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

From most recent VTR:

1.4. Conditions/Criteria Not Met

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

Condition 6, Human Resources (2005): 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.

Visiting Team Assessment (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.

2009 Narrative Report Response: The University of Hartford has assigned the Department of Architecture a total of three new Assistant Professor lines. The first was assigned in March 2008, and two more lines were assigned in November 2008. A search for the first line was conducted in 2009 and a new Assistant Professor hired in Fall 2009. A new search for a second position will commence in January 2010, with an anticipated hire in Fall 2010. A search for the third position will commence in Fall 2010. To ease the advising load on the full-time faculty, in Fall 2009 the Department’s two part-time faculty
members have taken on advising duties.

**Condition 8, Physical Resources (2005):** 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.

**Visiting Team Assessment (2008):** There is 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.

**2009 Narrative Report Response:** The Department continues to feel the space pinch. This was somewhat alleviated with the decision to move a graduate studio to downtown Hartford in the offices of JCJ Architecture, an architectural practice that has generously supported the architecture program for years. A studio was created in the JCJ offices in Spring 2009 allowing design instruction to take place off campus. The downtown studio was devoted to using Hartford as the setting for all of its design assignments. Another JCJ graduate studio is scheduled to take place in Spring 2010. Meanwhile, in Spring 2009 the University undertook a master planning study focused on campus space. The preliminary outcome of the planning study identifies the Architecture Department as a priority for space on campus, specifically to use space currently occupied by the University bookstore, which will be relocated. As an interim measure, the Department has proposed to the University that more studio space be created off the main campus for a period of two to three years while the bookstore space is vacated and renovated for Department use. The Department is currently looking into a ventilation system for the woodshop, which would be expanded with acquisition of the bookstore space.

**Criterion 13.14 Accessibility (2005):** Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities

**Visiting Team Assessment (2008):** This condition remains unmet. The team could not find consistent evidence of accessibility strategies in either course work or studio projects.

**2009 Narrative Report Response:** This criterion is covered in AET 233: Architectural Design II; AET 367: Architectural Design V; ARC 512: Advanced Site Planning; and ARC 621: Master's Thesis. Of all of these, AET 367 and ARC 621 are most critical. Following the receipt of the Visiting Team Report, the course requirements for AET 367 and ARC 621 were revised to require drawings and diagrams showing accessibility design strategies in the final presentations.

**Criterion 13.23, Building Systems Integration (2005):** Ability to assess, select, and conceptually integrate structural systems, building envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design

**Visiting Team Assessment (2008):** This condition remains unmet. 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.

**2009 Narrative Report Response:** This criterion is covered in AET 241: Mechanical,
Electrical, and Plumbing Systems; AET 367: Architectural Design V; ARC 513: Advanced Building Systems; and ARC 621: Master’s Thesis. Of all of these, AET 367 and ARC 621 are most critical. Following the receipt of the Visiting Team Report, the course requirements for AET 367 and ARC 621 were revised to require drawings and diagrams showing integrated building systems design strategies in the final presentations.

**Criterion 13.28, Comprehensive Design (2005):** 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

**Visiting Team Assessment (2008):** This condition remains unmet. 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.

**2009 Narrative Report Response:** This criterion is covered in AET 367: Architectural Design V; ARC 521: Architectural Studio II; and ARC 621: Master’s Thesis. Of all of these, AET 367 and ARC 621 are most critical. Following the receipt of the Visiting Team Report, the course requirements for AET 367 and ARC 621 were revised to require drawings and diagrams showing comprehensive design strategies in the final presentations.

1.5. **Causes of Concern**

**Visiting Team Report (2008):**
STATISTICAL BASE: Basic statistical data was not readily available. Either the College or the Department must develop and regularly update a statistical base which shows the number of full time equivalent faculty, the faculty/student ratio, the financial support provided to the Department and the comparison of these factors with other professional programs in the University. This information should appear in the narrative section of the Department’s next annual report and in its next APR.

**2009 Narrative Report Response:** Elsewhere in Part I this 2009 Report this statistical information is presented. The Department of Architecture is working with the College of Engineering, Technology, and Architecture, and the University’s Institutional Research Department to document financial, faculty, and student information.

**Visiting Team Report (2008):**
DRAWING AND MODELING AS PART OF CONCEPTUAL THINKING: The team could not find clear articulation of the goals and methods that instructors use to develop the students’ ability to see drawing and modeling as part of the thinking process. Work displayed for the first and second years appeared to focus more on the product than the process.

**2009 Narrative Report Response:** Beginning in the 2009-10 academic year, more emphasis has been placed in AET 110: Introduction to the Architectural Process to emphasize the use of hand-drawing and model-making as ways to explore design. Other undergraduate studios are placing similar emphasis on hand-drawing and model-making for design exploration.
Visiting Team Report (2008):
FOCUS: The program is laudably eager to address new and important issues such as urbanism, outreach, and integration with other campus programs. The focus of the program, however, should remain on improving the level of quality of all Student Performance Criteria and Conditions, both met and unmet. Maintaining focus will strengthen the program and lead to additional opportunities that will best be addressed after a solid base is established and refined.

2009 Narrative Report Response: The Department has continued to place emphasis on strengthening the curriculum and improving the quality of Student Performance Criteria and Conditions. In Spring 2009 the architecture faculty decided to suspend plans for a Construction Management curriculum track to keep the focus on improving the architecture curriculum and program. In Fall 2009 the architecture faculty voted to pursue curriculum changes in the program that will add a foreign studies component, additional required undergraduate studio courses, and required undergraduate courses on the architectural profession and computers in architecture. Changes to the curriculum are now being drafted for submission to the College and University curriculum committees in 2010. In Fall 2009 the Department, College, and University approved an Independent Study course for the graduate program, allowing more latitude for architectural graduate students to pursue independent studies for credit as a Professional Elective.

Changes in Program since last NAAB visit

2009 Narrative Report Response: In addition to the changes outlined above, the program is taking steps to expand the foreign studies opportunities for students. In May 2009 the Chair and Dean visited the architecture program at Bahcesehir University in Istanbul, Turkey to explore a collaboration of study for Hartford and Bahcesehir students. For Winter Session 2010 an elective course at Bahcesehir University on Istanbul architecture and planning is being offered.

The University of Hartford has been selected by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture to host the ACSA Northeast Regional Conference in Fall 2010.