*) the School was able to offer our potential tenure track assistant professors salaries that were more competitive with national and university wide standards. None of the candidates expressed concern that our salary offers were low or inadequate. In the coming searches we anticipate to once again offer competitive salaries for new faculty members.

2010 Report – We were successful in hiring two assistant professors at starting salaries that are at or above the national and regional averages. In addition, we are seeking an equity adjustment to the salary of an associate professor to improve our averages in this category.

2011 Report – We have received several salary adjustments for faculty in the past year. While it does not adequately acknowledge deserved "merit," it will keep our faculty salaries from continuing to diminish relative to the national and regional averages.

**B. Masters Thesis Option:** The graduate program has outlined a thesis option for students in the third year. To date, no student has embarked on a thesis (although a number have submitted thesis topics), and this may be in part due to "growing pains" experienced by the recently developed program. Although the procedures for applying to do a thesis in lieu of the final studio are laid out, it may not be adequately clear to students that they must meet demanding skill requirements for graphic and design ability before they can be approved for a thesis. The team concluded that the lack of a viable thesis to date may not be solely the outcome of the individual students' inability to meet this threshold, but is also derived from an ambiguity of program commitment to the time and coordination required to see through the completion of a thesis. In conclusion, while the team recognizes that a successful thesis proposal is the responsibility of the student, it was not clear that there exists adequate institutional support for the generation, application, and revision of proposals.

2008 Report -- The Team's comments have helped us recognize that it is probably impossible for our first-professional degree MARCH students to complete a masters thesis and we are taking steps to remove the option from our books.

2009 Report -- Upon reconsideration, the School has opted to not yet remove this option from our Master's curriculum, but rather to re-visit the scheduling and coordination needed to make this a viable option for our pre-professional degree holding, M. Arch. students. Currently no students are undertaking this option and we are withholding this option until clarifications have been made.

2010 Report -- We have committed to one student for the 2010-11 academic year as a thesis student. As we move through the process with this student we anticipate that the process will be refined and procedures for appropriate movement through this option will be refined.

2011 Report -- We have committed to one student for the 2011-12 academic year as a thesis student with anticipation of three thesis students for the 2012-13 academic year. Last year's student was a tremendous success and has helped us develop a more robust and clear process for the coming years. We do not anticipate a large number of students taking this option but it is important to the life of the school that we support this intellectual pursuit.

**C. Program breadth and rigor:** The students are ready for greater challenges. Unfilled faculty lines, insufficient funding for graduate assistant positions, other demands on faculty are some, but not all, of the impediments that appear to stand in the way of a program of more breadth and depth for student choice of electives, course variety, and more demanding curricular challenges. The team found a range of completeness in the course syllabi in the team room, ranging from extremely thorough, with detailed reading lists and course requirements to more sketchy submittals with incomplete course descriptions and significant omissions of elements, including the course studio culture policy. There was a correlation between the observed quality of the course notebook and the level attained by students in written work for these courses.

2008 Report -- During our regular end-of-semester faculty discussions we are putting more effort into critiquing the weaker studios and seeing how they can be modified to be more organized and get more out of the students.

2009 Report -- We continue to develop ways to challenge our students both inside and outside the classroom. In the past year many students have independently participated in student design competitions. Our lecture series continues to bring architects and educators of national and international stature to the School with opportunities for student engagement.

Two outstanding initiatives are also starting to yield results as an Architecture Honors program has begun as well as increased participation in the University-wide Communication Across the Curriculum (CxC) program. In it's second year the Honors program now has ten 2<sup>nd</sup> year students and has graduated at least one student each year for the past two years. Our faculty members are also bringing a Communication Across the Curriculum program to the classrooms and studios. In the spring of 2009 all 2<sup>nd</sup> year students earned six CxC credit hours through a focus on multi-modal communication in the studio. We believe these opportunities will both enhance our current programs and also provide more challenges for our students.

Finally, we are embarking on a strategic planning endeavor during the 2009-10 academic year. One of the goals of this planning effort is to identify areas of excellence and weakness. Through this process we will be developing plans for building on our strengths while also addressing low achieving areas.

2010 Report -- Faculty teaching assignments have been revised for the current year in hopes of addressing this deficiency. The new Student Performance Criteria have given us an opportunity to rethink these assignments and the courses that fulfill the criteria. In addition, newly hired faculty members with expertise in sustainable design and digital design will provide needed content in those areas.

We are on track to continue improving student completion of the Communication Across the Curriculum track outlined above as well the Honors sequence with four eligible students this year. Two students successfully completed the Honors track last year and three students graduated as Distinguished Communicators.



2011 Report – Faculty teaching assignments continue to be revised in hopes of addressing this deficiency. Recently hired faculty members with expertise in sustainable design and digital design have provided needed rigor and diversity of offerings, as have an influx of new adjuncts and visitors with expertise in different areas. In addition, the continued development of thesis type work at both the undergraduate and graduate levels allows students to pursue individualized research on a topic of their choosing and has empowered this group to demand more difficult coursework.

We are on track to continue improving student completion of the Communication Across the Curriculum track outlined above as well the Honors sequence with five eligible students this year.

**D. Scale of Projects:** The team observed a preponderance of small-scale projects and project types in advanced studio work. This may be driven in part by a natural response to regional needs in the aftermath of hurricane Katrina, and in part to exploration of time-honored regional traditions. There are opportunities for students at all levels at this scale, but the corollary is that options are limited for students to explore a greater variety of scale, context, complexity, project type and variety.

2008 Report --Following Hurricane Katrina, the School focused on residential projects in New Orleans. Now, as time has passed, we are returning to more traditional large-scale projects in a variety of settings.

2009 Report – As reported last year, the School has continued to offer more large-scale projects on a variety of sites with varying programs. Last year advanced studios were conducted that included projects such as: a cultural center in Mexico City; a multi-unit housing block in New Orleans, an office building in Baton Rouge, and a transit hub.

2010 Report – We continued to address this deficiency last year with advanced studio offerings for larger scale buildings and projects outside of Louisiana. Projects included housing in New York City and Rome, a hotel and convention center in Philadelphia, and larger projects including a train terminal and office buildings in Baton Rouge. We are trying to be strategic in our assignment of studio projects because we do not want to lose our strength in addressing the very real and significant issues within the state...issues such as sea-level rise that have global implications...but we understand the need for more diverse learning opportunities for our students across scales, locations and programs. This is area that will continue to require some adjustments.

2011 Report – We continued offering advanced studios with larger scale buildings and projects outside of Louisiana. Projects this year included a natatorium Houston, a museum in New York City, and larger urban projects in Baltimore and Boston.

**E. Professional Practice** Alternate study -4221 Architecture Internship Field Study: The program has experimented with this field study option as a potential alternate to the classroom setting for the professional practice class. The accreditation team wishes to stress a deep note of concern over the potential risks of assuming that this course of study would provide a comprehensive alternative to the subject matter included in the 5006 class. The school of architecture has invested a great deal of faith in the course 5006 to cover areas of the Student Performance Criteria that are not developed elsewhere in the curriculum. This will be satisfactory only if there are thorough means to measure and validate student performance in each of these areas.

2008 Report -- The citation here was for a lack of records and examples from this course. The problem resulted from a faculty member changing offices and losing a file in the shuffle. Subsequent offerings of the course have been more thoroughly documented.

2009 Report -- This option has been further assessed by members of the faculty and Director and has been discontinued as an option to substitute for ARCH 5006.

2010 Report – As determined last year, this option is no longer being considered at this time.

2011 Report – As determined previously, this option is no longer being considered at this time.

*For each Condition/Criterion Not Met, please include the Team Comments from the last site visit along with narrative from program on*

### *Changes in Program since last NAAB visit*

As mentioned last year, I was hired as Director in the spring of 2008. I began at the School as a full professor and Director in January of 2009.

2010 Report – There have been no significant changes to the programs since the last NAAB visit except for adjustments that are being made to address the current standards for student performance.

2011 Report – There have been no significant changes to the programs since the last NAAB visit except for adjustments that are being made to address the current standards for student performance.