August 3, 2012

Dr. Sidney A. Ribeau  
President  
Office of the President  
Howard University  
2400 Sixth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20059

Dear Dr. Ribeau:

At the July 2012 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the board reviewed the Visiting Team Report (VTR) for the Howard University, Department of Architecture.

As a result, the professional architecture program:

Bachelor of Architecture

was formally granted a six-year term of accreditation. The accreditation term is effective January 1, 2012. The program is scheduled for its next accreditation visit in 2018.

Continuing accreditation is subject to the submission of Annual Reports. Annual Reports are submitted online through the NAAB’s Annual Report Submission system and are due by November 30 of each year. These reports have two parts:

Part I (Annual Statistical Report) captures statistical information on the institution in which a program is located and the degree program.

Part II (Narrative Report) is the narrative report in which a program responds to the most recent VTR. The narrative must address Section 1.3 Conditions Not Met and Section 1.4 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.

If an acceptable Annual Report is not submitted to the NAAB by January 15, 2013, the NAAB may consider advancing the schedule for the program’s next visit. A complete description of the Annual Report process can be found in Section 10 of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2011 Edition.

Finally, under the terms of the 2011 Procedures for Accreditation, programs are required to make the Architecture Program Report, the VTR, and related documents available to the public. Please see Section 3, Paragraph 8 (page 22), for additional information.

The visiting team has asked me to express its appreciation for your gracious hospitality.

Very truly yours,

Keelan P. Kaiser, AIA  
President

cc: Edward Dunson, Chair  
Kevin Montgomery, FAIA, Visiting Team Chair  
Visiting Team Members

Enc.
Howard University
Department of Architecture

Visiting Team Report

B. Arch (171 undergraduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
28 March 2012

The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1940, is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture. Because most state registration boards in the United States require any applicant for licensure to have graduated from an NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.
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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The architecture program at Howard University has a long and rich history of educating a segment of society that has historically been underrepresented in the architecture profession; people of color in the United States and from around the African Diaspora. It has also been part of one of the oldest of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) in the country, since 1911, when architecture education began at Howard. As the program celebrates its centennial anniversary of teaching architecture at Howard University, it occurs at a time of reduced funding and transitioning of faculty at the university and department. While this is no different than what many universities are facing around the country, how the university, college, and school address these issues will determine the strength and vibrancy of the program going forward.

With the NAAB continuing accreditation visit coinciding with this significant milestone in the architecture program’s history, the visiting team was disappointed to find that the work in the team room wasn’t better displayed and curated, so that it could’ve been highlighted in the program’s centennial celebration activities and events after the team departed. The team believes an opportunity was missed to showcase the work of current students, recent graduates, and faculty, to show the role they play in contributing to the program’s legacy and positioning it for the future.

While the team room is an important part of any visit, the interaction with the key stakeholders in the program—administration at all levels in the university, faculty, alumni, and of course the students—is also important and provided the team with the following insights:

University Administration – The architecture program has support at the highest level of university administration. Dr. Ribeau, Howard’s president, indicated that he understands the importance and value of having a vibrant architecture program at the university based on his previous experience as provost of a university with a large architecture program and is aware of the significant and rich history of the architecture program at Howard.

College, School and Department Administration – The administration at the college, school and department level are all committed to the success of the students and have worked very hard during recent funding cuts to minimize the impact to students.

Faculty – Dedicated and hard working, the faculty was in studio and around the building, late into the evening working with students. They do an excellent job introducing the students to the profession and have a respectful and amiable relationship with the students.

Alumni – There is great pride and support for the program by the alumni. That is manifested by their presence in the school mentoring students, hiring of graduates and providing financial support. In addition, nine of the fourteen faculty members are alumni of Howard’s architecture program.

Students – The students have formed a tight-knit community, where they help one another and are very proud of their university and program. The students are bright, confident, and enthusiastic. They have good leadership skills and are well prepared to enter the profession.

Building on the strengths of these key stakeholders can provide the program with a good foundation and usher in another century of architecture education at Howard University.
2. **Conditions Not Met**

I.1.4 Long-Range Planning  
I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures  
I.3.1 Statistical Reports  
Section 4 – Policy Review  
II.1.1.A.1. Communication Skills  
II.1.1.C.1 Collaboration

3. **Causes of Concern**

**Faculty Retirement and Succession and Staffing Plans:** The team noted in its review of the materials for Conditions I.1.4 and I.2.1, Long-Range Planning, and Human Resources, respectively, and from meetings during the visit, that five out of the seven tenured faculty members are eligible for a 5-year phased retirement plan that is currently being offered throughout Howard University. Even though the university is implementing the phased retirement plan, it has not been determined who and how many in the architecture program will accept the offer and how many of the current tenured faculty lines will remain in the program. Since the university has indicated it does not intend to have a one-for-one replacement of faculty lines, the team is concerned that the program does not have a written plan in place indicating the number of faculty lines needed to be retained to sustain and grow the program, and how younger candidates will be retained and recruited to fill these vacancies and enhance the existing demographics of the faculty.

The recent budget cuts across the university have largely spared teaching positions in the School of Architecture, but at the expense of staff positions. Staff positions related to administrative support, financial aid, and recruitment have been eliminated. As the School attempts to grow its enrollment and course offerings, an evaluation and development of a staffing plan to support the program is needed.

**Faculty Development:** The team noted in its review of the information provided for Condition 1.2.1 Human Resource Development, that the school’s faculty development opportunities rely heavily on the university-wide “Fund for Academic Excellence” program, which provides grant opportunities for faculty for special projects and original research. Though about half the faculty benefitted from this program up until 2009, they have not since then, due to university-wide cutbacks and questions from the school’s faculty about the type of special projects and original research the fund would support. In addition there is also no evidence that consistent financial support for research exists at the school level; therefore, the acquisition of new knowledge for faculty members is primarily gained through professional practice. While acquiring new knowledge through professional practice should continue, with Howard University classified as a comprehensive research university, and research becoming an increasingly important component in the growth of design knowledge, it is important that support for faculty development be a priority in any accredited architecture program.

4. **Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2006)**

**2004 Condition 3, Public Information:** To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school
must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

Previous Team Report (2006): Howard University’s Undergraduate Bulletin 2000–02 was the last catalog published by the university. This document was in use at the time of the 2003 NAAB visit but is no longer in circulation. Since that visit, all interested parties have been referred to the university’s Web site, www.howard.edu/ceacs/departments/architecture/admissions.htm. The Web site must now be updated again to reflect the exact language found in the 2005 Appendix A.

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. See II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees.

2004 Criterion 13.1, Speaking and Writing Skills: Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

Previous Team Report (2006): While there are an extensive number of composition assignments integrated into the curriculum, formal writing assignments by the students showed uneven ability to write effectively and clearly. Most notably, there are problems with grammar and sentence construction in the work of upper-level students, including thesis-preparation documents.

There is also concern that students do not always thoroughly cite their sources and there is some obvious neglect on the part of students to use full notation when quoting material.

Students are articulate speakers, however, and acquit themselves well when giving public comments.

2012 Team Assessment: This condition remains unmet. The team found similar strengths and concerns noted in the 2006 Team Report. See II.1.1.A.1 Communication Skills: Ability to read, write, speak and listen effectively, for additional comments.

2004 Criterion 13.9, Non-Western Traditions: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

Previous Team Report (2006): Although some knowledge of non-Western architecture and urban design is gained through focused study of specific places for precedent analysis in the studio courses and there is some exposure to pre-Columbian and pre-16th-century Islamic architecture, this material is a marginal component of the curriculum.

Despite an excellent course offering in Tropical Architecture as an elective, this material is not a part of the core required curriculum.

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. See II.1.1.A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture.

2004 Criterion 13.10, National and Regional Traditions: Understanding of national traditions and the local regional heritage in architecture, landscape design and urban design, including the vernacular tradition

Previous Team Report (2006): This criterion is not met. Within several courses in the required core curriculum, there are several opportunities to learn about national heritage in architecture.
There is little to no exposure to vernacular architecture traditions or material culture studies of U.S. regional architecture.

**2012 Team Assessment:** This criterion is now met. See II.1.1.A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture.

**2004 Criterion 13.14, Accessibility:** Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities

**Previous Team Report (2006):** Evidence of the students' ability to design buildings and sites to accommodate individuals with physical disabilities was missing. While an understanding of this concept is clear in the work presented, there is inconsistent evidence of ability. Students should be directed to design reference criteria commonly used in the industry such as the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines and the Fair Housing Accessibility Guidelines as appropriate references.

**2012 Team Assessment:** This criterion is now met. See II.1.1.B.2. Accessibility.

**2004 Criterion 13.20, Life-Safety:** Understanding of the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress

**Previous Team Report (2006):** Life safety in the design of buildings includes knowledge of model building codes, such as the National Fire Protection Association codes and the International Building Code. This criterion is targeted to the understanding of code principles and life safety in building design with particular emphasis on principles of egress. Primary evidence meeting this criterion was not found.

**2012 Team Assessment:** This criterion is now met. See II.1.1.B.5. Life-Safety.

**2004 Criterion 13.25, Construction Cost Control:** Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

**Previous Team Report (2006):** Evidence of student performance that met this criterion was not apparent in sufficient quantity.

**2012 Team Assessment:** This criterion is now met. See II.1.1.B.7. Financial Considerations.

**Previous FE Team Report (2009):**

3. **Public Information**

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

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

13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills

Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.9 Non-Western Traditions

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the NAAB Response to the Howard University 2007 Annual Report, this criterion was judged to be "Satisfied, no further reporting required." The team requested that the same information and evidence be provided for the other SPCs be submitted for this criterion. Evidence of this criterion was found in various course work and, in particular, the coordinated Third Year curriculum, which includes design for non-Western communities and exposure to the special culture and conditions that inform design communities and exposure to the special culture and conditions that inform design.

13.10 National and Regional Traditions

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syllabi from recent courses that incorporate issues of National and Regional Traditions in course work, lectures and assignments were provided. This criterion is met in both lecture and design courses, primarily through use and study of precedents, as well as in assignments completed for Architecture History lectures.

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

- Met [X]
- Not Met [ ]

Universal and disabled access issues are introduced in the Third Year curriculum, including Design Studio III and IV, Environmental Systems, Programming courses. Work completed at this level and later (Thesis) provides evidence of this exposure, in applying the basic concepts and strategies to satisfy this criterion.

13.20 Life-Safety

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

- Met [X]
- Not Met [ ]

Life Safety issues are well-addressed in the Third Year curriculum

13.25 Construction Cost Control

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

- Met [ ]
- Not Met [X]

Syllabi from recent courses that incorporated issues of Construction Cost Control in coursework, lectures and quizzes/tests were provided. They were insufficient to conclusively demonstrate that this Criteria is now Met.

**2012 Team Assessment:** This criterion is now met. See II.1.1.B.7. Financial Considerations.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation
(Note, every assessment should be accompanied by a brief narrative. In the case of SPCs being Met, the team is encouraged to identify the course or courses where evidence of student accomplishment was found. Likewise, if the assessment of the condition or SPC is negative, please include a narrative that indicates the reasoning behind the team’s assessment.)

Part One (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Part One (I): Section 1. Identity and Self-Assessment

[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2012 Team Assessment: 2011 marked the 100th anniversary of architectural education at Howard University, which began on February 9, 1911, when the Board of Trustees approved degree studies in architecture. In 1919, the Department of Architecture was organized and placed in the School of Applied Sciences. The first two students graduated from the program in 1923 and the following year the namesake of the building where the architecture program currently resides, Howard H. Mackey, FAIA, was added to the faculty. Professor Mackey, a University of Pennsylvania graduate, would remain at the program for over 47 years, becoming chair and leading the Bachelor of Architecture degree to its initial accreditation by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), in 1951. It was under Professor Mackey’s leadership in 1970 that the School of Architecture and Planning was formed by the Board of Trustees as an independent professional degree-granting unit.

In fall 1997, as part of a university-wide realignment, the School of Architecture and Planning merged with the School of Engineering & Computer Science, which became the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences (CEACS). With the merger of the two schools, the School of Architecture and Planning became the School of Architecture and Design and the School of Engineering became the School of Engineering and Computer Science. The architecture program resides in the Department of Architecture, which at this time is the only department in the School of Architecture and Design.

Historically, Howard’s architecture program has graduated a significant number of African Americans with degrees in architecture, who go on to attend graduate programs at the top universities around the country and become licensed architects. Howard also continues to educate a significant number of foreign-born architects who continue to contribute in their respective countries. The heads of many significant firms worldwide and heads of local governing bodies and associations continue to be represented by graduates of this program.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:
- Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff in all learning environments both traditional and non-traditional.

Further, the program must demonstrate that it encourages students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers, and it addresses health-related issues, such as time management.

Finally, the program must document, through narrative and artifacts, its efforts to ensure that all members of the learning community: faculty, staff, and students are aware of these objectives and are advised as to the expectations for ensuring they are met in all elements of the learning culture.
• 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 a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program 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. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2012 Team Assessment: A positive and respectful learning environment permeates the atmosphere within the school and the program. The program has a current Studio Culture Policy on the web. Students and faculty participated in the writing of the document, and it is reflective of their values. In conversations with faculty and students it is clear that everyone is treated equally and with respect.

The school follows the university policy of seeking a diverse student and faculty cohort with a global perspective. There are also policies in place at the university level to protect various constituencies including the Policy of Sexual Harassment and EEO Policies.

1.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives: Programs must demonstrate through narrative and artifacts, how they respond to the following perspectives on architecture education. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently within the context of its history, mission, and culture and to further identify as part of its long-range planning activities how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community. That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching. In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The program is responsive to the condition of architectural education and the academic community. Although the program is significantly dedicated to teaching and personal practice, there is also intermittent evidence of contributions to community engagement or service—locally, nationally, or internationally.

While many of the faculty members are engaged in professional practice, only two out of fourteen faculty members have active scholarship contributions at the current time. The school has a lecture series and visiting scholars that contribute to a culture focused on architecture in the contemporary world. Students are encouraged to participate in academic competitions sponsored by NOMA and other organizations.

B. Architectural Education and Students. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to live and work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured and respected; to emerge as leaders in the academic setting and the profession; to understand the breadth of professional opportunities; to make thoughtful, deliberate, informed choices and; to develop the habit of lifelong learning.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: This condition is met with distinction as evidenced by the information provided by the program and the team's interaction with students during the visit. It was clear that Howard University is committed to providing a wide range of opportunities to engage students and to prepare them to lead and work in the profession. As a result, Howard University students are well prepared to live, work and contribute in the profession.

Examples of some of the ways the program prepares students to live and work in a global world are:
- Students have the opportunity to be involved in student governance and have a voice in program's faculty and dean selection process.
- The program supports student organizations to connect with the profession by attending conferences that enrich their professional, educational and leadership experience.
- Students have the opportunity to collaborate with professional organizations like AIA, NOMA, and architecture firms through studio reviews and events like lunch & learn, firm pin ups and local and national conferences.
- The level of effort the program and student organizations have invested to promote professionalism through courses, committees, events and mentorship impressed the team. An example is the IDP class that prepares students to enter practice by identifying internship opportunities, teaching them how to interview, and providing guidance on how to launch and advance their careers in architecture.
- The program is committed to providing a wide range of opportunities to engage students and to prepare them to lead and work in the profession.

C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located, and; prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: This condition is met with distinction. Throughout the program, Howard students are provided with opportunities to obtain information about licensure, IDP and the role of the registration boards. Beginning with the curriculum with the Environment and Architecture course in the first year to Professional Practice in the final year, students are exposed to the importance and process of becoming licensed. There is also an IDP course, taught by Professor McGhee, that many students take. This course not only exposes students to IDP but also seeks internship opportunities for them.

The program also takes advantage of the five collateral organizations in architecture being headquartered in Washington, D.C., to invite representatives from these organizations to the school to meet with the student body. An example was when representatives from NCARB gave a presentation on the IDP changes that are going into effect this spring. When the team met with students and asked them about IDP, the overwhelming majority knew about it and were aware of the recent changes that will allow freshmen to enroll.
Faculty members are also very active in professional and regulatory agencies, serving in leadership roles that enable them to bring meetings to the campus to expose students to the regulatory aspects of the profession. Several of the faculty members have served on the District of Columbia Board of Architecture, which gives them an excellent platform to share with the students the importance of licensure and the role of the regulatory boards. Currently Professor McGhee serves on the District of Columbia Board of Architecture.

D. Architectural Education and the Profession. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to practice in a global economy; to recognize the impact of design on the environment; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to the multiple needs of a diversity of clients and diverse populations, as well as the needs of communities and; to contribute to the growth and development of the profession.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The team found that Howard University’s Bachelor of Architecture program has met this condition with distinction. This was accomplished in three ways: Core and elective courses, support for student organizations, and relationships with alumni and professional societies.

Specifically, ARCH 751 – Professional Practice, ARCH 521 and 522 – Environmental Systems I and II, and the series of design studios support students in satisfying the criteria within this perspective. The new elective course formed around the Intern Development Program adds depth to students’ understanding of the profession and its linkage to architectural education.

For a relatively small program, Howard University maintains a large number of student organizations that supplement the formal curriculum and offer added knowledge and leadership training in architecture. The team observed and engaged in conversation with leaders of ADSA (Architecture and Design Student Assembly), AIAS, NOMAS, CEACS Student Assembly Council (College student assembly), Alpha Rho Chi Fraternity, and Tau Sigma Delta Honor Society as confirmation of this.

In conversation with students and alumni during the site visit, the team found evidence of a close affinity and loyalty of alumni to the school, as well as support by the school to bring students in direct engagement with professionals, professional organizations, and events.

E. 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.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: This is another condition that the team thought was met with distinction. Service to society is part of the culture of Howard University as reflected in the university’s mission and vision statement, which calls for “a tradition of leadership and service to the underserved communities.” The architecture students embrace the university’s mission and vision statement by working with DC high school students in underprivileged neighborhoods and
serving as mentors and introducing them to design. They are also engaged in community service projects through student organizations and working with faculty.

A significant number of design studio projects are sited in DC, and students are required to go into the communities and engage the residents as part of the pre-design effort and sometimes final presentations. ARCH 701- Public Issues in Architecture, is a course designed to encourage students to be critical thinkers with respect to cultural trends, policy, and the environmental impact of decisions made regarding the built environment.

Students have also participated in the “Haiti Ideas Challenge” in response to the devastating earthquake in 2010. The department also reaches out to the Caribbean School of Architecture in Kingston, Jamaica, and is developing a relationship to improve the quality of life in communities in this part of the world, and where several of Howard’s students and graduates come from.

I.1.4 Long-Range Planning: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and, where appropriate, the five perspectives. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform its future planning and strategic decision making.

[X] The program’s processes do not meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: At the time of our visit, the team did not find documents and policies indicating that NAAB’s standards for this condition were met. This also is a cause of concern for the team.

While there is evidence at the university level of long-range planning with the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal (PCAR), the team found no documents and policies indicating a similar strategic plan at the department and school level. In addition, the university is in the midst of implementing a phased retirement plan, that will impact 5 out of the 7 tenured faculty positions, but no decision has been made on how many professors will accept the offer and how many tenured positions the school and department will retain.

At the college, school and department levels there was discussion about increasing enrollment, growing the Architecture School from one department, expanding the program offerings, and the program’s direction and focus, but no written plan for how to accomplish these objectives.

There is evidence committees are in place to address the day-to-day issues and there is a proposal to change the degree nomenclature from B Arch to M Arch, but they are no substitute for long-range strategic planning to increase enrollment, expand program offerings, and provide a framework for how to transition between long-serving tenured faculty and attracting and retaining young and talented new professors to replace them.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:
- How the program is progressing towards its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.
- Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:
  - Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
- Individual course evaluations.
- Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.
- Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.

The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.

[X] The program’s processes do not meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: The team did not find sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the program regularly conducts self-assessment and how that self-assessment is used to change and adjust the program. Although the faculty indicates that they are in agreement about the direction of the program based on a proposed change to the nomenclature of the degree, there are no written policies to indicate how assessment tools should be used, nor a timeline for implementing the plan or objectives. Some evidence of self-assessment such as course evaluations was provided, but there was no indication of how that information was used to improve the program and promote student success.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:
- Faculty & Staff:
  - An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions².
  - Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
  - Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.

[X] Human Resources (Faculty & Staff) are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence in the APR of a profile of the school faculty, course assignments for each instructor over the past two years, as well as résumés for each faculty member, including adjuncts. Initiatives for diversity are mentioned in the APR, and the team noted that only 4 of 19 faculty members are women. Policies and procedures for equal employment opportunity for faculty, staff and students were found on the university’s website.

From conversations with students, the team found evidence that instructors offer personal attention in design studios and that structures instructors and building systems instructors regularly meet with students in design studios to help integrate the design work in promotion of student achievement.

The School has begun a new elective course around the Intern Development Program, and in conversation with students, the team learned that this is a popular and desired course.

The School’s record regarding human resource development opportunities relies heavily on the university-wide “Fund for Academic Excellence” program, which provides grant opportunities for faculty for special projects and original research. Though about half the faculty have benefitted from this program, it has not been in effect since 2009, and it is currently being restructured. At this time, the acquisition of new knowledge for faculty members is largely gained through professional practice. The team did not find evidence that there is consistent financial support for faculty research at the school level.

Policies and procedures related to the appointment of faculty, faculty promotion and pathways to tenure were found on the university website.

Recent budget cuts across the university have largely spared teaching positions, but at the expense of staff positions. Staff positions related to financial aid and recruitment have been eliminated. The

² A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
team notes this as a cause for concern as the School attempts to grow its enrollment and course offerings.

• Students:
  o An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This documentation may include, but is not limited to application forms and instructions, admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshman, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.
  o An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.

[X] Human Resources (Students) are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The admissions policies and procedures are documented on the website for the College of Engineering, Architecture, and Computer Sciences at:


These policies were also contained in a binder delivered to the team during the site visit from the Office of Student Services.

The team found evidence that the School provides regular, annual support for students to attend meetings, conferences, and field trips related to course work and student organizations. However, students have limited ability to participate in independent/directed studies.

1.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

• Administrative Structure: An accredited degree program must demonstrate it has a measure of administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm the program’s ability to conform to the conditions for accreditation. Accredited programs are required to maintain an organizational chart describing the administrative structure of the program and position descriptions describing the responsibilities of the administrative staff.

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the administrative structure provides sufficient autonomy for the program to conform to the conditions of accreditation.

The current administrative structure was implemented in the fall of 1997 when the School of Architecture & Planning merged with the School of Engineering & Computer Science to become the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences (CEACS), as part of a university-wide realignment. This structure was designed for a School of Architecture & Planning with multiple departments. This is currently not the profile of the school, and it does not appear it has been for quite some time, since the school only has one department.

The team was informed that one of the reasons Professor Grant, director and associate dean of the school since 2008, was hired was to grow the number of programs in the school, increase enrollment and shepherd the program through its degree nomenclature change, but his arrival coincided with a university-wide moratorium on starting new programs in response to the challenging economic conditions. While this has clearly impacted the school’s efforts to grow, the team also heard aspirations expressed at all levels to expand the school, its programs and enrollment. The team believes that unless long-range plans and policies, as previously noted under Condition 1.1.4 Long-Range Planning, are put in place to grow the school and increase enrollment, the current structure for the school and department needs to be re-evaluated to determine how effective it is in operating the department and for redundancy.
• Governance: The program must demonstrate that all faculty, staff, and students have equitable opportunities to participate in program and institutional governance.

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: Governance opportunities are adequate for the program. There are six standing committees that include faculty and student participation and two additional committees for faculty only. Senior faculty members remain very active and engaged in the program and program development. Junior faculty members are similarly invested in the program with optimism about the inevitable transitions that will occur as senior faculty members retire. Through the committee structure, all interested parties have equitable opportunities for participation in program and institutional governance.

1.2.3 Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:
- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: Based on a review of the information provided in the APR relative to the facility, and a tour that was conducted by the team, the physical resources are adequate for the program.

1.2.4 Financial Resources: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion has been met per the financial and budgetary information provided during the visit. This information was supplemented at meetings held with members of the administrative staff during the team’s visit.

1.2.5 Information Resources: The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

Further, the accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resources professionals who provide information services that teach and develop research and evaluative skills, and critical thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The primary architecture library is located within the department’s building, which puts it in close proximity to classrooms and design studios. Students have convenient access to a wide range of articles, journals, books, reports, and publications. The library provides books and digital access to additional information. The architecture library receives a moderate amount of financial support to grow in its resources. Budget figures found in the APR indicate funding is available to add to the current collection.
The architecture librarian has interest and passion and provides full support in assisting students with resources in the library. To augment the architecture library, the main library at Howard University is adjacent to the architecture building and provides architecture students with access to additional architectural digital and visual resources.

PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

1.3.1 Statistical Reports*: Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

- Program student characteristics.
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.
  - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
    - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
  - Time to graduation.
    - Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.
    - Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.

- Program faculty characteristics
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.
  - Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.

[X] Statistical reports do not provide the appropriate information.

2012 Team Assessment: The Howard University APR contained only some of the statistical information required to satisfy this criterion. During the site visit the team requested additional information. Following is a list of the materials that were not provided:

- Program Student Characteristics
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity and gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
    - Demographics of students at the time of the previous visit were not provided.
    - Demographics compared to those of the institution overall were provided for 2009 only.

\[3\] In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
• Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
  - Qualifications of students at the time of the previous visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit were not provided.

• Time to graduation.
  - Percentage that completed the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit was not found.

• Program Faculty Characteristics
  • Demographics (race/ethnicity and gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit were not provided.
    - Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall were not found.

• Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.
  - Comparison to the number of faculty promoted each year across Howard during the same period was not found.

• Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
  - Comparison to the number of faculty receiving tenure at Howard during the same period was not provided, though the team became aware of one faculty member receiving tenure.

• Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit and where they are licensed, was found as a current list of registration locations provided in Section 1.3.3 – Faculty Credentials. The team also found a separate list of faculty categories with licenses in U.S. jurisdictions, but did not find a composite list.

1.3.2. Annual Reports: The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2009 NAAB Procedures. Beginning in 2008, these reports are submitted electronically to the NAAB. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the NAAB will provide to the visiting team all annual reports submitted since 2008. The NAAB will also provide the NAAB Responses to the annual reports.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

[X] Annual Reports and NAAB Responses were provided and provide the appropriate information

2012 Team Assessment: This condition is met, as reports and responses were provided in the APR and contained the appropriate information.

1.3.3 Faculty Credentials: The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty are adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history and context of the institution.
In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit\textsuperscript{4} that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

[X] Faculty credentials were provided and demonstrate the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement.

2012 Team Assessment: This condition is met as evidenced by the APR in section 4.2 Faculty résumés (pages 144 to 170) and the faculty exhibit. The current faculty members have the experience and range of knowledge necessary to promote student achievement, with the majority holding professional degrees in architecture and licensed. In addition, most of the faculty members practice in some form and are able to share that knowledge with students.

**PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW**
The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

[X] The policy documents in the team room did not meet the requirements of Appendix 3.

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion was not met based on the reporting information required under this section. The Annual Reports and Faculty Credential reports were provided, but the required documentation for the Statistical Reports was not. In particular, those specified under the subsections; Program Student Characteristics and Program Faculty Characteristics were not provided.

\textsuperscript{4} The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria: The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:
Architects must have the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This ability includes facility with the wider range of media used to think about architecture including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making. Students' learning aspirations include:

- Being broadly educated.
- Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.
- Communicating graphically in a range of media.
- Recognizing the assessment of evidence.
- Comprehending people, place, and context.
- Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.

A.1. Communication Skills: Ability to read, write, speak and listen effectively.

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: Criterion of communication skills at the level of ability was not met. There is evidence of ability in reading, speaking and listening, but not in writing effectively. The grammar, vocabulary and structure of the written work did not meet the standards of effective communication. Evidence of this deficiency was found throughout the program, including the terminal written document, the thesis book for ARCH 891 Thesis Preparation. It was also evident in ARCH 301 and 302 – Architectural History I and II, despite efforts on the part of the faculty to provide a feedback loop for the students to improve on their skills by repeating the exercises in writing.

In addition to the deficiency in basic writing skills, there was a lack of citations found throughout the thesis books produced for ARCH 891 Thesis Preparation including specific citations regarding sources for images, firm and project profiles, and incomplete notations for textual work. The ability to structure proper annotations is a part of effective communication and professional accuracy.

The ability to listen and speak was met and was evident throughout the visit in studio observations, and interactions with the student body, both formal and informal. Reading skills were evident in ARCH 301 and 302 – Architectural History I and II, as well as many other courses that required reading assignments in order to complete work and tests required.

A. 2. Design Thinking Skills: Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of ability as evidenced by the student work in the design studio sequence (ARCH 202 – Design II through ARCH 206 – Design VIII).
A. 3. Visual Communication Skills: Ability to use appropriate representational media, such as traditional graphic and digital technology skills, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of ability as evidenced by the student work in the design studio sequence (ARCH 202 – Design II through ARCH 206 – Design VIII).

A.4. Technical Documentation: Ability to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The criterion is met at the level of ability as evidenced by the student work in ARCH 951 – Construction Documents.

A.5. Investigative Skills: Ability to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion was met at the level of ability as demonstrated in ARCH 891 Thesis Preparation. In this course students demonstrated an ability to use investigative skills and apply research to a design process. Evidence was also found in studio visits and history courses.

A. 6. Fundamental Design Skills: Ability to effectively use basic architectural and environmental principles in design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of ability as evidenced by the student work in ARCH II – Design IV.

A. 7. Use of Precedents: Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of ability as evidenced by the student work found in the following design studios: ARCH 201 – Design III, ARCH202 – Design IV, and ARCH 205 – Design VII.
A. 8. Ordering Systems Skills: Understanding of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of understanding of ordering systems skills is evidenced in ARCH 202 Arch Design IV. The student work demonstrates a facility with the diagramming of various ordering systems as well as execution through the project design.

A. 9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced in the course material and student work for ARCH 301 and 302 Architectural History I and II.

A. 10. Cultural Diversity: Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at a level of understanding as evidenced in the referenced course work and student work in ARCH 901 – Programming and Pre-Design, ARCH 301 - Architectural History I, and ARCH 302 – Architectural History II.


[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion was met at the level of understanding as demonstrated in ARCH 891 Thesis Preparation. Thesis research documents demonstrate the understanding of applied research as it relates to architectural design.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: Evidence to support student performance in critical thinking and representation was found throughout the program, from the beginning of the curriculum to the end. The eleven criteria in this realm were addressed at all levels of the program. While it is clear that some areas in this realm can be improved, it is equally clear that the faculty value the role of critical thinking and representation in the development of architecture students. The thesis project gives students the opportunity to develop a singular project for an entire year, from research to design production. This process tests and further develops these skills and demonstrates the program's commitment to this realm of architectural education.
Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Incorporating life safety systems.
- Integrating accessibility.
- Applying principles of sustainable design.

B. 1. Pre-Design: Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The criterion is met at the level of ability as evidenced in student work in ARCH 901, Programming.

B. 2. Accessibility: Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical (including mobility), sensory, and cognitive disabilities.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of ability as evidenced in student work in ARCH 201 – Design III, through the application of basic circulation, ADA requirements, entrances and the use of materials for those with cognitive disabilities.

B. 3. Sustainability: Ability to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction and operations on future generations through means such as carbon-neutral design, bioclimatic design, and energy efficiency.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of ability as evidenced by the student work and assessments contained in ARCH 522 – Environmental Systems II, as well as ARCH 402 – Materials and Methods II.

B. 4. Site Design: Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of ability as evidenced in ARCH 206 – Design VIII, through the application of basic manipulation and adaptation of the topography,
incorporation of vegetation into design and the use of natural resources like water for efficiency and sustainability.

B. 5. **Life Safety:** Ability to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met at the level of ability as evidenced in ARCH 402 – Materials and Methods II, ARCH 205 – Design VII, and ARCH 951 – Construction Documents.

B. 6. **Comprehensive Design:** Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student’s capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following SPC:

- A.2. Design Thinking Skills
- A.4. Technical Documentation
- A.5. Investigative Skills
- A.8. Ordering Systems
- A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture
- B.2. Accessibility
- B.3. Sustainability
- B.4. Site Design
- B.7. Environmental Systems
- B.9. Structural Systems
- B.5. Life Safety

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met at the level of ability as evidenced by the student work in ARCH 951 – Construction Documents.

B. 7 **Financial Considerations:** Understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting.

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met at a level of understanding as ARCH 402 – Materials and Methods included lecture materials, quizzes and examples of student assessment. The team also found evidence in ARCH 901 – Programming and Pre-Design of economic analysis in the form of two lectures, though this appeared conceptual and did not contain evidence of acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, or estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting.

B. 8. **Environmental Systems:** Understanding the principles of environmental systems’ design such as embodied energy, active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar orientation, daylighting and artificial illumination, and acoustics; including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools.
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at a level of understanding as demonstrated by student work in ARCH 522 Environmental Systems II. The quizzes, assignments and lectures provided show that the students have a good understanding of the principles of environmental systems and how to apply those systems to their design work. The work required included the use of appropriate analogical performance assessment tools.

B. 9. Structural Systems: Understanding of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced in ARCH 502 – Structures II. The structures professor also works with students in studios ARCH 203 - Design V and ARCH 204 - Design VI to review and consult with students to develop structural systems for their projects.

B. 10. Building Envelope Systems: Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced in ARCH 402 – Materials and Methods, ARCH 951 – Construction Documents, and ARCH 206 – Design VIII (Thesis).

B. 11. Building Service Systems Integration: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced by the student work in ARCH 522 – Environmental Systems II and ARCH 951 – Construction Documents.

B. 12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration: Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced by the student work in ARCH 401 and 402, Materials and Methods I and II.
Realm B. General Team Commentary: Of the three realms, the goals of Realm B reflect what the team found to be perhaps the greatest strengths of Howard University’s Bachelor of Architecture program. At its core, the curriculum is built upon solid understanding of materials, components, and systems. Through culture and pedagogy, students develop a comprehensive knowledge of design, based in reality and an appreciation of the impact of materials and systems that are sustainable, accessible, and integrated.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

- Knowing societal and professional responsibilities
- Comprehending the business of building.
- Collaborating and negotiating with clients and consultants in the design process.
- Discerning the diverse roles of architects and those in related disciplines.
- Integrating community service into the practice of architecture.

C. 1. Collaboration: Ability to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: While there is evidence in the design studios that the students have the ability to work in collaboration with each other during programming and pre-design, there was no evidence that the students met a level of ability collaborating with others outside the program in multi-disciplinary teams with other departments and schools in the university, such as engineering, computer science, art and interior design, to successfully complete design projects.

C. 2. Human Behavior: Understanding of the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment and the design of the built environment.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced by student work in ARCH 901 – Programming and ARCH 891 – Thesis Preparation. Students display the ability to integrate their understanding of physical and psychological behavior, surrounding context and urban and suburban space into their projects.

C. 3. Client Role in Architecture: Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and reconcile the needs of the client, owner, user groups, and the public and community domains.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced by student work in ARCH 751 – Professional Practice and ARCH 901 Programming.
C. 4. Project Management: Understanding of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced by student work in ARCH 751 – Professional Practice.

C. 5. Practice Management: Understanding of the basic principles of architectural practice management such as financial management and business planning, time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced in ARCH 751 – Professional Practice.

C. 6. Leadership: Understanding of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: 2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced in ARCH 751 – Professional Practice, as well as through conversations with students.

C. 7. Legal Responsibilities: Understanding of the architect’s responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced in ARCH 751 – Professional Practice.

C. 8. Ethics and Professional Judgment: Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues, and responsibility in architectural design and practice.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced in ARCH 751 – Professional Practice, as well as through conversations with students.

C. 9. Community and Social Responsibility: Understanding of the architect’s responsibility to work in the public interest, to respect historic resources, and to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors.

[X] Met
**2012 Team Assessment:** This criterion is met at the level of understanding as evidenced in ARCH 701—Public Issues in Architecture and ARCH 891—Thesis Preparation, as well as through interviews, conversations, and observation of students.

**Realm C. General Team Commentary:** While the objectives of Realm C are primarily covered in ARCH 751—Professional Practice, they are also covered in a few other required and elective courses. Students are also exposed to the objectives covered in this realm by the majority of faculty, who are engaged in architectural practice and ongoing interaction with practitioners in and out of the classroom. Opportunities for students to develop leadership skills were found in course work and through their involvement in student organizations.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Regional Accreditation: The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This condition is met as Howard University holds accreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). Evidence of this information of the schools accreditation status was also accessible on the (MSCHE) website http://www.msche.org/institutions_view.asp?idinstitution=271, and through a copy of the March 4, 2010, accreditation letter, which is also accessible on the university’s website http://www.gs.howard.edu/middle_states/mse/.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: 2012 Team Assessment: Howard University offers a five-year Bachelor of Architecture professional degree and is supported by the requisite professional studies, general studies, and electives.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

The program must describe the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications (e.g., changes or additions) are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Further, the NAAB expects that programs are evaluating curricula with a view toward the advancement of the discipline and toward ensuring that students are exposed to current issues in practice. Therefore, the program must demonstrate that licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program has a process for evaluating the curriculum and making modifications through their curriculum committee and faculty meetings. The team found evidence of the continuous review, evaluation, and modification process through observations and meetings with students and faculty.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

In the event a program relies on the preparatory/pre-professional educational experience to ensure that students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist. Likewise, the program must demonstrate it has determined how any gaps will be addressed during each student’s progress through the accredited degree program. This assessment should be documented in a student’s admission and advising files.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This condition is not applicable to Howard University’s program, because transfer students are not given credit for courses that satisfy SPC.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees
In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The link to the “Statement on NAAB Accredited Degrees” is found on the Howard University website at the following address:

www.howard.edu/ceacs/departments/architecture/degreeprograms.htm

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:
The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation  
The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The link to “NAAB Conditions and Procedures” is found on Howard University’s website at the following address:

www.howard.edu/ceacs/departments/architecture/degreeprograms.htm

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:

www.ARCHCareers.org
The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
The Emerging Professional’s Companion
www.NCARB.org
www.aiia.org
www.aias.org
www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The link to “Career Development Information” is found on Howard University’s website at the following address:

www.howard.edu/ceacs/departments/architecture/degreeprograms.htm

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:

All Annual Reports, including the narrative
All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
The final decision letter from the NAAB
The most recent APR
The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

These documents must be housed together and accessible to all. Programs are encouraged to make these documents available electronically from their websites.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The link to “Public Access to APRs and VTRs” is found on Howard University’s website at the following address:

www.howard.edu/ceacs/departments/architecture/degreeprograms.htm

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The link to “ARE Pass Rates” is found on Howard University’s website at the following address:

www.howard.edu/ceacs/departments/architecture/degreeprograms.htm
III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

[Taken from the Architecture Program Report, responses to Part One: Section 1 Identity and Self-Assessment]

A. History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)

Reference Howard University, APR, pp 1-3.

B. History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)

Reference Howard University, APR, pp. 3-7.

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference Howard University, APR, pp. 16-20.

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference Howard University, APR, pp. 20-24.
2. **Conditions Met with Distinction**
   (list number and title; include comments where appropriate)

   I.1.3.B  Architectural Education and Students  
   I.1.3.C  Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment  
   I.1.3.D  Architectural Education and the Profession  
   I.1.3.E  Architecture and the Public Good
3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the NCARB
Kevin G. Montgomery, FAIA, NOMA, LEED AP BD+C
Principal + Director of Architecture
O'Brien Atkins Associates, PA
204 Hardwick Drive
Durham, NC 27713
(919) 941-9000 ext. 2020
(919) 941-9000 fax
kmontgomery@obrienatkins.com

Non-voting member
Tyrone B. Bradley, AIA
Principal
Bradley/Parker & Assoc., P.C
110 South Lee Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 548-5026
(703) 548-5342 fax
lbradley@bradleyparker.com

Representing the AIA
Thomas R. Mathison, FAIA, REFP
Principal
Tower Pinkster
678 Front Avenue, NW
Suite 255
Grand Rapids, MI 49504-5323
(616) 456-9944 ext. 241
(616) 456-5936 fax
tmathison@towerpinkster.com

Representing the AIAS
Carla J. Wijaya
699 14th Street
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 588-8120
carlawijaya@gmail.com

Representing the ACSA
Jori Ann Erdman, AIA, NOMA, LEED®AP
Director
School of Architecture
Louisiana State University
136 Atkinson Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
(225) 578-6985
(225) 578-2168 fax
jerdman@lsu.edu
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Kevin G. Montgomery, FAIA
Team Chair
Representing the NCARB

Thomas R. Mathison, FAIA, REFP
Team member
Representing the AIA

Carla J. Wijaya
Team member
Representing the AIAS

Jori Ann Erdman, AIA, NOMA, LEED®AP
Team member
Representing the ACSA

Tyrone B. Bradley, AIA
Non-voting member
## Student Performance Criteria

### Critical Thinking and Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 003</td>
<td>Environment/Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 166</td>
<td>Design Comm. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 011</td>
<td>Elements of Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 151</td>
<td>Design Comm. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 199</td>
<td>Arch Design I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 301</td>
<td>History Survey I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 401</td>
<td>Materials and Methods I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 200</td>
<td>Arch Design II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 302</td>
<td>History Survey II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 402</td>
<td>Materials and Methods II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 511</td>
<td>Computer Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 201</td>
<td>Arch Design III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 521</td>
<td>Environ., Systems I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 501</td>
<td>Structures I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 601</td>
<td>Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 202</td>
<td>Arch Design IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 651</td>
<td>Principles of Urban Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 822</td>
<td>Environ., Systems II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 502</td>
<td>Structures II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 203</td>
<td>Arch Design V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 561</td>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 204</td>
<td>Arch Design VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 701</td>
<td>Public Issues in Arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 205</td>
<td>Design VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 891</td>
<td>Thesis Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 206</td>
<td>Design VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 701</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>