July 21, 2006

H. Patrick Swygert, President
Howard University
2400 Six Street, NW
Washington, DC 20059

Dear President Swygert:

At the July 2006 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the board reviewed the Visiting Team Report for the Howard University School of Architecture and Design.

The board noted the concern of the visiting team regarding problems in several areas.

As a result, the professional architecture program:

Bachelor of Architecture

was formally granted a six-year term of accreditation with the stipulation that a focused evaluation be scheduled in three years to look at Public Information and all unmet Student Performance Criteria and the progress that has been made in those areas. In addition, the Board will closely review the program’s 2007 Annual Report to determine what strategies the school of architecture is instituting to address the Causes of Concern identified in the Visiting Team Report. The accreditation terms are effective January 1, 2006. The program is scheduled for its next full accreditation visit in 2012. The focused evaluation is scheduled for the calendar year 2009.

Accreditation is subject to the submission of Annual Reports. Annual Reports are due by June 1 and must include a response to each condition identified as not met in the Visiting Team Report, a response to each of the causes of concern in the Visiting Team Report, a brief summary of changes that have been made or may be made in the accredited program, and the two-page statistical report. If an acceptable Annual Report is not submitted to the NAAB by the time of its fall board meeting, the NAAB may consider advancing the schedule for the program’s next accreditation sequence. A complete description of the Annual Report process can be found on pages 14–15 of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2005 Edition.

NAAB encourages public dissemination of information about each school contained in both the school’s Architecture Program Report and the Visiting Team Report. If the Visiting Team Report is made public, then it is to be published in its entirety.

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

Very truly yours,

C. William Beins, FAIA
President

Enc. Visiting Team Report

cc: Victor Dzidziengo, Director and Associate Professor
Morris Brown, MFA, AIA, Team Chair
Visiting Team Members
Howard University
School of Architecture and Design

Visiting Team Report

Bachelor of Architecture (171 undergraduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
5 April 2009

The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1948, 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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1. **Summary of Team Findings**

1. **Team Comments**

A spirited culture of pride in the legacy of a school of architecture educating mostly black architects is broadly felt among the students, faculty, and administration.

The students are forthright; they value the legacy of the school's “service-to-community” orientation and they exhibit an uncommon camaraderie. A new wave of student leadership in several organizations has reenergized their participation in the school. This is a definite strength.

The faculty are accessible to the students. There is a broad-based sense of rapport between students and faculty. Several faculty members indicated they work around student schedules to extend classes or meet at off-hours in the studio, and well-subscribed sign-up sheets posted on faculty doors are visible in the school.

The school's renewed and simultaneous attention to systems integration, comprehensive projects, programming, and technical representation has come to the fore as a strength of the school.

Practice is valued as a mode of inquiry. The practice of the faculty provide the students with multiple models of ethical conduct and participation in community as well as traditional client-centered work.

Two areas could use some development: a) an intellectual freshening of the debates in the school and the scholarly endeavors of the program, both within coursework and among the research pursuits of the faculty, and b) a leaning of critical perspective, adventure, risk, and refinement in student design proposals.

Howard University attracts students gifted with leadership qualities. This was evident in sessions the accreditation team spent with the students and student leaders.

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

**Condition 3, Public Information**

The program must provide clear, complete and accurate information to the public by including in its catalog and promotional literature the exact language found in Appendix A-2, which explains the parameters of an accredited professional degree program.

Previous Team Report: While the information in the university’s catalog is similar to that required by the NAAB, it has been edited and revised outside the school by the university's campus printing office.

Howard University’s *Undergraduate Bulletin* 2000–02 was the last printed 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/seacs/departments/architecture/admissions.htm, which had the exact language required by the NAAB. The *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, 2004 edition*, Appendix A, has once again changed its language for catalog and promotional literature, thus the Web site must now be updated.
Condition 7, Physical Resources

The program must provide physical resources that are appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each full-time student; lecture and seminar spaces that accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space.

**Previous Team Report:** The merging of the School of Architecture and Planning with the School of Engineering to make the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences may prove beneficial to the Architecture program in terms of the university's long-range strategic goals and the collegial relationships of the Department of Architecture's staff with colleagues in associated disciplines. However, there are short-term, interim facility issues affecting the program's performance and progress today.

While the Department of Architecture provides administrators and full professors with private offices, there are a number of full-time faculty members who must share their office space and computers with part-time faculty members. Approximately 50 percent of the basement has been converted to computer science classrooms; some offices previously assigned to architecture are now occupied for other college uses. The architectural woodworking and model shop has been moved to larger quarters in the basement but is not in operation, and space dedicated for use as a building materials and systems resource center has been closed down as the mechanical/electrical systems are not deemed adequate to currently service these functions.

While there still remain some concerns regarding life-safety and code compliance in the building, it should be understood that the building was designed and constructed in the 1950s for studies in law and converted to provide space for architecture students later. The university is currently planning for the design and construction of a new future facility for architecture, engineering, and the computer sciences and the current building will be converted to some other use and activity in the future.

The team found this section is met. The merging of the School of Architecture and Planning with the School of Engineering in 1997 as part of the university realignment, creating the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences, has evidenced short-term faculty issues. The current progress and the faculty's excitement about the future are evident. Adding to this anticipation of change, the director and chair, Victor Dzidzienyo, has resigned to teach full time and a search is underway for his replacement.

All administrators and full professors have private offices; part-time faculty share semi-private offices. Approximately 50 percent of the basement has been converted to computer science classrooms; some offices previously assigned to architecture are now occupied for other college uses.

Concerns cited in the previous site visit (in 2003) appear to be corrected, and plans are in place to implement infrastructure upgrades later this year. However, there remain significant concerns regarding the heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC), the Materials Resource Center, and handicapped accessibility. See Section II, Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation, Condition 8, Physical Resources.

Condition 11, Professional Degrees and Curriculum

The NAAB only accredits professional programs offering the Bachelor of Architecture and the Master of Architecture degrees. The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must
include three components—general studies, professional studies, and electives—which respond to the needs of the institution, the architecture profession, and the students, respectively.

**Previous Team Report**: While the program provides students adequate access to general electives, there are no structured interdisciplinary provisions in place for students to obtain minors outside the college or in any areas of concentration within architecture, engineering, or computer sciences.

The team finds that this condition is met. The credit-hour distribution meets NAAB’s criterion of 45 general studies credits and sufficient electives to achieve a concentration in special interests in architecture. While there are still no “structured interdisciplinary provisions in place for students to obtain minors outside the college” or in areas of concentration, there is ample credit hour capacity to pursue either or both. The critical issue is timely advising in order to plan for prerequisites and to coordinate course times among the various programs. Advising assistance is available in the college and in other academic units to clarify expectations and to assist with planning a program of study.

**Criterion 12.14, Accessibility**

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

**Previous Team Report**: Evidence submitted in the APR and student exhibit confirms that the students are made “aware” of code requirements and are encouraged to understand accessibility requirements. The NAAB criterion requires evidence of ability in this area. Coursework and student design projects evidenced little or no incorporation of this criterion in the design work submitted for review. Accessibility and universal design should be taught as design strategies established as goals for measuring every studio project.

While the team found evidence of ability expressed in some projects, on the whole, this criterion is not met. In reviewing the student projects on display throughout the building, it was clear that accessibility and universal design were not expressed as important elements in Design Studio 3.

**Criterion 12.22, Building Systems Integration**

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

**Previous Team Report**: The exhibited studio work of students clearly shows the lack of any comprehensive ability to address the integration of building systems. While course work incorporates aspects of systems integration, it is rarely visible in exhibited student projects.

The team finds that this criterion is well met. The Team Room materials for required structures, environmental systems and materials, and assemblies courses; the required construction documents course; the comprehensive thesis project in Studio VIII; and prior studios all contain explicit documented evidence of addressing this criterion. In addition, the extensive schoolwide exhibit of required and elective coursework further evidences compliance.
Criterion 12.27, Detailed Design Development

Ability to assess, select, configure, and detail as an integral part of the design appropriate combinations of building materials, components, and assemblies to satisfy the requirements of building programs.

Previous Team Report: Student projects remain largely schematic through the final stages of design, even into the advanced stages of the student's academic development. Details are at the essence of any notable project of architecture and the ability to incorporate building materials and systems, including connections between the two within the tectonics of a greater "whole," was not shown. The analysis of detailed sections, connections, and assemblies need to be performed by the students using the media of drawing, drafting, and modeling at more conventional, larger scales.

The team finds that this criterion is met. The Team Room materials, the required construction documents course, the comprehensive thesis project in Studio VIII, and prior studios all show explicit documented evidence of addressing this criterion. In addition, the extensive schoolwide exhibit of required and elective coursework further evidences compliance.

Criterion 12.28, Technical Documentation

Ability to make technically precise descriptions and documentation of a proposed design for purposes of review and construction

Previous Team Report: The ability to produce precise technical documentation and descriptions of proposed designs was not exhibited through student work. While plans, elevations, and basic sections were evident, the ability to create a level of documentation (including construction methodology and connection details) that could then be used for construction was not found.

The team finds that this criterion is met. The Team Room materials, the required construction documents course, technical concept diagrams, and developmental detail sketches in the studios all show explicit documented evidence of addressing this criterion. In addition, the extensive schoolwide exhibit of required and elective coursework further evidences compliance.

Criterion 12.29, Comprehensive Design

Ability to produce an architecture project informed by a comprehensive program, from schematic design through the detailed development of programmatic spaces, structural and environmental systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections, and building assemblies, as may be appropriate, and to assess the completed project with respect to the program's design criteria

Previous Team Report: The designs submitted in the student exhibits failed to demonstrate the ability to present an architecture project informed by a comprehensive program. Even though some projects (most evident in Arch 205/206, Design VIII) succeeded in moving through schematic and development stages, they failed to integrate the influences of structure, environmental systems, and systems of life safety. There was also insufficient evidence of appropriate wall sections and building assemblies. A comprehensive architectural design should bear witness to the architect's ability to develop a design from the earliest schematic phase through to detailed design-development, embracing all the technologies and materials common in contemporary architecture.
The team finds that this criterion is met. The Team Room materials for the required thesis preparation course and the comprehensive thesis project in Studio VIII contain explicit documented evidence of addressing this criterion. From thesis preparation through the studio, programming, site assessment, conceptual design, systems development, and documentation at both schematic and advanced levels of development are expected. The "thesis statement," and the "technical review" provide milestones. Graphics are thorough at all levels of development. In addition, the extensive schoolwide exhibit of additional thesis projects and other required and elective coursework, which includes many "mini-comprehensive" projects, further testify to compliance.

**Criterion 12.30, Program Preparation**

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

**Previous Team Report:** The ability to create a comprehensive program indicates a thorough understanding of the spaces necessary to satisfy the needs of the user. (This criterion should be most likely evident in Arch 891, Thesis Preparation, and Arch 901, Programming.) The school teaches a basic foundation in programming methods and theory. The work submitted in these courses demonstrates a sound fundamental but disconnected knowledge of precedent, site analysis, and programming. Evidence was not found in any exhibit of the ability to bring all elements together in an overarching program that demonstrates a firm ability to determine the user's needs, site conditions, climatic considerations, and a detailed breakdown of building spaces, subspaces, and support spaces.

The team finds that this criterion is met. The Team Room materials for the required programming course, the thesis preparation course, and diagrammatic programming content of the thesis project in Studio VIII contain explicit documented evidence of addressing this criterion. In addition, the extensive schoolwide exhibit of additional thesis projects and other required and elective coursework, which includes many "mini-comprehensive" projects, provides further evidence of compliance.

3. **Conditions Well Met**
   - 13.3 Graphic Skills
   - 13.15 Sustainable Design
   - 13.18 Structural Systems

4. **Conditions Not Met**
   - 13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills
   - 13.9 Non-Western Traditions
   - 13.10 National and Regional Traditions
   - 13.14 Accessibility
   - 13.20 Life-Safety
   - 13.25 Construction Cost Control
5. Causes of Concern

Condition 4  Social Equity
Condition 6  Human Resources
Condition 7  Human Resource Development
Condition 8  Physical Resources
Condition 9  Information Resources
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

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

1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context

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

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

The academic context for the Howard University architecture program must be considered to extend beyond the boundaries of the university proper to include Washington, D.C. Many design projects are based at sites throughout the city, and issues of urban design, neighborhood context, and architecture are woven together. Materials, assemblies, and building systems studies are enhanced by regular visits to construction sites in the city. Washington provides a rich social and physical fabric within which students pursue their studies.

There is no doubt that the program is recognized within the university for its preparation of graduates who can contribute to the profession and the community.

However, despite being located in the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences, little interdisciplinary teaching and or research is being conducted with potential partners in engineering and computer science. To some degree, the relatively new college is still building a community of the whole that supports such interdisciplinarily, but there is much room for complementary work if faculty members are encouraged to do so. Similarly, there is limited indication of work with other divisions of the university. While students have the credit-hour capacity to pursue minors outside architecture, there are institutional problems such as scheduling and prerequisites that make it very difficult to minor in a subject.

With the completion of the merger of the schools into a single college and with the search for a new director under way, perhaps the time has come for more explicit interdisciplinary scholarly ventures.

1.2 Architecture Education and Students

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

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

The program provides several opportunities for students to assume leadership roles in the school including American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS) and the National Organization of Minority Architecture Students (NOMAS) chapters, a governing body for the School of Architecture, and a position on the grievance committees. Student leaders actively participate in discussions with the faculty and administration and may attend the program’s administrative meetings.

Students and faculty share a close relationship and the students feel well respected, supported, and advised as they work towards a Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.) degree and a future in architecture and design. Students generally do not take coursework towards minors in fields outside the college while they are at Howard University. There seems to be a variety of reasons for this: Transfer students do not generally have room in their schedules to take general electives that would, together, constitute a minor; students feel they are discouraged from pursuing minors, even told that they cannot pursue minors; other students feel that they are not advised well in their first and most flexible year at Howard, in terms of schedule, to pursue a minor.

Because of the international presence on the faculty, exposure to international architectural practice is part of the culture of the program. In addition, most of the students asked to participate in at least one international study program while in school. Faculty have commented that the programs to study abroad could be stronger and become a more dominant facet of the curriculum and culture of the school.

1.3 Architecture Education and Registration

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

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

During the course of discussions, it was repeatedly noted many graduates choose to move into allied fields or simply not obtain professional certification. The program supports intern development by encouraging the AIAS to arrange and sponsor intern development seminars during the spring semester each year. They include students, faculty, and local practitioners who participate in roundtable discussions that include the topic.

In our meeting with the president (an attorney), he recognized the importance of completing professional certification. He also expressed an interest in opportunities for
outreach with local architects in the form of guest speakers or employment for the students.

One of the program's strengths is its ability to produce graduates with strong fundamental skills who are quickly hired upon graduation.

1.4 Architecture Education and the Profession

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

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

The APR states, "The professional architectural degree program at Howard University is framed by the diversity of faculty and students." The visiting team found cultural diversity to be a fundamental and unique strength of the program. This diversity in the faculty and student body tables any "preconceived notions" regarding individuals' backgrounds and focuses on matters of intellect. Professional bonds and friendships grow easily in this environment. Student body members have a high level of respect for each other and the faculty.

The Department of Architecture's mission is to provide professional and advanced degree education which is directed to developing individuals capable of exerting leadership in all sectors and at all levels of society. The graduates will be capable of engaging in practice, advanced study, public service, research and teaching as practitioners and scholars. The strength of the graduates will be their passion for excellence in architecture and their ability to participate productively in the contemporary world, to encourage and anticipate change and to adapt to change in the local, national and international communities.

Howard University fosters a unique bond with its students, both present and former. There is strong alumni support for the program and the university's mission. The Department of Architecture's student body is bright, energetic, and full of promise, both professionally and as future citizens. The team found a high level of collegiality, respect, and mutual support within the student body.
1.5 Architecture Education and Society

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

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

This exposure is found throughout the curriculum and is especially evident in the design studios, where community charrettes and design projects address these issues.

2. Program Self-Assessment Procedures

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

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

There has been significant focus on rectifying learning deficiencies in a number of areas: plans are in place to enrich relationships with alumniae, and student activism and participation is on the upswing. However, the Departmental Assessment Plan (May 2003) and the Program Strategic Plan (January 2006) are somewhat distinct from one another, e.g., measures are in the Assessment Plan, but not in the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan provides an extensive list of near-term (1-year) issues, some of which have strategic implications and others of which meet immediate needs. Future ambitions, including those regarding graduate programs, are not well defined, making it more an action than a strategic plan. The school may wish to revisit the Strategic Plan once a new director arrives.

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.

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

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.
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.

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

The Architecture Program Report (APR) does include a section on the criteria and procedures used to achieve diversity in student admissions, advancement, retention, and graduation.

Despite the rich ethnic and racial diversity of the program’s students, faculty, and staff, progress since the last visit regarding the number of women architects on the full-time faculty amounts to one individual out of 10 architecture faculty members. While this is an improvement from having no full-time women faculty members teaching design studio and the program has hired three part-time female instructors, gender imbalance in the faculty remains an issue. Particularly of concern is that this one full-time woman instructor is the only female mentor who is working in traditional architecture practice.

Furthermore, there is no mention of a plan to address this imbalance in the Program Strategic Plan nor are there any documents that the team has seen that make hiring women a priority with upcoming faculty searches for the four open faculty lines.

5. Studio Culture

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

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

There is a studio culture policy for the school that was partially drafted by student leaders within the program. Students are aware of this policy and feel it reflects their needs and values.

However, there is no implementation plan for this policy or a means of assessing whether and how it is effective. The program needs to develop an implementation plan beyond cultural assimilation.

Students are concerned that outside jurors on their studio final reviews are not always well prepared by studio critics concerning the goals and conditions of the design project and how critiques fit into the studio culture expectations of the program.
6. Human Resources

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

Met [X]  Not Met [ ]

The School of Architecture and Design is currently in the midst of a search for a new director who will also serve as associate dean. The hiring of a director needs to be done as soon as possible to lend vigor to the school and to advance it. This position has direct access to the provost, and the new director will be responsible for filling the position of chair of the department of architecture. Several vacant full-time tenure-track lines will remain with the department as well. These need to be protected, and filling them presents opportunities for advancing the agenda of the school as outlined in its strategic plan. The school has a number of dedicated, talented part-time non-tenure track faculty who are delivering substantive portions of the curriculum. Every effort should be made to stabilize the curricular base and enrich the scholarly agenda of the school with full-time tenure-track appointments. Progress on this front needs to be closely monitored.

7. Human Resource Development

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

Met [X]  Not Met [ ]

School and collegiate funds are augmented by the university’s Fund for Academic Excellence to support travel, sabbaticals, and research. These funds are available on a competitive basis at each level. While practice is valued as a path to advancement, scholarly productivity with peer review does not seem to be a priority in the school, and recent scholarly work has been limited. A culture that nurtures scholarly productivity among peers with active support from the administration does not seem to be present. This is somewhat at odds with the university’s strategic interest in advancing research.

The departmental promotion and tenure document is based upon a 1982 policy of the College of Architecture and Planning that is no longer an academic unit. The College of Engineering, Architecture, and Computer Sciences has not developed a new promotion and tenure (P&T) policy, nor apparently have the departments of the college. While it has been some time since a member of the architecture faculty has gone forward for tenure and/or promotion, with one new tenure-track appointment and the prospect for more, it is imperative that the school formulate P&T criteria (as called for in the university’s Faculty Handbook) commensurate with university, collegiate, and school strategic objectives. The paths for advancement, financial support for scholarship, and start-up assistance need to be transparent.

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.

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

The team found this condition is met. The merging of the School of Architecture and Planning with the School of Engineering in 1997 as part of the university realignment, creating the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences, has evidenced short-term faculty issues. The current progress and the faculty’s excitement about the future are evident. Adding to this anticipation of change, the director and chair, Victor Dzidziienko, has resigned to teach full time and a search is underway for his replacement.

All administrators and full professors have private offices; part-time faculty share semiprivate offices. Approximately 50 percent of the basement has been converted to computer science classrooms; some offices previously assigned to architecture are now occupied for other college uses.

Concerns cited in the previous site visit (in 2003) appear to be corrected, and plans are in place to implement infrastructure upgrades later this year. However, there remain significant concerns regarding the HVAC, the Materials Resource Center, and handicapped accessibility. These issues were noted in the 1998 and 2003 Visiting Team Reports (VTRs). The school has financial resources and designs for an HVAC overhaul and construction and outfitting of the Materials Resource Center. These must proceed immediately. Also, the school needs to develop an acceptable Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance upgrade plan that includes the elevator with budgeted financial resources to improve the facility.

Concerning building security, touchpads with magnetic locks on exterior doors are cumbersome and difficult to coordinate and maintain.

Adequate facilities for model building that include a vacuum system connected to each piece of woodworking equipment are present in a facility on Sherman Avenue where they share space with sculpture and engineering model-making classes. However, this location is inconvenient because of its distant location from the architecture building.

Records indicate that total enrollment in the School of Architecture is down from 147 in 1999–2000 to 127 in 2004–05 (13 percent). One cannot help but recognize that other competing programs are attracting students from Howard simply as a result of the antiquated condition of the facility. A new building to house architecture, engineering, and computer sciences will lift morale, improve operational efficiency, and attract students. The team understands plans are underway for a new interdisciplinary science and engineering complex to house the College of Engineering, Architecture, and Computer Sciences. The target date for ribbon cutting is 2011. Prompt completion of planning and of the new facility is recommended.

9. Information Resources

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

While the library meets NAAB’s minimum standards, total support for collection development has declined during the past 3 fiscal years from $20,477 to $14,275 a year. Within that allocation, the book purchase budget, which also covers videos, slides, maps, and government documents, has declined from $12,000 to $5,280 a year. During the last 2½ fiscal years, a total of 188 books has been purchased, there has been virtually no development of the visual resources collection (such as slides and scanned images), and the project to develop an online visual image resource collection has been stalled. This approach is inadequate to maintaining currency in an information resource center for professional programs. The school should energetically pursue an infusion of financial resources to upgrade the library and visual resources collections.

10. Financial Resources

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]

It appears that this program has access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs with funds that are on the low end of comparable funds available to other professional programs. The areas compared were the School of Education, the School of Social Work, and the College of Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health.

Per-Student Funding for the 2004–05 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>Funding/Student</th>
<th>School or College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>School of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>$45,100</td>
<td>School of Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>$37,230</td>
<td>College of Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Administrative Structure

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

Met Not Met
[X] [ ]
Howard University is an institution that is accredited by the MSACS. The accredited degree program has a measure of autonomy that is both comparable to that afforded other professional degree programs in the institution and sufficient to ensure conformance with the conditions for accreditation.

12. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

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

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

The team finds that this condition is met. The credit-hour distribution meets NAAB’s criterion of 45 general studies credits and sufficient electives to achieve a concentration in special interests in architecture. While there are still no “structured interdisciplinary provisions in place for students to obtain minors outside the college” or in areas of concentration, there is ample credit-hour capacity to pursue either or both. The critical issue is timely advising in order to plan for prerequisites and to coordinate course times among the various programs. Advising assistance is available in the college and in other academic units to clarify expectations and to assist with planning a program of study.

13. Student Performance Criteria

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

13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills

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

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 in the part of students to use full notation when quoting material.

Students are articulate speakers, however, and acquit themselves well when giving public comments.
13.2 Critical Thinking Skills

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

Met  Not Met
[ ]  [ ]

13.3 Graphic Skills

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

Met  Not Met
[ ]  [ ]

The team recognizes that the presentations, across the board, are exemplary in the use of graphics techniques to communicate.

13.4 Research Skills

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

Met  Not Met
[ ]  [ ]

13.5 Formal Ordering Skills

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

Met  Not Met
[ ]  [ ]

13.6 Fundamental Skills

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

Met  Not Met
[ ]  [ ]

13.7 Collaborative Skills

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

Met  Not Met
[ ]  [ ]
13.8 Western Traditions

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

Met | Not Met
---|---
[X] | [ ]

13.9 Non-Western Traditions

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

Met | Not Met
---|---
[ ] | [X]

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.

13.10 National and Regional Traditions

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

Met | Not Met
---|---
[ ] | [X]

This 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.

13.11 Use of Precedents

Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects

Met | Not Met
---|---
[X] | [ ]

13.12 Human Behavior

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

Met | Not Met
---|---
[X] | [ ]
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

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

13.14 Accessibility

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

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

Evidence of the student's 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.

13.15 Sustainable Design

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

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

This criterion is well met. Professor Hussey's Introduction to Environmental Systems 2 (Arch 522) addresses issues regarding sustainable design. Students who successfully complete his course will have a broad exposure and understanding of sustainable design and Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) principles.

13.16 Program Preparation

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

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

The team finds that this criterion is met. The Team Room materials for the required programming course, the thesis preparation course, and diagrammatic programming content of the thesis project in Studio VIII contain explicit documented evidence of addressing this criterion. In addition, the extensive schoolwide exhibit of additional thesis
projects and other required and elective coursework, which includes many "mini-
comprehensive" projects, provides further evidence of compliance.

13.17 Site Conditions

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

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

13.18 Structural Systems

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

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

The creative and innovative design of Assistant Professor Amvor's course, Arch 350-
502, provides students with the skills necessary to understand the principles of structural
behavior in buildings. This criterion is well met.

13.19 Environmental Systems

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

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

13.20 Life-Safety

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

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

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.

13.21 Building Envelope Systems

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is the team's feeling that, although the criterion stipulates a basic understanding of building envelope materials and assemblies, these courses should be expanded to include a wider variety of envelope systems, e.g., stone, metal, curtain wall, and stucco.

13.22 Building Service Systems

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

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

13.23 Building Systems Integration

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

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

The team finds that this criterion is well met. The Team Room materials for required structures, environmental systems and materials, and assemblies courses; the required construction documents course; the comprehensive thesis project in Studio VIII; and prior studios all contain explicit documented evidence of addressing this criterion. In addition, the extensive schoolwide exhibit of required and elective coursework further evidences compliance.

13.24 Building Materials and Assemblies

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

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

13.25 Construction Cost Control

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

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

Evidence of student performance that met this criterion was not apparent in sufficient quantity.
13.26 Technical Documentation

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

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

The team finds that this criterion is met. The Team Room materials, the required construction documents course, technical concept diagrams, and developmental detail sketches in the studios all show explicit documented evidence of addressing this criterion. In addition, the extensive schoolwide exhibit of required and elective coursework further evidences compliance.

13.27 Client Role in Architecture

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

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

See comments at 13.34.

13.28 Comprehensive Design

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

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

The team finds that this criterion is met. The Team Room materials for the required thesis preparation course and the comprehensive thesis project in Studio VIII contain explicit documented evidence of addressing this criterion. From thesis preparation through the studio, programming, site assessment, conceptual design, systems development, and documentation at both schematic and advanced levels of development are expected. The “thesis statement,” and the “technical review” provide milestones. Graphics are thorough at all levels of development. In addition, the extensive schoolwide exhibit of additional thesis projects and other required and elective coursework, which includes many “mini-comprehensive” projects, further testifies to compliance.

13.29 Architect’s Administrative Roles

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

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

See comments at 13.34.
13.30 **Architectural Practice**

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

- Met
- Not Met

[X] [ ]

See comments at 13.34.

13.31 **Professional Development**

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

- Met
- Not Met

[X] [ ]

See comments at 13.34.

13.32 **Leadership**

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

- Met
- Not Met

[X] [ ]

See comments at 13.34.

13.33 **Legal Responsibilities**

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

- Met
- Not Met

[X] [ ]

See comments at 13.34.

13.34 **Ethics and Professional Judgment**

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

- Met
- Not Met

[X] [ ]

The texts used (The AIA Handbook, Pressman, Blau, Cuff, and the like) for the readings, written summaries developed before class, the Socratic structure of class discussion, and the essay-format projects and exam methods are combined in a rich manner. Teachings in ethics are reinforced in the Public Issues course. Also, many of the faculty practice and are models for the students on these fronts.
Appendix A: Program Information

1. History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2005 Howard University Architecture Program Report.

Howard University, established on March 2, 1867, is a comprehensive research university, with a commitment to educating students for leadership and service to our nation and the global community. Howard University values diversity, which can be observed in the administration, faculty, staff, students, and alumni, as well as in the wide range of academic programs, services, research, and scholarly pursuits. Through the years, it has been the number-one producer of African Americans with degrees in many fields, at both undergraduate and graduate/professional levels, including engineering, architecture, and science.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the leading authority for classifying higher education institutions in the United States, classifies Howard University as a "Doctoral/Research University-Extensive." This category is the highest classification the Carnegie Foundation awards the nation's over 4,000 colleges and universities. Howard is one of only 151 such institutions, one of only 49 private institutions, and the only Historically Black College/University (HBCU) with this designation. In its most recent rankings, U.S. News and World Report has ranked Howard 90 among the 248 universities categorized as "Best National Universities." This same publication has ranked Howard 28 on a scale of Best Values among the 248 national research universities. In addition, Howard University was recognized in the rankings as a leading national university with 10% population of international undergraduates. The magazine Princeton Review ranked the Howard University student newspaper, The Hilltop, the number one university newspaper in the country in 2004.

Students and Faculty
Over the years, the student body of Howard University has included men and women from all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and 100 countries around the world. During the fall 2004 semester, the student body consisted of 3,754 graduate and professional students and 7,112 undergraduates, a combined total of 10,866. Howard employs a full and part-time faculty of approximately 1,600 men and women, 85% of whom hold degrees from national research universities. Howard University is the United States' only comprehensive academic institution with a predominately black constituency. Within Howard's multicultural, multiethnic, multi-cultural, international faculty is the largest concentration of black scholars of any university in the world.

Academic Programs
At Howard University, degrees are offered at the undergraduate level in 80 fields, master's degrees in 75 fields, and doctoral degree in 28 fields. Among these are undergraduate and graduate degrees in science, technology, engineering, and several interdisciplinary areas. Some 37 agencies provide accreditation for Howard's academic programs. The University is organized into 12 Schools and Colleges: seven Schools (Business, Communications, Divinity, Education, Graduate, Law, and Social Work) and five Colleges (Arts and Sciences; Dentistry; Engineering; Architecture and Computer Sciences; Medicine; and Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences).

The University's Library System encompasses the Founder's Library (the central research library), the Undergraduate Library, and branch libraries in the professional
Schools. The Association of Research Libraries, of which the Howard Library System is a member, ranks it among the top 100 research libraries in the nation. The University is home to the Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, one of the largest and most important collections of materials by and about African-American people and culture.

Howard University is a member of the Washington Metropolitan Area Consortium of Universities, which includes George Mason, Georgetown, George Washington, Catholic, American, Marymount and Gallaudet Universities; Mount Vernon and Trinity Colleges, the University of the District of Columbia and the University of Maryland, College Park. The consortium offers productive engagement with colleagues' faculty and students of member Schools.

2. Institutional Mission

The following text is taken from the 2005 Howard University Architecture Program Report.

"Howard University is a comprehensive, research-oriented, historically Black private university providing an educational experience of exceptional quality to students of high academic potential with particular emphasis upon the provision of educational opportunities to promising Black students. Further, the University is dedicated to attracting and sustaining a cadre of faculty who are, through their teaching and research, committed to the development of distinguished and compassionate graduates and to the quest for solutions to human and social problems in the United States and throughout the world." September 1996

3. Program History

The following text is taken from the 2005 Howard University Architecture Program Report.

Architectural education at Howard University formally began on February 9, 1911 when the Board of Trustees approved degree studies in architecture. Prior to that time, William J. Decatur had been appointed as the first faculty member in architecture in 1908. William Buckner succeeded Professor Decatur. In 1919, Professor Buckner organized the Department of Architecture in the School of Applied Sciences, one of many parent units in which architecture education was to reside.

In 1920, Albert I. Cassell, noted architect and graduate of Cornell University, was appointed to the faculty and became Chairman in 1921. Hilyard R. Robinson, FAIA was appointed to the faculty and the first two students graduated. Arthur W. Ferguson and Julius M. Garéner, graduated in 1923. When Cassell resigned to become the Howard University Architect, the appointments of Robinson as Chairman and Howard H. Mackey, FAIA, a University of Pennsylvania graduate, to the faculty made 1924 a significant year in the history of architectural education at Howard University. Professor Mackey became acting head of the Department in 1930 when Professor Robinson resigned to pursue graduate studies in architecture.

Professor Mackey would become Chairman and lead the Bachelor of Architecture degree program to accreditation by the National Architectural Accrediting Board, NAAB,
In 1951, it was under his leadership that the School of Architecture and Planning would be formed in 1970 by the Board of Trustees as an independent professional degree-granting unit.

In 1970 Jerome W. Lindsey, the first architecture graduate of Howard University to assume a leadership position was appointed dean. In 1979, Dean Harry G. Robinson III, FAIA, another Howard University architecture graduate succeeded Dean Lindsey. In 1995, Dean Robinson was appointed interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and, subsequently, Vice President for University Administration and Victor C. W. Dzikdzieyko became Acting Dean of the School. Acting Dean Dzikdzieyko, like Dean Robinson held both the professional degree in architecture and the Master of City Planning from Howard University.

In Fall 1997, as part of the university realignment, the School of Architecture & Planning merged with the School of Engineering & Computer Science, which became the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences (CEACS).

4. Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2005 Howard University Architecture Program Report.

The program has, over time, developed and revised its mission statement influenced by the reality of its future and determinants both internal and external to its place in the national and international communities. The most recent mission statement was developed and affirmed on 6 December, 2002.

That statement is as follows:

"The Department of Architecture's mission is to provide professional and advanced degree education which is directed to developing individuals capable of exerting leadership in all sectors and at all levels of society. The graduates will be capable of engaging in practice, advanced study, public service, research and teaching as practitioners and scholars. The strength of the graduates will be their passion for excellence in architecture and their ability to participate productively in the contemporary world, to encourage and anticipate change and to adapt to change in the local, national and international communities."

5. Program Strategic Plan

The following text is taken from the 2005 Howard University Architecture Program Report.

Program's Strength

The program strengths focus on the following:

- Curriculum for the professional degree program
- Diversity of students and faculty
- Location of professional degree program in Washington, DC
  (see section 4.7 - "School Catalog" for further information)
The professional degree architecture program at Howard University is framed by the diversity of the faculty and students. This diversity is at once the opportunity and the challenge of the program. It encourages divergent views and explorations and it creates an environment within which the resulting wide breadth of thinking is invigorating, enriching and is the center of the architecture program’s legacy and its future.

This stratification in attitudes, interests, impulses and cultural and socio-economic backgrounds among the faculty and the students encourages an environment and its resultant interaction most nearly reflecting those of the wider community of humankind. The diversity resists institutional and individual dogmas while encouraging socially culturally responsive relationships.

This diversity is a powerful ingredient in the program’s milieu. It spawns a wide range of creative impulses and an equally wide range of responses to the orthodoxy of the architectural discourse. The management and support of this pervasive quality is a challenge and is unique in its strategies.

The Program’s legacy elements -- alumni, friends and supporters at-large - reinforce its purposes and encourage a positive future. Most recently, two alumni James E. Silcott, B Arch 1957, and Charles David Moody, B Arch. 1982, made major gifts to the Program.

Mr. Silcott, a trustee of the University, endowed both a faculty chair and the exhibition gallery. The Silcott Professorship is the first endowed chair in architecture in the history of Howard University and one of only a few in this academy. These gifts extend Mr. Silcott’s beneficent support of the program began in the 1980s when he initially established an endowed scholarship fund.

Mr. Moody initially established the Harry Robinson III/Charles D. Moody Scholarship Fund. Two years ago he made a generous gift of $100,000 specifically designated for renovation of the design studio environment.

These two alumni exemplars are among many who contribute their resources and time to supporting architecture education at Howard University. Many alumni named scholarship and loan funds attest to this.

The outreach of alumni and friends to students seeking internships and post graduation employment is constant, significant and representative of many venues in which architecture is practice, locally, nationally and internationally.

The location of the Program in Howard University and Washington, DC, the Nation’s Capital and a center of global activity is a significant strength/asset. Both the University and the City extend the diversity of the Program to broader and richer limits. This diversity has always been a hallmark of the University’s leadership position in the national and international communities and is, in fact, an element of its brand statement — “Leadership for America and the global community.” Teaching and learning architecture in these nationally and internationally rich environments is matched by few in this country.

**Program Challenges**

Within the premise of the strengths, there exist three challenges. These challenges are essentially sequential and of long term existence.

The late 1960s was a period of substantive growth and development for architecture
education in Howard University. With support from the Ford Foundation, graduate professional and advanced study programs were developed and implemented. This new layer of study and its attendant advanced scholarship enriched the extant pedagogy of the professional degree program in architecture.

The challenge to broaden, once again, the degree offerings is before the Program as a keystone in connecting architecture education with the Carnegie status of "Doctoral/Research University-Extensive." It is within the framework of graduate education and its research orientations that increased resources will become commonplace. The broadening of the degree/curricula offerings is an imperative that must be addressed.

Plans to Address the Challenges

Achieving a priority relationship within the University budgeting process consistent with that of a professional degree offering entity is important to any future development of architecture education in Howard University. The proud 95 year history of the Program within the University is characterized by budgetary, spatial and perceptual support aligned with an undergraduate arts and sciences program. One movement that can begin to overcome this symbolic posture is the development of the 4+1 sequence leading to the BS Arch, academic degree and the M Arch, professional, NAAB accredited degree and an advanced degree program in architecture.

A compliment of support personnel and specialized environments directly supporting professional education in architecture is a shortcoming of the Program. As the Program moves toward its 100 year anniversary, so, too, must the infrastructure supporting its operation. This support must be aligned with the environments in which architecture is made external to the academy equal to the environments in which medicine and dentistry is taught and practiced.
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Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Saturday, April 1, 2006

Afternoon. .................. Team arrival and check-in at accommodations:
Embassy Suites Hotel, Washington, DC
1250 22nd Street Northwest
Washington, D.C. United States 20037
Phone: 1202/957-3388 Fax: 1202/785-2411

7:00pm...................... Informal team meeting (team introductions in Chairman’s suite)

8:00 – 9:30pm............. Team dinner at Embassy Suites Hotel (Panaevino Ristorante)
All members of Team present.

Sunday, April 2, 2006

7:00 – 8:00am............ Complimentary full-service breakfast at Embassy Suites (ask concierge for details)

8:00 - 10:00am......... Team orientation and review of the Architecture Program Report (APR) with Team Chair at Embassy Suites (Wine Room) Continental Breakfast. All members of Team present.

10:15am .................. Team pick-up and travel to school

10:45 – 12:00pm .... Tour of the Architecture Program Facilities (Part 1):

Overview of Mackey Building & General Facilities:

1st Floor - (Víctor Dzidzienyo, Director & James H. Johnson, Dean)
• College – Dean
• School – Associate Dean & Director
• Department – Chairman
• Conference Room
• Smart Room
• Lobby, corridors, exhibition spaces
• T. George Silcott Architecture & Design Exhibition Gallery
• Smart Room (special presentation room)

2nd Floor - (Víctor Dzidzienyo, Director & James H. Johnson, Dean)
• Design studio space (5th year)
• Classrooms
• Team Room
• Corridors, exhibition and jury spaces
• Hylard and Helena Robinson Auditorium

Upper Mezzanine - (Víctor Dzidzienyo, Director & James H. Johnson, Dean)
• Design studio spaces (4th yr.)
• Design studio spaces (3rd yr.)
• Community space/presentation area

**Lower Mezzanine (Ground level) - (Victor Dzidzenyo, Director & James H. Johnson, Dean)**
• Design studio spaces (2nd year)
• Design studio spaces (1st year)
• Community space/presentation area
• Reproduction space (student operated)
• School of Architecture & Design library – Alliah Humber
• Contours (presentation space)
• Student Organizations space

**Basement - (Victor Dzidzenyo, Director & James H. Johnson, Dean)**
• Computer (CADD) lab – Esteb Lopes
• Seminar/presentation space
• Building Materials and Systems Resource Center (proposed shared space)

12:00 – 1:00pm……..Team lunch with program administrators – Room 100 (Dean’s conference rm.) V. Dzidzenyo, Director and J. H. Johnson, Dean.

1:00 – 2:00pm………..Introduction/orientation of exhibits in the Team Room - Victor Dzidzenyo, Director & James H. Johnson Jr., Dean
5th year exhibition space; 4th year exhibition space; 3rd year exhibition space; 2nd year exhibition space; 1st year exhibition space

2:00 – 3:00pm………..Tour of the Architecture Program Facilities (Part 2):

**Other Facilities /External to the Mackey Building**
• Media Center and Audiovisual Resources (Founders Library) – Mr. Mohammad, Mekawwai, Director & Ms. Ailiah Humber, Curator
• Computer Learning & Design Center (CLDC) Lab – Mr. Lester Lihard
• Information lab (I-lab)
• Shared Model & Fabrication Shop (Fine Arts/Sculpture Dept.) – Prof. David Smelvey, Prof. William Taylor, Joseph Bernard

3:00 – 4:30pm …………..Team Review of Materials in Team Room

4:30 – 6:00pm………..Entrance meeting with faculty – Rm. 150. E. Dunson, B. Laurie, M. Chin, N. Galloway, W. Taylor, A. Elagga, A. Clarens, K. Jadin, O. Hussey

6:15pm …………………..Travel to Clyde’s at Gallery Place with selected program administrators

6:45 – 9:30pm………..Team Dinner at Clyde’s at Gallery Place with selected program administrators. W. Taylor, K. Jadin, E. Dunson, B. Laurie, A. Clarens, P. VanderPoel, V. Dzidzenyo, H. Robinson

9:45pm…………………..Team pick-up and travel to Embassy Suites Hotel

**Monday, April 3, 2006**

7:00 – 7:45am………..Complimentary full-service breakfast at Embassy Suites (ask concierge for details)
8:00 – 8:15 am .......... Pick-up and team travel to school

8:30 – 9:15 am .......... Team meeting with James H. Johnson, Jr., Dean and Victor Dzidzienyo, Assoc. Dean & Director (continental) - Dean’s conference rm. – rm. 100

9:15 – 9:30 am .......... Walk to Mordecai W. Johnson Building – escorted by James H. Johnson, Jr., Dean & Victor Dzidzienyo, Director


10:30 – 11:30 am .......... Entrance meeting with President H. Patrick Swygert, Esq., in the Conference Room. President’s Office, 4th floor, Mordecai W. Johnson Building

11:30 – 12:30 pm .......... Review of exhibits/records

12:30 – 1:30 pm .......... Lunch with faculty - Room 1 50, McGhee, Laurie, Robinson, Taylor, Clarens, Elneggar, Minai, Jadin, Hessey, Dunson, Vanderpoel

1:30 – 2:30 pm .......... Observation of design studios/classes

2:30 – 4:30 pm .......... Review of exhibits and records

4:45 – 6:00 pm .......... School-wide entrance meeting with the student body in the Hilyard and Helena Robinson Auditorium (rm. 201) Approx. 55 students (45% of all FTE students)

6:00 – 8:00 pm .......... Reception with faculty, administrators, alumni, and local practitioners Grand Lobby area.

8:00 – 8:45 pm .......... Team only dinner (Rm. 100 – Dean’s Conf. rm.)

8:45 – 9:30 pm .......... Review of exhibits/records

9:30 – 10:00 pm .......... Team Debriefing Session

10:00 – 10:15 pm .......... Team pick-up and travel to Embassy Suites Hotel

Tuesday, April 4, 2006

7:00 – 7:45 am .......... Complimentary full-service breakfast at Embassy Suites (ask concierge for details)

8:00 – 8:15 am .......... Team pick-up and travel to School

8:15 – 9:15 am .......... Meeting with Program Head (continental) – V. Dzidzienyo & J. Johnson, Dean. Dean’s Conf. room – rm. 100

9:30 – 11:00 am .......... Review of general, professional electives and related programs

11:00 – 12:00 pm .......... Observation of classes (possibly by one or two members – subset of team)

12:00 – 12:30 pm .......... Review of exhibits/records (continue)

12:30 – 1:30 pm .......... Team lunch with class/student organization representatives – rm. 150
ADSA: Rena Bradley, President
NOMAS: Saral Williams, President
AIAS: Kristal Peters, President
CEACS (UGSA): Kristal Aquil
Alan Henderson, Billy Almon, Javier Guzman, & Michael Smith, Marcus Boine, Adrian Richardson, Joseph ...

1:45 - 2:30pm.......... Meeting with Director of University Central Library Systems and Curator of School of Architecture & Design Library - Architecture Library. G. Palermo & Alliah Humber

1:45 – 2:30 PM Meeting with E. Lopes, IT. M. Fisher.

2:30 – 3:30pm.......... Meeting with faculty (full-time & part-time) – room 150. G. Palermo, for the Team; O. Gleen Chase, Curtis Clay, Edward Pinkard, Dunson, Taylor, VanderPoe, Claras, Eneeggar, Jadin, Sylvanus Amevor

3:30 – 7:00pm.......... Complete review of exhibits/records

7:00 – 7:45pm.......... Team only dinner (rn. 150)

7:45 – 11:45pm.......... Team Accreditation deliberations and drafting the VTR

11:45 – Midnight .......... Team travel to Embassy Suites Hotel

Wednesday, April 5, 2006

7:00 – 7:45am.......... Complimentary full-service breakfast at Embassy Suites (ask concierge for details)

8:00am .................. Check out of Embassy Suites Hotel

8:00am .................. Team pick-up and travel to School

8:15 – 9:00am .......... Team meeting with the James H. Johnson, Jr., Dean & Victor Dzidzienyo, Director (continental breakfast) – Dean’s conf. room – Rm. 100.

9:15 – 9:30am .......... Walk to Mordecai W. Johnson Building – escorted by James H. Johnson, Jr., Dean & Victor Dzidzienyo, Director

9:30 – 10:45am.......... Team exit meeting with Provost and Chief Academic Officer Richard A. English & President H. Patrick Swygert, Esq., & Assoc. Prov. J. Reitly in the Conference Room, President’s Office, 4th floor, Mordecai Wyatt Johnson Administration Building. Team and V. Dzidzienyo, Director, and J. H. Johnson, Dean

11:00 – 12:15pm........ Team exit meeting with School of Architecture & Design Administration, Faculty, Students and Staff in the Hildyard and Helena Robinson Auditorium

12:15 – 1:00pm.......... Team only lunch – Dean’s conference room – Rm. 100. All members of Team & V. Dzidzienyo
End of visit

DEPARTURES LEAVING THE SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN:
1:30pm. Shuttles to:
- Reagan National Airport
- Dulles International Airport
- Thurgood Marshall Baltimore-Washington International Airport
- Union Station (Amtrak, Marc, VRE, Metro)
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IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully submitted,

Morris Brown, MFA, AIA
Team Chair
Representing the AIA

Marzette Fisher
Team member
Representing the NCARB

Kirk Wilker
Team member
Representing the AIAS

Gregory & Palermo, FAIA
Team member
Representing the ACSA

James E. Elliott, AIA
Observer
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