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 NAAB visiting team wishes to thank our University hosts. The host school did a tremendous job in arranging for our visit and insuring full access to the information we required. We know full well how much work is required of students, faculty, Chair Michael Crosbie, Dean Louis Manzione, Provost Sharon Vasquez, and President Walter Harrison. Their effort and the transparent organization of materials allowed the team’s work to go smoothly.

The architecture program can be characterized by three important factors: people, location and program age.

We found that the people involved in shaping the program are dedicated and passionate about establishing a highly professional program. The Chair, Associate Professor Michael Crosbie, who is well regarded nationally, brings to the program outstanding administrative and teaching skills. His familiarity with the profession at all scales—local, national and international—is rare and distinguishing. In addition, the administrative support overseen by the university president, provost and college dean is robust and effective. Students and faculty alike engender a warm and nurturing atmosphere that constitutes an effective learning environment.

The location of the program in Hartford, Connecticut provides much needed leadership to the regional community for solid architectural and planning decision-making. Over time, this community will benefit from the ideas generated by student projects, and as a result of visiting lectures and faculty scholarship. Area professionals who in large part are credited for lobbying for the establishment of the program remain its enthusiastic supporters and of course they are its beneficiaries as well.

Finally, age-wise the program is still in its early years. And in these years it must and has made professional education—congruent with NAAB requirements—its first priority. As the program matures the team assumes that the curriculum will broaden to encompass multiple areas of specialization. In time the program will grow, the curriculum will broaden, and the faculty will gain still further in its reach and scholarly distinction.

2. Conditions Not Met

   I.2.3 Physical Resources
   II.1.1 B.11 Building Service Systems Integration
   II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

3. Causes of Concern

Woodshop: The woodshop does not have a dedicated staff person to manage the shop and insure the safety of the students. The space is small and poorly maintained. Ventilation of the space continues to be grossly insufficient. Working conditions in the woodshop are unsafe. The dust collection system is inadequate. An electrical conduit, condensate piping, and dust collection “duct” run fully exposed over the floor directly next to the table saw. This is hazardous for all who traverse this area. Moreover, because so few tools are available in the small woodshop, power tools are being used in the studio itself, and their use is not sufficiently monitored. Their presence there is hazardous and a nuisance. Placement of the computer lab adjoining the woodshop is clearly undesirable as dust, noise and traffic compromise computer usage. The college plans to complete an upgrade to the ventilations system over the 2011 Summer Break. Dean Manzione also notes that arrangements could be made so that the
architecture students could use the engineering woodshop that is located close by and is fully equipped and staffed.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2008 M. Arch)

2004 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2008): There is a significant, ongoing need for curricular development, scholarship, and an investment of time and energy to create, maintain and increase the quality of the program. The current demands on full-time faculty and staff, including but not limited to their advising duties, conflict with this goal. The current number of staff and faculty relative to the current number of students is not sustainable in an accredited professional program.

While the team believes that Chair Crosbie is doing an outstanding job of administration, his additional role as graduate program director and his teaching load place demands on his time that may not be sustainable over time. It is important to recognize that the chair’s interest in research and publishing is an asset to the program and if he wants to continue in those endeavors additional support may be required.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Additional faculty members have been hired since the last accreditation visit, and these constitute an acceptable near-term remedy for a prior noted deficiency. Faculty size is no longer an issue. Regarding the concern about the demands on Chair Crosbie’s time, this team feels that he can handle his workload given the current size of the program.

2004 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2008): There are an inadequate number of dedicated desks to serve next year’s projected enrollment. By extension there is also inadequate studio space to house the additional assigned desks that will be needed. The woodshop, print rooms and computer lab are too small for the number of students they serve. The woodshop and computer lab are limited in the time they are available to the students. The size, configuration, and limited ventilation in the woodshop are safety concerns.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Since the last visit, the program has added comfortable graduate student studio space in a near-by, off-campus location. Parking is conveniently located directly outside the studio. The graduate space contains 30 dedicated studio desks and two classrooms. This space is adequate to house the current 28 graduate students, however, the faculty and students alike look forward to the undergraduate and graduate programs being housed in one location. Final project pin-ups are taken to the main building so that the entire student body can observe the critiques. The university master plan indicates that the graduate studio is to be relocated
to the program’s main building; however, the move is on hold until sufficient resources can be found to move forward. The woodshop remains a problem. (See comments under Causes for Concern, page 1.) The print rooms and computer lab are too small for the number of students they serve. The computer room is also too warm for students who use the facility. There are other options for the location of the computer lab. Students reported the department has provided adequate means to access information. We find that the hardware and software provided are up to date and sufficient for the conduct of learning and research. Graduate students have key cards for access to the computer lab.

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

Previous Team Report (2008): The team could not find consistent evidence of accessibility strategies in either course work or studio projects.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met.

2004 Criterion 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

Previous Team Report (2008): While there is clear evidence of the integration of structural and building envelope systems in student work, life safety systems and building service systems are much less evident. The team could find little evidence of the integration of these systems in either studio or coursework.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: There is clear evidence of the integration of structural systems, building envelope systems and environmental systems in student work. The team, however, could find little evidence of the integration of life safety and building service systems in either studio or coursework.

2004 Criterion 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

Previous Team Report (2008): Comprehensive projects are expected to address a wide range of issues. While some coursework and many studio projects address most aspects of comprehensive design, there is no clear evidence that High Pass projects consistently meet the criterion. Wall sections, which are included on most projects, are generally not sufficient to show full compliance with the criterion. Comprehensive design evidence should be found in a combination of plans, sections, wall sections, and diagrams.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The criterion is now met.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission and culture and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context.

The accredited degree program must describe and then provide evidence of the relationship between the program, the administrative unit that supports it (e.g., school or college) and the institution. This includes an explanation of the program’s benefits to the institutional setting, how the institution benefits from the program, any unique synergies, events, or activities occurring as a result, etc.

Finally, the program must describe and then demonstrate how the course of study and learning experiences encourage the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects.

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

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is well met. The program’s mission—properly expressed in its evolving curriculum—melds seamlessly with the institution’s own broader mission statement. The university mission and the goals that support this mission are captured in the phrase “a private university with a public purpose”. The Architecture Department, in turn, has grounded its own “public purpose” in three distinct realms: Civic, Social and Professional.

Fulfillment of this mission is illustrated by the following examples:

- In the Civic Realm, the design of the new urban space at the city’s Wadsworth Athenaeum;
- In the Social Realm, a graduate studio project for a mosque for a downtown Hartford site;
- In the Professional Realm, the department provides a lecture series that is free and open to the public. This, among other things, has served as a vehicle for presenting the work of the area’s practitioners.

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 equally 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 in each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2011 Team Assessment: The positive and respectful learning environment is well met. The college dean, program chair and faculty provide a nurturing environment for the program’s students. Students are often greeted personally as they pass through the administrative suite to reach their studios. The studio culture policy is a living document that faculty and students revisit annually to review and revise. Communication among the administration, faculty and students is a strength of the program.

A copy of the Studio Culture Policy is hung in each studio, the woodshop, the computer lab, critique spaces and within the faculty office complex. Students were essential participants in the construction of the document and play a large part of the review process each semester. The document specifically lays out the responsibilities of students and faculty and, further notes how these bodies should interact internally and externally. Graduate students are aware of the “Operational Guidelines” policy as posted in the Butterworth Hall Graduate Studios, and they are satisfied with the Department of Public Safety’s guidelines for the use of the space outside of regular class hours.

University and college policies and goals call for improvement in attracting women and minorities to the campus. Twenty-five percent of all students are female. The percentages of minorities are as follows: 7% African American, 3% Hispanic, and 11% Foreign National. Of the current full-time faculty, the percentage that is female is 29%. The percentage of adjunct faculty who are female is 36%. The adjunct faculty is a diverse mixture of Hispanic, Caucasian, Arabic, Indian and Asian-Americans.

I.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. 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.

2011 Team Assessment: The faculty, although small in number, has a large presence on campus, with extensive involvement on college and university committees. Its service contributions are well known and well respected by the upper reaches of the campus.

The lecture series remains a popular feature on campus, with other disciplines aware of it and sometimes in attendance at talks. The graduate research symposium has also enabled graduate students to contribute to the intellectual life of the university. The Center for Integrated Design program, led by an architecture faculty member and connecting the school to other disciplines like business, engineering, and art, has become a highly visible effort in the Hartford community. The ability of graduate students to take courses in other colleges such as business and art also enables them to connect with the rest of the university and to bring an architectural perspective to other fields.

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.

2011 Team Assessment: Students have demonstrated positive self worth within the department. Each believes that s/he is a person and not a mere "number". They seem to find their professors to be both accessible and proficient. The students have demonstrated a desire to learn professionally from each other. Under strong internal leadership, the AIAS chapter has grown 5-fold in the last year.

The students feel well-prepared to enter the job force. They agree that the faculty has been effective in providing career guidance. Additionally, students are given guidance with which to pursue work outside of architecture should a student wish to explore other options. There is also a lot of exposure to professionals working in the field.

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.

2011 Team Assessment: The students are aware of the IDP and timing of the ARE. ARC 623 outlines the regulatory process very well, and lecturers from the professional community reinforce the syllabus of ARC 623 relative to the regulatory environment. Courses entitled Professional Life, Legal Dimensions of Practice and Developing a Practice all directly relate to the regulatory environment. Exhibits (tests and final projects) indicate evidence of learning.

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.

2011 Team Assessment: This Criterion was met with distinction. The program maintains a strong and active partnership with local practitioners, who serve as adjunct faculty, studio critics,
advisory board members, and guest lecturers in the recently introduced lecture series. Many of both the full-time and adjunct faculty members are licensed architects, with several practicing in local firms or in their own firms.

The local professional community was instrumental in the establishment of both the undergraduate and graduate programs. A local firm helped establish the David LaBau Memorial Graduate Architecture Scholarship to assist graduate students in their studies. A local architect established an annual graduate traveling fellowship program. The program also receives support from the AIA Connecticut chapter, including donations of books and materials to the Mortensen Library for use by students and faculty.

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.

2011 Team Assessment: The mission and vision of the department are responsive to this perspective. The city and surrounding region offer students an opportunity for hands-on collaborative experiences with community partners relative to urban-related design, social, environmental, and economic issues. Students in the ARC 622 Advanced Urban Issues course are introduced to a variety of urban issues relating to urban needs and revitalization. Leading by example, faculty members are involved in civic and professional activities within the community and encourage students to become involved as well through AIAS, Habitat for Humanity, and other opportunities. Faculty members are also active in university service. Several of these activities are undertaken in high-visibility positions and afford an opportunity to bring these experiences back into their coursework. Faculty members also publish in the local and national media. The department hosted an Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) conference in fall 2010 that focused on urban issues. The relationship with members of the architectural community offers students an opportunity for interaction with practicing professionals regarding practice issues beyond those addressed in regular coursework.

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 meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2011 Team Assessment: The long range 5-year plan Strategic Plan was recently revised by the Architecture Department. Goals for the graduate program call for new computer software and lab hardware, classroom equipment, an improved wood shop and fabrication lab, and improved faculty and student diversity.
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 meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2011 Team Assessment: This Criterion is met with distinction. The department of architecture collects information from a number of constituencies including students, faculty, staff, and local professionals. The regular gathering of this information allows the department to make dynamic, sensitive changes to the program where needed.

The assessment techniques are varied. Student meetings with the chair include the student representative from each class and occur at least once a month, although all students are free to meet with the chair at any time. A suggestion box is available for anonymous student input. Course evaluations are distributed in each course at the end of each semester and are reviewed by the faculty. Graduating students complete a survey at the end of their last semester about the quality of their education. These results are discussed at the faculty meetings. Department meetings are held monthly and are attended by all full- and part-time faculty and staff members. A department retreat is held once per semester for all faculty and staff as well as the dean of the college. The dean and the chair meet with the Advisory Board once per semester. Employers of graduates from the architecture program complete evaluations of their employees regarding whether they have been effectively educated for professional practice.

These assessments have resulted in the revision of the Studio Culture Policy and the development of a graduate level independent study course. Further, an annual graduate student bonding trip was established to help the students become a more cohesive group.
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 descriptions. 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

2011 Team Assessment: With the additional faculty, students have adequate access to professors, and there are EEO/AA policies in place at the university level, which govern the department. Faculty indicated that there are adequate funds to pursue professional development such as attendance at conferences. Elizabeth Petry, the IDP Educator Coordinator, serves to educate students on IDP in multiple ways, including firm visits and lectures in ARC 623 Advanced Professional Practice and ad-hoc lectures to educate students about changes in the registration procedures. The IDP Educator Coordinator recently attended an IDP conference in Chicago. The department follows the university’s tenure code, although the department does not have its own policy in this area.

- Students:
  - 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.
  - 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

2011 Team Assessment: Upon application to the graduate program following receipt of an undergraduate degree earned outside of the University of Hartford, an applicant's previous degree is evaluated. The school has two forms for this evaluation, the “Prerequisite Evaluation for Graduate Admission” and the “Master of Architecture Application Review”. The Graduate Application for the Master of Architecture program explains the process for admission contingent upon the review of the undergraduate degree. This application also outlines the general requirements of admission into 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.
graduate program and requirements to stay in the program, regardless of where the undergraduate degree was earned. All financial aid and scholarship procedures are conducted through the university, and information is made available through the Graduate Admission Office.

I.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

**2011 Team Assessment:** The program has an adequate number of administrators, with a chair who is also the director of the graduate program and another faculty member who serves as director of the undergraduate program. The program offers two degrees: the Bachelor of Science in Architectural Engineering Technology, and the M.Arch degree. A Minor in Architecture is also offered in the department.

- **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

**2011 Team Assessment:** The Architecture Department has the autonomy sufficient to insure that the student performance criteria are met. The faculty in the Architecture Department is small in number and therefore the entire faculty acts as a singular committee of the whole in matters of curriculum and admissions. Students participate in the monitoring and developing the Studio Culture Policy.

I.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 inadequate for the program

**2011 Team Assessment:** The woodshop is too small for the number of students it serves. (See additional comments about the woodshop under Causes of Concern, page 1.) Other than the woodshop, there are adequate spaces to support the program. (See additional comments under Progress since the Previous Visit, Condition 8, page 2.)

I.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

**2011 Team Assessment:** The financial resources provided are sufficient for a program of this size. While the recent recession led to a decrease in the department’s budget, there has been a healthy recovery of restricted or endowment funds, with the architecture fund increasing 5-fold. The department has also
reduced allocations in some areas, including events that require expenditures on food and office supplies, in order to maintain or increase those in other areas more central to its educational mission. Faculty members feel well supported in terms of funding for faculty development. Support appears adequate for conference participation; however, some faculty did express a concern about salary compression among the assistant, associate, and full professors.

I.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

2011 Team Assessment: This Criterion is met with distinction. The Mortensen Library is located in the same complex of buildings as the architecture program and houses the general collection for the entire University of Hartford. The resources of the main library are accessible 101 hours each week during the fall and spring terms. Interlibrary resource sharing services are available, as well as resources from many of the 45 Connecticut institutions of higher education. Electronic databases including indexes, full text, and journal abstracts are available. Images can be obtained through EBSCO, Applied Science & Technology Index, Art Bibliographies Modern, Art Index, Grove Art, and Associated Press Photo Archives. ARTStor is also accessible and currently contains over 400,000 images.

More than 100 PCs and 4 iMacs are available for student use, as well as 2 collaborative pods consisting of one 42 inch monitor, one computer, 3 mice and 3 keyboards for collaborative learning. Scanners and printers are also available.

Media related to architecture number over 8000 pieces, and over 24,000 books and videos related to art are available. 18,000 art plates can also be accessed. The architecture collection is supported by two endowments: the Betty and Irving Sikov Book Endowment and another supported by AIA Connecticut. These dedicated endowments are strictly for the acquisition of architecture materials. Architecture faculty members are consulted regarding material purchases.
PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

1.3.1 Statistical Reports\(^3\). 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 were provided and provide the appropriate information

**2011 Team Assessment:** All required statistical information was provided. This is a young program that continues to grow. The graduate program currently admits 12 students a year and is expected to grow to 24 students a year. Improvements in demographic diversity, applicant qualifications (2009 entering class has a 3.50 grade average. 2010 entering class has a 3.43 grade average.), and time to graduation should show improvement as the program matures.

**I.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.

---

\(^3\) In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
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

2011 Team Assessment: The program provided the Annual Reports for 2008, 2009, and 2010 during the site visit. It also provided a letter from the Director of Institutional Research in the University verifying that the reports are consistent with the institution’s reports to national and regional agencies.

I.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 exhibit⁴ 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.

2011 Team Assessment: The faculty’s academic and professional credentials are appropriate for the range of content in the curriculum. The tenured and tenure-track faculty all have terminal degrees that align with what they teach in the classroom or studio. Some required courses, such as architectural history, are taught by adjuncts without terminal degrees and as the program matures, we would encourage the department to hire faculty with the appropriate terminal degrees.

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 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 met the requirements of Appendix 3

2011 Team Assessment: The department mission statement and Studio Culture Policy are posted in the team room, studios, and in other places within the department. Personnel-related policies are contained in the Faculty Policy Manual. Student-related policies are in the Student Handbook, Studio Culture Policy, and other documents. Admissions requirements are on the web and are contained in several documents including department brochures and the Manual of Academic Policies and Procedures. Library-related information is also on the web and is contained in the University Libraries Collection Development Manual. Information on space, and student-to-faculty ratios and related materials are contained in the team binders.
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.*

Met [X]

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence of writing skills is found in ARC 612 - Advanced Design Theory and ARC 613 - Thesis Research and ARC 621 - Master’s Thesis.

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.*

Met [X]

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence of design thinking skills is found in ARC 613 - Thesis Research and ARC 621 - Master’s Thesis.

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.*

Met [X]

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence is found in the design studios, ARC 511 - Design I, 521 - Design II and in ARC 621 Thesis Research.

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.*
2011 Team Assessment: Evidence for technical documentation is found in ARC 621 - Master’s Thesis.

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

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence for investigative skills is found in ARC 613 - Thesis Research.

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

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence of fundamental design skills is found in the design studios, ARC 511 - Design I, ARC 521 - Design II, and ARC 621 - Master’s Thesis.

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.

2011 Team Assessment: This Criterion is met with distinction. Every design project demonstrates an extensive precedent study. Evidence is found in the design studios ARC 511 - Design I, ARC 521 - Design II, and ARC 621 - Master’s Thesis.

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.

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence of ordering systems skills is found in the design studios ARC 511 - Design I, ARC 521 - Design II, ARC 621 - Master’s Thesis.

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.
2011 Team Assessment: This Criterion is met with distinction. Evidence for historical traditions and global culture is found in the type of projects assigned in ARC 511 - Design I and ARC 521 - Design 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.

2011 Team Assessment: This Criterion is met with distinction. Evidence for cultural diversity is found in ARC 511 - Design II


2011 Team Assessment: Evidence for applied research is found in ARC 613 - Thesis Research.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: As a young program, the school has been strongly influenced by the NAAB Conditions. The program is professional and practical in orientation. Placing the comprehensive project within the graduate thesis further ensures a professional approach to academic outcomes. The design work demonstrates a strong pre-design aspect. Student writing assignments benefit noticeably from the instruction and editorial oversight offered by Associate Professor Michael J. Crosbie.

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.

Met
[X]

2011 Team Assessment: There is clear evidence of pre-design in ARC 613 - Thesis Research and in the exhibit tests.

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.

Met
[X]

2011 Team Assessment: There is evidence of accessibility in ARC 512 – Advanced Site Planning, 521 – Architectural Studio II, and ARC 621- Master’s Thesis.

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.

Met
[X]

2011 Team Assessment: There is evidence of sustainability in ARC 512 – Advances Site Planning, 513 – Advanced Building Systems, 611 – Architectural Design Studio III, 621 – Master’s Thesis, and 622 – Advanced Urban Issues. There is an opportunity to expand this area in the future with more vigor.

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

Met
[X]

2011 Team Assessment: There is evidence of site design in ARC 512 – Advanced Site Planning and 621 – Master’s Thesis. Ability is evident in studio projects. Very large and complicated sites are pursued with clarity at a large scale.

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

Met
[X]

2011 Team Assessment: There is evidence of life safety learning found in ARC 621 – Master’s Thesis. Ability is exhibited in studio projects and thesis.
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

**Met**

[X]

**2011 Team Assessment:** There is some evidence of comprehensive design in ARC 521 – Architectural Studio II. However, ARC 621 – Master’s Thesis exhibits more complete evidence of this ability.

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.

**Met**

[X]

**2011 Team Assessment:** There is evidence of financial considerations in ARC 513 – Advanced Building Systems and ARC 522 – Advanced Building Economics. Understanding is evident in the material in the course binders.

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.

**Met**

[X]

**2011 Team Assessment:** There is evidence of understanding in environmental systems in ARC 513 – Advanced Building Systems and ARC 621 - Master’s Thesis.

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.

**Met**

[X]
2011 Team Assessment: This Criterion is met with distinction. Understanding of structural systems is evident in ARC 523 – Advanced Structural Systems and ARC 621 – Master’s Thesis. Through tests, quizzes and PowerPoint presentations, ARC 523 exhibits an excellent understanding of the subject area. The thesis projects also exhibit understanding.

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.

Met [X]

2011 Team Assessment: Understanding of building envelope systems is found in ARC 513 – Advanced Building Systems and ARC 621 – Master’s 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

Met [X]

2011 Team Assessment: There is little evidence of the integration of building service systems in ARC 513 – Advanced Building Systems. There is also no evidence of vertical transportation, security, or fire-protection systems in the student course work.

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.

Met [X]

2011 Team Assessment: Understanding of building materials and assemblies is evident in ARC 513 – Advanced Building Systems and ARC 523 – Advanced Structural Systems. ARC 513 and ARC 523 exhibit understanding in this subject area through tests and quizzes.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: Overall, Realm B is well addressed in the curriculum, with one area satisfied with particular distinction. Because of the engineering focus of the program, the technical aspects, especially structures, are a well-taught part of the curriculum.

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.**

**Met [X]**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence of an ability of collaboration is found in ARC 511 - Architectural Studio I, ARC 611 - Architectural Studio III, and ARC 622 - Advanced Urban Issues.

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

**Met [X]**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence of an understanding of human behavior is found in ARC 511 - Architectural Studio I and ARC 622 - Advanced Urban Issues.

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.**

**Met [X]**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence of an understanding of the client role in architecture is found in ARC 623 - Advanced Professional Practice.

C. 4. Project Management: **Understanding of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods**

**Met [X]**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence of an understanding of project management is found in ARC 623 - Advanced 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.**

**Met [X]**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence of an understanding of practice management is found in ARC 623 - Advanced 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.

**Met**

**[X]**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence of an understanding of leadership is found in ARC 623 - Advanced Professional Practice.

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.

**Met**

**[X]**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence of an understanding of legal responsibilities is found in ARC 623 - Advanced 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.

**Met**

**[X]**

**2011 Team Assessment:** This Criterion is met with distinction. Evidence of an understanding of ethics and professional judgment is found in ARC 623 - Advanced Professional Practice.

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.

**Met**

**[X]**

**2011 Team Assessment:** Evidence of an understanding of community and social responsibility is found in ARC 612 - Advanced Design Theory, ARC 622 - Advanced Urban Issues, and ARC 623 - Advanced Professional Practice.

**Realm C. General Team Commentary:** Because of the high number of practicing faculty members, students are able to interact with individuals involved in the profession, helping reinforce the learning objectives in Realm C. Opportunities in studio projects allow for a healthy balance of traditional practice and a less traditional, more global field of study.

Collaborative assignments are evident throughout the graduate curriculum, even in non-studio courses. ARC 623 - Advance Professional Practice does well to cover nearly every criterion in Realm C. Ethics and Professional Judgment is met with distinction because of in-classroom training, case studies, readings and field studies of local firms.
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).

Met [X]

2011 Team Assessment: A letter from Valerie F. Lewis, Commissioner with the State of Connecticut’s Department of Higher Education to Dr. Walter Harrison, President of the University of Hartford, stated that the NEASC assessment granted the university reaccreditation until December 31, 2012.

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.

Met [X]

2011 Team Assessment: The University of Hartford requires all students to complete a pre-professional undergraduate degree plus 64 graduate credit hours to obtain a Master of Architecture (M. Arch.) degree. For the M. Arch. Degree, all students complete 52 credit hours in professional studies and 12 credit hours in electives. The electives may be chosen from within the program as well as from outside the College.

For the undergraduate Architectural Engineering Technology Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree, all students must complete 130 credit hours, of which 68 credit hours prerequisites are in the major and 62 credit hours are from outside the major.

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.

Met [X]

2011 Team Assessment: The curriculum review and development process is described under I.1.5 Program Self Assessment. The curriculum review and development requirement has been met based on conversations with the chair, faculty, and university administration. Licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.
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.

Met
[X]

2011 Team Assessment: Sample files of student evaluations were furnished and they included all of the NAAB requirements in terms of accepting and placing students into the program.
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.

Not Met
[X]

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence of this statement is on the home web page for the graduate program in architecture and in the graduate program’s catalog. However, it is not present in the e-brochure that is downloadable from the website. It is also not present on the web page for graduate programs that are accessible through the graduate studies website. The department is currently revising its promotional materials, where this statement should be located.

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)

Met
[X]

2011 Team Assessment: The Architecture Department web site makes available the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and the 2010 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation for both viewing and/or downloading.

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.aia.org
- www.aias.org
- www.acsa-arch.org

Met
[X]

2011 Team Assessment: Links to the required resources can be found at the following page: http://uhaweb.hartford.edu/architect/careerdevelopment.html. All links are in working order.

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.

**Met**

2011 Team Assessment: The reports are available on the department website. In addition, copies may be requested from the department chair and/or staff.

**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.

**Met**

2011 Team Assessment: Because this is a new program, only one person has met the internship requirement, taken the test and passed.
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)

The University of Hartford, located in West Hartford, Connecticut, is an independent, comprehensive university with seven schools and colleges providing educational programs in the liberal arts and professional disciplines for undergraduate and graduate students. These units are the Barney School of Business; the College of Arts and Sciences; the College of Education, Nursing and Health Professions; the College of Engineering, Technology, and Architecture; the Hartford Art School; the Hartt School; and Hillyer College.

The University was chartered in 1957, when three long-standing Hartford institutions of higher learning were combined: the Hartford Art School (1877), Hillyer College (1879), and the Hartt School (1920). The College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Engineering, the Barney School of Business; the College of Education, Nursing and Health Professions; and the College of Technology all originated in Hillyer. In 1966, the College of Basic Studies (now Hillyer College) was founded and it features a carefully structured associate's degree program. In 1971, the Ward Technical College (later S.I. Ward College of Technology) joined the campus. In 2003, the College of Engineering and Ward College of Technology were merged to form the College of Engineering, Technology, and Architecture.

The University of Hartford is accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). It has been continuously accredited since 1965; the next accreditation site visit will be in 2011.

The University’s spacious and scenic 340-acre wooded main campus in suburban West Hartford features housing for approximately 3,700 students, a modern sports and recreation complex, and a performing arts center. The heart of the campus is the Harry Jack Gray Center, designed by Tai Soo Kim, FAIA, (one of the Department of Architecture’s advisory board members) and the home of the Department of Architecture. This cloister-style building also houses the Mortensen Library, the 1877 Club, and the School of Communications, classrooms, Wilde Auditorium, the Joseloff Art Gallery, and the University Bookstore. The building is centrally located on campus between the Hartford School of Art and the Integrated Science, Engineering and Technology (ISET) complex.

Enrolled (Fall 2010) in the University are 4,694 full-time undergraduate students, 804 part-time undergraduates, and 1,682 graduate students. The students come from 47 different states and 51 foreign countries.

The University’s faculty, 86 percent of whom hold the terminal degree in their field, enjoy world-renowned academic reputations and take a personal interest in helping students reach their goals. The University’s full-time student/full-time faculty ratio is 11 to 1, with the educational experience occurring in small, supportive classroom environments.

At the University of Hartford classes are small with a variety of academic opportunities. Students have the flexibility to combine studies in the various schools and even create
individual contract majors. The institution prides itself on responding quickly to the needs of a changing society. Physical therapy, audio engineering technology, and architecture engineering technology have all grown to be among the most popular majors in the University.

University undergraduate programs include an innovative All-University Curriculum (AUC). The AUC is a liberal education curriculum that seeks to develop a student’s ability to learn, instills the desire to learn, and seeks learning as a lifelong endeavor. All students in the baccalaureate programs are required to take at least four AUC courses over four years. They take one course from four of the five breadth categories for a minimum of 12 AUC credits. By emphasizing the traditional liberal arts and sciences, this curriculum focuses on the core of learning that is essential for the well-educated adult. In this way students develop a sound foundation in important areas outside their majors.

Performing and visual arts at the University continually enrich the cultural life of the Hartford area. Theater, opera, dance, and music ranging from jazz to chamber ensembles, and exhibitions and lectures by contemporary artists make the West Hartford campus an exciting place to visit.

The University of Hartford elevated its athletics program to Division I status – the highest level of intercollegiate competition – in 1984. Athletics continue to be a source of tremendous pride for the institution. Several former University athletes are currently playing professionally.

The University of Hartford benefits from its location equidistant between New York City and Boston. The campus is actually part of three municipalities: Bloomfield, West Hartford, and the City of Hartford— an economically diverse urban/suburban center with new buildings recently constructed, such as the Connecticut Science Center, designed by Cesar Pelli, FAIA. The city has a rich cultural life with Bushnell Theater and the Wadsworth Atheneum Art Museum. Noted Hartford buildings, such as the Cheney Building by H.H. Richardson, the Connecticut State Capitol by Richard M. Upjohn, the Mark Twain House by Edward Tuckerman Potter, The Mark Twain House Museum by Robert A.M. Stern, FAIA, the Hartford Stage by Robert Venturi, FAIA, and the Hartford Seminary by Richard Meier, FAIA, reflect the region’s architectural diversity.

Mission of the University of Hartford (Adopted 2010)
“As a private university with a public purpose, we engage students in acquiring the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to thrive in, and contribute to, a pluralistic, complex world.”

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

Architectural education at the University of Hartford began with the Architectural Engineering Technology program in 1991-1992. Since then, the pre-professional architecture program has grown to more than 200 undergraduate students, while the professional program currently has 28 graduate students.

With the advantageous location of our program in the Northeast, students and faculty benefit from being part of an independent, comprehensive university with seven schools and colleges providing educational programs in the liberal arts and professional disciplines for undergraduate and graduate students.

The undergraduate program (Bachelor of Science in Architectural Engineering Technology) has traditionally prepared students for positions in a wide assortment of
careers in architecture, design, and construction. The undergraduate program is accredited by the Technology Accreditation Commission/ Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (TAC/ABET), one of only a handful of architecture programs in the U.S. with that distinction.

In May 2000, the architecture faculty and the Dean of the College decided to pursue discussions of a NAAB-accredited Master of Architecture program. During the following academic year this proposed program was developed and presented to the appropriate University administrators, deans, and committees. In May 2001, the University of Hartford approved the Master of Architecture program.

In order to facilitate the NAAB approval process and to assist the faculty in recruiting students, the administrative unit involved with architecture was renamed the Department of Architecture, effective January 1, 2002.

In January 2002, after numerous presentations and reviews by the State of Connecticut Department of Higher Education, the State approved the program. The program submitted an initial Architectural Program Report to the NAAB in March 2002 and was granted a review in October. At the January 2003 meeting of the NAAB, the Board reviewed the Visiting Team Report for the University of Hartford, Department of Architecture. As a result, the professional architecture program, Master of Architecture, was formally granted candidacy effective January 1, 2003.

The NAAB made its first accreditation visit in November 2005. Several shortcomings in the program were noted, and the department responded to the NAAB VTR in writing.

Michael J. Crosbie, AIA, who had taught for four years in the program as an adjunct professor, was appointed Associate Professor and Chair by CETA Dean Lou Manzione in December 2006. Crosbie helped refine the department’s mission and vision and improve internal and external communications (including the institution of a new Architecture Department Website). Crosbie worked with the University’s Development Office to promote outside financial support to the program. One result of these efforts has been the establishment of a graduate traveling fellowship program made possible through the generosity of Hartford architect Tai Soo Kim, FAIA. Crosbie focused on increasing the number of full-time, tenure-track faculty. With the support of Dean Manzione, the program is now conducting searches for a new full-time non-tenure-track position in digital media and design.

As Chair, Crosbie expanded the pool of adjunct professors, bringing in new teachers for studio and support courses in efforts to expand the range of architectural experiences and viewpoints available to both graduate and undergraduate students. He assisted the Department’s existing architecture public lecture program by inviting internationally recognized practitioners and theorists. Crosbie also strengthened ties to the AIA/Connecticut Chapter. The program has always enjoyed good relations and support from the chapter. There have been greater opportunities for chapter programs to take place on campus, for donations of books and materials to come to the Department through the chapter, and to keep the professional community informed about developments and accomplishments in the University of Hartford’s architecture program through articles in the chapter newsletter and daily newspapers.

In Fall 2008 the NAAB conducted an Initial Accreditation visit (a copy of the Visiting Team Report is found in Part 4: Supplemental Information). A three-year accreditation was granted, effective January 2008.
Since the visit, the architecture department has made several refinements to its preprofessional architecture degree program to strengthen the design and theory sequence. The department filled a new non-tenure-track position in Fall 2009 with the appointment of Assistant Professor Dariel Cobb (who has been instrumental in expanding the department’s architecture lecture series) and a new tenure-track position with Associate Professor Theodore Sawruk in Fall 2010 (Sawruk had been a Visiting Assistant Professor since Fall 2007).

In Spring 2009, the S/L/A/M Collaborative architecture firm helped establish the David LaBau Memorial Graduate Architecture Scholarship, to assist graduate students in their studies at Hartford. A search for a new non-tenure-track position in digital design started in Fall 2010, and a new 30-desk graduate studio was opened on the University’s nearby Asylum Avenue campus.

In October 2010 (in another first), the Department of Architecture hosted the ACSA Northeast Regional Conference on its campus. The theme of the conference, “Urban/Suburban Identity,” was inspired by the Architecture Department’s stated mission and focused on the changing nature of cities and suburbs and the sustainability and livability of future communities. The two-and-a-half-day conference drew architectural educators from the U.S. and abroad and 45 papers were presented. Proceedings of the conference papers and lectures are now being prepared.

**Program Mission**

“The Department of Architecture is a diverse community of practitioners, teachers, and students dedicated to educating future architectural professionals and growing the knowledge base of the profession. Our commitment is to engage architecture in its civic, social, and professional realms for the ultimate benefit of the built environment and those who use it.”

The Mission of the Department of Architecture fits within the larger Mission of the University. The University of Hartford was founded in 1957 by a group of community leaders who envisioned an institution of higher learning that would serve the Greater Hartford region. The University’s description of itself as “a private university with a public purpose” is seen in the various ways that the University has over the years served the world beyond its campus, producing students for careers as active and productive citizens, sending graduates all over the world to become leaders in shaping tomorrow.

Some concrete examples of the fulfillment of the University’s Mission are as follows:

1. Community Division of the Hartt School (providing performing arts education and training for more than 3,000, from children to adults, every semester);
2. The Micro-Business Incubator on Albany Avenue, where Barney School of Business students provide valuable consulting services for small business owners;
3. Project Horizon, which places nursing students in homeless shelters throughout Hartford;
4. Partnership with the public school system, through which each semester 300 University students provide a wide variety of services to students in nine schools in the City of Hartford through the Educational Main Street program;
5. Two magnet schools on campus, which demonstrates the University’s commitment to forging strong connections between K-12 and higher education.

The Department of Architecture views its Mission as part of the University’s commitment as a private institution dedicated to public purpose and influence. It shares the vision expressed in the University of Hartford motto, found on the University seal: *Ad Humanitatem*, “For humanity.”
The Architecture Department’s commitment to the education of architects grew from the initiative of several architects in the Greater Hartford region, with the support of the AIA/Connecticut chapter, who in the mid 1990s met with the University’s president to encourage the institution of a professional architectural degree program that would help serve the architectural community—both locally and in the New England region—and offer a choice in architectural education in Connecticut. The AIA/Connecticut chapter has championed the Department of Architecture over the years, as have practitioners throughout the Greater Hartford region. Building Community, Ernest Boyer and Lee Mitgang’s landmark report on architectural education, underscored the need for greater connections between the architectural academia and the world beyond the campus. From this history, the Architecture Department views its Mission of “public purpose” in three realms: Civic, Social, and Professional.

The Civic Realm: Located in the City of Hartford, the Department of Architecture sees the city as a “laboratory of opportunity” in the education of future architects. Urban sites are the basis of many studio projects that respond to issues of density, civic life, and the role of the urban environment in creating dynamic settings for the pursuit of public life. Some recent projects have included:

- Design of new urban space at the city’s Wadsworth Athenaeum (one of the oldest art museums in the country);
- Development of a large vacant city block in downtown Hartford to instill new urban life;
- Assessment of under-utilized open spaces (such as the abundance of surface parking lots) in the city for new civic uses in response to the Hartford Mayor’s Office to seek ways to revitalize downtown;
- Reclamation and rebirth of a civic landmark in nearby downtown New Britain;
- Collaboration of graduate students with Park Street neighborhood groups for the design of a demountable art gallery and municipal buildings.
- A graduate studio based in downtown Hartford in the offices of the firm JCJ Architecture to immerse students in the urban context and work on Hartford related projects.

Students benefit from the insights of faculty, architects and developers, visiting critics and lecturers engaged in civic place-making. Hartford has serious deficiencies (the density of its urban fabric has been decimated over the years) which provide opportunities for students to appraise urban challenges common in many cities, explore design solutions, and present the results in public forums.

The Social Realm: The Department of Architecture’s focus on the Social Realm responds to the role of the architect in serving the public through leadership in design, particularly social groups that have not in the past had access to the benefits of architecture. In Building Community Boyer and Mitgang lamented the fact that too often academia is viewed as a “private benefit, not a public good.” Architecture is a social art, and the Department of Architecture seeks to engage the Social Realm. For example:

- A graduate studio project for a mosque for a downtown Hartford site considered the needs of a growing religious population now often marginalized in the U.S. Students met with leaders in the Greater Hartford Islamic community, attended prayer services, and developed designs based on ancient mosque design precedents. Similar mosque projects have been designed for sites in Doha, Qatar, and Montreal, Canada.
- In January 2010, 17 architecture students traveled to a rural site in Panama to help a local community to design and build a surf shelter to help support tourism and create a new economy for the community. The students worked in design
charettes with local people and presented a design, which they documented the following semester. On a later trip to Panama the students will assist in the building of the shelter.

- James E. Fuller, a member of the Department of Architecture faculty, has been instrumental in the establishment and management of the University’s Center for Integrated Design (CID). The CID brings together University of Hartford faculty from three colleges and five disciplines (engineering, architecture, visual communications, business, and marketing) to respond to the needs of institutions and communities that seek design services. Through the CID, architecture faculty and students have undertaken conceptual designs for the town of Bloomfield Central Business/Community District and is currently in the early stages with the City of Hartford’s Upper Albany Town Center project. Additional projects and grants are pending.

- Michael J. Crosbie has been involved in outreach efforts with the University’s Magnet Elementary school on campus. Crosbie has visited kindergarten classes to talk about buildings and what architects do. He has also invited kindergarten classes to the Department’s architecture studios so that the kindergarteners can see architecture students at work. The exchange has piqued the interest of this very young group of potential clients and future architects.

The Professional Realm: The Department of Architecture’s mission in the Professional Realm is part of its history. The Department believes in the value of practicing architects teaching future architects. Five of the nine full-time and part-time faculty are licensed architects, as is most of the adjunct faculty. The Department continues to engage the state professional architecture society. The AIA/Connecticut chapter was an early proponent of the University’s architecture program and continues as a solid supporter. The department and the campus have served as a setting for a number of professional educational events for the region’s architects:

- Through the Department, the AIA/Connecticut chapter was able to host an on campus screening of Al Gore’s “An Inconvenient Truth” for practitioners and students.
- The Department provides a lecture series (supported by JCJ Architecture), free and open to the public, which has presented the work of practitioners from throughout the New England region, metropolitan New York, and beyond.
- Practicing architects from Connecticut participate in the architecture program as adjunct faculty, studio critics, review participants, and Advisory Board Members.

For its students, the Department and the region’s architects offer examples of leadership within the profession.

The Civic, Social, and Professional realms reinforce the mission of architectural education at the University of Hartford, and help serve the mission of the University itself.

The Department views the three realms as the bedrock of the discipline and profession of architecture, reinforcing it as a social art with a civic purpose, created by professionals engaged with the community.

The Department of Architecture Mission is posted on the department website an in studio spaces throughout the department. An article on the influence of the Mission on pedagogy is found in Part 4: Supplemental Materials.
# Description of the Program

The accredited professional degree program in the Department of Architecture at the University of Hartford is the Master of Architecture program. This degree program qualifies our Master’s graduates to take a state professional licensing examination after a required internship period.

The Department of Architecture at the University of Hartford established its undergraduate four-year Bachelor of Science degree program in Architectural Engineering Technology in 1991. The creation of the two-year Master of Architecture degree program fits the “4+2” structure, with the first professional architecture degree awarded at the graduate level. The Master of Architecture degree program is intended to provide our graduates with the requisite educational background to enter the professional practice of architecture. Students are prepared for careers in architecture and a wide assortment of other design, construction, or business-related professions. The professional program balances theoretical, technical, and creative knowledge in the civic, social, and professional realms of architecture. Students are encouraged to round out their education with professional electives offered through the Hartford Art School, CETA Engineering departments, and the Barney School of Business.

Our undergraduate program is TAC/ABET accredited. Recipients of the four-year preprofessional architectural degree may apply for admission directly into the Master of Architecture program. The graduate curriculum, which requires at least 64 credit hours for completion, is built upon the undergraduate foundation and includes a core of professional course work supported by a liberal arts education.

Fundamental to the graduate curriculum is the architectural design studio sequence. Informing and enriching the studio experience for students in the Master of Architecture Program are courses in site planning, building systems, building economics, structures, architectural history and theory, professional practice, and urban planning. Great emphasis is placed on the student’s ability to integrate and synthesize the information in these courses into appropriate architectural form in the design studio, which ideally engages the civic, social, and professional realms of architecture.

The Master of Architecture Program is a two-year, 64-credit professional degree curriculum organized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 511 Architectural Studio I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 512 Advanced Site Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 513 Advanced Building Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 521 Architectural Studio II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 522 Advanced Building Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 523 Advanced Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Elective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECOND YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 611 Architectural Studio III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 612 Advanced Design Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 613 Thesis Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 621 Master of Architecture Thesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

In conjunction with the renewal of the 5-year Strategic Plan for the College of Engineering, Technology, and Architecture (CETA), the department asked Assistant Professor Dariel Cobb, who sits on CETA’s Strategic Plan Committee, to devise a department-specific long-range plan. The department purposely sought the insights of a newly appointed member of the faculty, someone who could approach the plan with a fresh perspective. This plan was discussed at length at a department faculty meeting and modified to reflect the faculty’s priorities. The entire long-range plan can be found in Part 4: Supplemental Materials of this APR. The long-range plan will be re-evaluated every year, or at the discretion of the Chair of the department.

The long-range plan gathers internal demographic data, university data, and data from the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA). It also relies on faculty knowledge of regional programs and current professional standards. Informal conversations with students at the graduate and undergraduate level allow faculty to add their students’ insights to the formation of the long-range plan.

Every five years the University asks each college to revisit its long-range strategic plan as part of its own redevelopment of the University-wide plan. The college-level plan is used as a tool to gauge the progress of its academic programs, identify new directions, pinpoint problems, and propose solutions. CETA Dean Louis Manzione views the long range plan as a tool to identify fruitful new initiatives to improve and expand the quality of undergraduate and, in particular, graduate education. The Dean will also use the CETA strategic long-range plan as a template to ask the University to increase funding to specific programs for specific targeted initiatives.

In terms of the influence of the five perspectives, the long-range plan takes into account the place of the department within the larger academic community. The long range plan expresses continued support for faculty research and participation in conferences; the curriculum section of the long-range plan notes the annual review of the NAAB student performance criteria matrix as applied to all courses; the diversity section notes that the department, together with the American Institute of Architecture Students Hartford Chapter, will found a chapter of the National Organization of Minority Architects, helping to address diversity issues. Students are the primary focus of the plan. Expanding the course offerings by hiring more faculty and the eventual expansion of the graduate program are also student-oriented goals delineated by the long-range plan. The Regulatory Environment is a consideration in establishing a new Design-Build studio, training students to understand the LEED regulatory standards in a first-hand process. The Design-Build studio is also oriented towards the Public Good, as it will seek clients from the surrounding community and from local non-profit organizations. The state of the Profession is a major force behind the desire to create a fabrication lab. Movement in the profession towards rapid prototyping and direct manufacture are predicted to become a standard aspect of architectural design in the coming decades. A fabrication lab with the proper equipment will prepare our students for this future.
D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

The Department of Architecture has in place a number of program assessment techniques that allow the collection of information from a number of constituencies as described in the five perspectives (including the university community, students, the local and regional community, the profession and its regulation), opportunities for discussion and interpretation of this information, and mechanisms to make changes in the Department's mission, the curriculum, and long-range planning, based on assessments. Assessment techniques are described below.

Assessment Technique: Student Representative Meetings with the Chair
Responsible Assessment Parties: Department Chair and Student Reps
Program Constituencies Served: Students
Assessment Frequency: Approximately twice a semester
Description of Assessment Technique: A board of 6 student representatives elected from within the Architecture student body from both undergraduate and graduate levels meets on a regular basis with the Chair to discuss issues, problems, complaints, and opportunities that have been communicated to the representatives by student body members. The meetings are scheduled by mutual agreement between the students and the Chair. The agenda for the meeting is set by the student representatives. Minutes are recorded and later distributed. Items are discussed in an open forum, and solutions and responses are worked out by all the participants. Action plans are discussed and agreed upon. Certain issues are tabled or are brought by the Chair to be discussed at future Department Meetings. The student representatives then communicate back to the student body the action to be taken to respond to the situation.

Assessment Technique: Suggestion Box
Responsible Assessment Parties: Department Chair
Program Constituencies Served: Students
Assessment Frequency: Check for suggestions 2 times per week.
Description of Assessment Technique: The Suggestion Box is a technique for gathering students' assessments that allows the students to remain anonymous. It is felt that more candid assessments are possible with this technique. A suggestion box installed in the department office has allowed anonymous suggestions to be submitted by students. The Chair checks the box for suggestions twice a week and reviews the suggestions. Sometimes the suggestions are communicated by the Chair to the Department for discussion at Department meetings. Simple suggestions are considered by the Chair or in consultation with a faculty or staff member, and an action plan is formulated and implemented.

Assessment Technique: Course Evaluations
Responsible Assessment Parties: Evaluation forms are provided by the University, distributed by the faculty to students, completed and returned by students
Program Constituencies Served: Students and faculty
Assessment Frequency: End of each semester
Description of Assessment Technique: Course evaluations are implemented university-wide to provide faculty with feedback on teaching techniques, course materials, teaching effectiveness, etc. Evaluations are completed within a month before the end of the semester; professors are provided with a tabulation of the results and individual comments after the semester ends. Based on results, changes can be made to course content and instruction technique. Full-time faculty review their own course evaluations. The Chair reviews course evaluations for adjunct faculty.

Assessment Technique: Department Meetings
Responsible Assessment Parties: Faculty and staff  
Program Constituencies Served: Students, faculty, staff, and the professional architectural community  
Assessment Frequency: Monthly  
Description of Assessment Technique: Department of Architecture meetings are attended by all full-time and part-time (G-3) faculty members, and staff. Department meetings are opportunities to air concerns among faculty, to discuss student concerns, to develop action plans in response to issues, problems, and opportunities, and to assess outcomes based on previous decisions. These meetings provide a forum for sharing ideas, disseminating information, reviewing student progress, reviewing teaching techniques, presenting new initiatives, assessing curriculum, and evaluating progress toward strategic planning initiatives. A Department meeting agenda is circulated a few days before the meeting, the Chair presides at the meeting, and minutes are recorded and later distributed.

Assessment Technique: Department Retreats  
Responsible Assessment Parties: Faculty, Staff, and Administration:  
Program Constituencies Served: Students, faculty, staff, and the professional architectural community.  
Assessment Frequency: Once a semester  
Description of the Assessment Technique: The entire architecture faculty, staff, and the CETA Dean meet immediately following the end of the semester for a half day of discussion of course content, delivery, student advising, equipment and facility needs, relationships with university community, student feedback and concerns, plans for the future, new opportunities to connect with the local and regional community, and ways to be more responsive to the profession. Outcomes from the meeting are to pursue new goals for the following semester or the following academic year.

Assessment Technique: Meetings with Architecture Department Advisory Board  
Responsible Assessment Parties: Dean and the Chair  
Program Constituencies Served: Students, faculty, and the professional architectural community  
Assessment Frequency: Once a semester  
Description of Assessment Technique: The Chair met with the Architecture Department Advisory Board once a semester to report on progress in the department, challenges met, new challenges on the horizon, and opportunities for improvement. The board consists of approximately a dozen members from the professional fields of architecture, design, construction, and education. Reports from faculty members are often presented at the meetings, and minutes are recorded and later distributed. The Chair reports back to the Advisory Board on actions taken.

Assessment Technique: Graduating Student Survey Forms  
Responsible Assessment Parties: Graduating students  
Program Constituencies Served: Students and faculty  
Assessment Frequency: At the end of each academic year  
Description of Assessment Technique: Graduating Student Survey Forms are completed by candidates for undergraduate degrees in the last semester of the senior year. They are distributed at the time seniors apply for a degree audit by Janice Girouard, the Director of Student Services for CETA. The students cannot apply for graduation without submission of the form. Students complete questions about the quality of education. The form also allows written responses from students. Results are discussed at faculty meetings and action plans are formulated around the results.

Assessment Technique: Graduate Employee Evaluations
Responsible Assessment Parties: Faculty and employers
Program Constituencies Served: Students, faculty, and industry professionals
Assessment Frequency: At the end of each academic year
Description of Assessment Technique: This evaluation is completed by employers of graduates from the architecture program. Employers are asked if, in their estimation, graduates have been effectively educated to contribute to the architecture and construction industry.

Examples of Improvements in the Program Made in Response to Various Assessments

Below are examples of changes to the program and its curriculum that were prompted by the assessment techniques.

Assessment and Revision of Learning Culture Policy
The student representatives met with the department Chair to assess changes and revisions to the Learning Culture Policy discussion of the policy led to revisions that extend the Learning Culture Policy to the wider University community, and more descriptive language on expected levels of behavior in the learning environment. The changes were also reviewed by the faculty and additional input was solicited. The final version of the Policy was approved and posted throughout the department spaces and on the department website.

Curriculum Development of a Graduate Independent Study Course
This change in the Architecture graduate curriculum was brought about through direct student petition to the Department Chair by the graduate students. The undergraduate program has an Independent Study course, AET 471 that allows students to work directly with faculty on individual projects. No such course existed for the graduate students. In fall 2009 the matter was forwarded by the graduate students, discussed by faculty and staff at the department level, approved for action, and a new graduate level Independent Study, ARC 581, was created. This course allowed graduate students to participate in a project to design and construct a community project in Panama over the following winter session.

Establishment of a Chapter of the National Organization of Minority Architects
This project is currently in process. Representatives of the American Institute of Architecture Students Hartford Chapter expressed an interest to faculty regarding the establishment of a Hartford Chapter of NOMA. The idea was discussed at student representative meetings with the department Chair, and during faculty meetings. Professor Theodore Sawruk is now working with students to establish a NOMA chapter.

Fall Semester Graduate Student Bonding Trip
This opportunity for a semester kick-off graduate student trip grew out of concerns among the faculty speaking to the first-year graduate students that they were not bonding as a group as early as one would hope. The issue was discussed at faculty meetings and during a department Board of Advisors meeting. A plan was formulated and implemented to commence each Fall semester with a day-long trip to New York, Boston, or other nearby city to help the entire graduate student body to bond. Past trips have included museum shows, lectures, architecture tours, and attending exhibits at the local AIA chapter headquarters. Funds in the Department budget were identified for this annual event.
2. Conditions Met with Distinction

I.1.1 History and Mission
The mission is well coordinated among university, department and curriculum goals.

I.1.2 Learning Culture
The program benefits from an especially supportive environment among faculty, students and administration.

I.1.3.D Architectural Education and the Profession
Professionals are very active in teaching, critiques, and in lecturing and monitoring student progress.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures
The multiple ways of assessment insure up-to-date data on the performance of the curriculum and opportunities for improvement.

I.2.5 Information Resources
The library staff and information resources provide students and faculty with ample support.

II.1.1 A.7 Use of Precedents
The use of precedents permeates the studio projects and provides valuable background and ideas for student design projects.

II.1.1 A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture
Design programs that serve to inform projects from traditional and diverse cultures are annually offered.

II.1.1 A.10 Culture Diversity
Design programs that serve to inform projects from diverse cultures are annually offered.

II.1.1 B.9 Structural Systems
Because of the engineering focus of the program, the technical aspects, especially structures, are particularly well taught in this curriculum.

II.1.1 C.8 Ethics and Professional Judgment
This material is especially well covered in ARC 623 - Advanced Professional Practice.
3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA  Non-voting member
Patricia O'Leary, FAIA  Thomas Fisher, Assoc., AIA
College of Architecture and Planning  College of Design
University of Colorado at Denver  University of Minnesota
Campus Box 126, PO Box 173364  101 Rapson Hall
Denver, CO  80217-3364  89 Church Street, SE
(303) 864-9001 H  (612) 626-9068
patricia.oleary@cudenver.edu  (612) 625-7525 fax

Representing the AIA
Tamara L. Redburn, AIA
Fleming Associates Architects, P.C.
5124 Poplar Avenue
Memphis, TN 38117
(901) 767-3924
(901) 767-7136 fax
tredburn@gmail.com

Representing the AIAS
Matthew Friesz
120 8th Street
Apt. 109
Fargo, ND 58102
(701) 391-4964
matthew.friesz.2@ndsu.edu

Representing the NCARB
Robert A. Boynton, FAIA
Boynton Rothschild Rowlanl Architects, PC
The Ironfronts, Suite 221
1011 East Main Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 643-1977
(804) 643-1981 fax
rabfaia@aol.com

Non-voting member
Michael D. Hagge, Chair
Architecture Program
Department of Architecture
University of Memphis
404 Jones Hall
Memphis, TN 38152
(901) 678-2677
mdhagge@memphis.edu